United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JANUARY 5, 2007 No. 2

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, January 8, 2007, at 11:30 a.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, JANUARY 5, 2007

The House met at 9:30 a.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

''Like the eyes of a servant
on the hand of her mistress
so our eyes are on the Lord our God.
till He shows us His mercy.''

Lord, giver of all good gifts, You know as an institution the House of Representatives is served by many staffers and workers. As the 110th Congress begins its work, bless all who labor here on Capitol Hill. From police to parliamentarian to painter, recording clerk to reporter, both physician and political adviser, all are a blessing to the Members who are here to serve You and Your people by governance.

Assist them in their daily tasks, for all contribute to the common undertaking and serve this country. Be present to them in the midst of routine and show them Your mercy, both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. POE 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 MEMBERS TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 11 of rule X and clause 11 of rule I, the Chair appoints the following members of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. REYES, Texas, Chairman
Mr. HOEKSTRA, Michigan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair customarily takes this occasion at the outset of a Congress to announce her policies with respect to particular aspects of the legislative process. The Chair will insert in the RECORD announcements concerning:

first, privileges of the floor;

second, introduction of bills and resolutions;

third, unanimous-consent requests for the consideration of legislation;

fourth, recognition for 1-minute speeches;

fifth, decorum in debate;

sixth, conduct of votes by electronic device;

seventh, use of handouts on the House floor; and

eighth, use of electronic equipment on the House floor.

These announcements, where appropriate, will reiterate the origins of the stated policies. The Chair intends to continue in the 110th Congress the policies reflected in these statements. The policy announced in the 102nd Congress with respect to jurisdictional concepts related to clause 5(a) of rule XXI—tax and tariff measures—will continue to govern but need not be reiterated, as it is adequately documented as precedent in the House Rules and Manual.

Without objection, the announcements will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

1. PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

The Chair will make the following announcements regarding floor privileges, which will apply during the 110th Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER WITH RESPECT TO STAFF

Rule IV strictly limits those persons to whom the privileges of the floor during sessions of the House are extended, and that rule prohibits the Chair from entertaining requests for suspension or waiver of that rule. As reiterated by the Chair on January 21, 1986, January 3, 1985, January 25, 1983, and August 22, 1974, and as stated in Chapter 10, section 2, of House Practice, the rule strictly limits the number of committee staff on the floor at one time during the consideration of measures reported from their committees. This permission does not extend to Members' personal staff except when a Member's amendment is actually pending during the five-minute rule. It also does not extend to personal staff of Members who are sponsors of pending bills or who are engaging in special orders. The Chair requests the cooperation of all Members and committee staff to assure that only the proper number of staff are on the floor, and then only during the consideration of measures within the jurisdiction of their committees. The Chair is making this statement and reiterating this policy because of Members' past insistence

Printed on recycled paper.

upon strict enforcement of the rule. The Chair requests each chairman, and each ranking minority member, to submit to the Speaker a list of those staff who are allowed on the floor during the consideration of a measure reported by their committee. The Sergeant-at-Arms, who has been directed to assure proper enforcement of rule IV, will keep the list. Each staff person should exchange his or her ID for a ''committee staff'' badge, which is to be worn while on the floor. The Chair has consulted with the Minority Leader and will continue to consult with him.

Furthermore, as the Chair announced on January 7, 2003, in accordance with the change in the 108th Congress of clause 2(a) of rule IV regarding leadership staff floor access, only designated staff approved by the Speaker shall be granted the privilege of the floor. The Speaker intends that her approval be narrowly granted on a bipartisan basis to staff from the majority and minority side and only to those staff essential to floor activities.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER WITH RESPECT TO FORMER MEMBERS

The Speaker's policy announced on February 1, 2006, will continue to apply in the 110th Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER, FEBRUARY 1, 2006

The SPEAKER. The House has adopted a revision to the rule regarding the admission to the floor and the rooms leading thereto. Clause 4 of rule IV provides that a former Member, Delegate or Resident Commissioner or a former Parliamentarian of the House, or a former elected officer of the House or a former minority employee nominated as an elected officer of the House shall not be entitled to the privilege of admission to the Hall of the House and the rooms extending thereto if he or she is a registered lobbyist or an agent of a foreign principal; has any direct personal pecuniary interest in any legislative measure pending before the House, or reported by a committee; or is in the employ of or represents any party or organization for the purpose of influencing, directly or indirectly, the passage, defeat, or amendment of any legislative proposal.

This restriction extends not only to the House floor but adjacent rooms, the cloakrooms and the Speaker's lobby.

Clause 4 of rule IV also allows the Speaker to exempt ceremonial and educational functions from the restrictions of this clause. These restrictions shall not apply to attendance at joint meetings or joint sessions, Former Members' Day proceedings, educational tours, and other occasions as the Speaker may designate.

Members who have reason to know that a person is on the floor inconsistent with clause 4 of rule IV should notify the Sergeant at Arms promptly.

2. INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

The policy that the Chair announced on January 3, 1983, with respect to the introduction and reference of bills and resolutions will continue to apply in the 110th Congress. The Chair has advised all officers and employees of the House that are involved in the processing of bills that every bill, resolution, memorial, petition or other material that is placed in the hopper must bear the signature of a Member. Where a bill or resolution is jointly sponsored, the signature must be that of the Member first named thereon. The bill clerk is instructed to return to the Member any bill which appears in the hopper without an original signature. This procedure was inaugurated in the 92d Congress. It has worked well, and the Chair thinks that it is essential to continue this practice to insure the integrity of the process by which legislation is introduced in the House.

3. UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUESTS FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION

The policy the Chair announced on January 6, 1999, with respect to recognition for unanimous consent requests for the consideration of certain legislative measures will continue to apply in the 110th Congress. The Speaker will continue to follow the guidelines recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual conferring recognition for unanimous-consent requests for the consideration of bills, resolutions, and other measures only when assured that the majority and minority floor leadership and committee chairmen and ranking minority members have no objection. Consistent with those guidelines, and with the Chair's inherent power of recognition under clause 2 of rule XVII, the Chair, and any occupant of the Chair appointed as Speaker pro tempore pursuant to clause 8 of rule I, will decline recognition for the unanimous-consent requests chronicled in section 956 without assurances that the request has been so cleared. This denial of recognition by the Chair will not reflect necessarily any personal opposition on the part of the Chair to orderly consideration of the matter in question, but will reflect the determination upon the part of the Chair that orderly procedures will be followed; that is, procedures involving consultation and agreement between floor and committee leadership on both sides of the aisle.

4. RECOGNITION FOR ONE-MINUTE SPEECHES

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER WITH RESPECT TO ONE-MINUTE SPEECHES

The Speaker's policy announced on August 8, 1984, with respect to recognition for one-minute speeches will apply during the 110th Congress. The Chair will alternate recognition for one-minute speeches between majority and minority Members, in the order in which they seek recognition in the well under present practice from the Chair's right to the Chair's left, with possible exceptions for Members of the leadership and Members having business requests. The Chair, of course, reserves the right to limit one-minute speeches to a certain period of time or to a special place in the program on any given day, with notice to the leadership.

5. DECORUM IN DEBATE

The Chair's announced policies of January 7, 2003, January 4, 1995, and January 3, 1991, will apply in the 110th Congress. It is essential that the dignity of the proceedings of the House be preserved, not only to assure that the House conducts its business in an orderly fashion but also to permit Members to properly comprehend and participate in the business of the House. To this end, and in order to permit the Chair to understand and to correctly put the question on the numerous requests that are made by Members, the Chair requests that Members and others who have the privileges of the floor desist from audible conversation in the Chamber while the business of the House is being conducted. The Chair would encourage all Members to review rule XVII to gain a better understanding of the proper rules of decorum expected of them, and especially: to avoid ''personalities'' in debate with respect to references to other Members, the Senate, and the President; to address the Chair while standing and only during, and not beyond, the time recognized, and not to address the television or other imagined audience; to refrain from passing between the Chair and a Member speaking, or directly in front of a Member speaking from the well; to refrain from smoking in the Chamber; to deactivate any audible ring of wireless telephones when entering the Chamber; to wear appropriate business attire in the Chamber; and to generally display the same degree of respect to the Chair and other Members that every Member is due.

The Chair would like all Members to be on notice that the Chair intends to strictly enforce time limitations on debate. Furthermore, the Chair has the authority to immediately interrupt Members in debate who transgress rule XVII by failing to avoid ''personalities'' in debate with respect to references to the Senate, the President, and other Members, rather than wait for Members to complete their remarks.

Finally, it is not in order to speak disrespectfully of the Speaker; and under the precedents the sanctions for such violations transcend the ordinary requirements for timeliness of challenges. This separate treatment is recorded in volume 2 of Hinds' Precedents, at section 1248 and was reiterated on January 19, 1995.

6. CONDUCT OF VOTES BY ELECTRONIC DEVICE

The Speaker's policy announced on January 4, 1995, with respect to the conduct of electronic votes will continue in the 110th Congress with modifications as follows.

As Members are aware, clause 2(a) of rule XX provides that Members shall have not less than 15 minutes in which to answer an ordinary record vote or quorum call. The rule obviously establishes 15 minutes as a minimum. Still, with the cooperation of the Members, a vote can easily be completed in that time. The events of October 30, 1991, stand out as proof of this point. On that occasion, the House was considering a bill in the Committee of the Whole under a special rule that placed an overall time limit on the amendment process, including the time consumed by record votes. The Chair announced, and then strictly enforced, a policy of closing electronic votes as soon as possible after the guaranteed period of 15 minutes. Members appreciated and cooperated with the Chair's enforcement of the policy on that occasion.

The Chair desires that the example of October 30, 1991, be made the regular practice of the House. To that end, the Chair enlists the assistance of all Members in avoiding the unnecessary loss of time in conducting the business of the House. The Chair encourages all Members to depart for the Chamber promptly upon the appropriate bell and light signal. As in recent Congresses, the cloakrooms should not forward to the Chair requests to hold a vote by electronic device, but should simply apprise inquiring Members of the time remaining on the voting clock. Members should not rely on signals relayed from outside the Chamber to assume that votes will be held open until they arrive in the Chamber. Members will be given a reasonable amount of time in which to accurately record their votes. No occupant of the Chair would prevent a Member who is in the Well before the announcement of the result from casting his or her vote.

7. USE OF HANDOUTS ON HOUSE FLOOR

The Speaker's policy announced on September 27, 1995, which was prompted by a misuse of handouts on the House floor and made at the bipartisan request of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, will continue in the 110th Congress. All handouts distributed on or adjacent to the House floor by Members during House proceedings must bear the name of the Member authorizing their distribution. In addition, the content of those materials must comport with standards of propriety applicable to words spoken in debate or inserted in the Record. Failure to comply with this admonition may constitute a breach of decorum and may give rise to a question of privilege.

The Chair would also remind Members that, pursuant to clause 5 of rule IV, staff is prohibited from engaging in efforts in the Hall of the House or rooms leading thereto to influence Members with regard to the legislation being amended. Staff cannot distribute handouts.

In order to enhance the quality of debate in the House, the Chair would ask Members to minimize the use of handouts.

8. USE OF ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT ON HOUSE FLOOR

The Speaker's policy announced on January 27, 2000, as modified by the change in clause 5 of rule XVII in the 108th Congress, will continue in the 110th Congress. All Members and staff are reminded of the absolute prohibition contained in clause 5 of rule XVII against the use of a wireless telephone or personal computer upon the floor of the House at any time.

The Chair requests all Members and staff wishing to receive or send wireless telephone messages to do so outside of the Chamber, and to deactivate, which means to turn off, any audible ring of wireless phones before entering the Chamber. To this end, the Chair insists upon the cooperation of all Members and staff and instructs the Sergeant-at-Arms, pursuant to clause 3(a) of rule II and clause 5 of rule XVII, to enforce this prohibition.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain five 1-minute speeches on each side.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Speaker, the administration has turned a projected 10-year, $5.6 billion surplus into a nearly $3 trillion deficit. Over the past 6 years, America's debt has climbed 50 percent to more than $28,000 per person. It is so bad that this administration has borrowed more money from foreign nations than all previous 42 U.S. Presidents combined. That is the fiscal mess that we inherit from the 109th Congress.

We believe it is time that we finally get our fiscal house in order. Today, we will restore the pay-as-you-go rules that were instrumental to the budget surpluses we experienced in the early 1990s. Pay-as-you-go budgeting with no new deficit spending is a key first step. This will reverse the budget deficits that are currently passing billions of dollars in debt to our children and our grandchildren.

It was wrong to eliminate pay-as-you-go in 2002. We need to begin to treat our Federal budget in the way that working families treat their budgets, and pay-as-you-go is a good first step.

Madam Speaker, I hope that this House can act in a bipartisan fashion to restore fiscal responsibility to Washington.

OLE NUMBER 48—GERALD FORD

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, when President Gerald Ford played football for Michigan, he was the team's center on offense. He touched the ball on every play. The play could not begin without Gerald Ford snapping the ball. Others on the team, however, the quarterback, running back and receivers, made all the headlines, but that was fine with Gerald Ford. As the center he was neither on the right nor the left but in the middle of the charge to move the ball over the goal line.

Gerald Ford and Michigan were successful. Michigan won two national championships. Gerald Ford was offered contracts with NFL teams, such as the Detroit Lions. He chose law school instead, served in World War II, fought in that great war, and was a Member of this very House.

When he became President, ole No. 48, President Ford, took the ball again, but this time on the field of American discontent about corruption and war. He stayed in the center and once again was successful in moving Team America across the goal line of healing and hope.

However, when entering a room, President Ford always preferred the band not play the traditional Hail to the Chief but, rather, the Michigan fight song.

Thank you, President Ford, for playing ball for Team America.

And that's just the way it is.

BRING THE TROOPS HOME

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, Congress as a coequal branch of government must be prepared to act to bring our troops home from Iraq. Congress must have an exit plan and take steps to implement it. President Bush has every intention of keeping the troops in Iraq through the end of his term. However, the money is there to bring the troops home now. If Congress appropriates more money for Iraq, the war will escalate and more troops and innocent civilians will die. The American people voted for a new direction. That direction is out of Iraq. Let us rescue our troops. Let us rescue a domestic agenda. Let us reverse policies which have created chaos, massive civilian casualties and destruction in Iraq. Let us reunite the community of nations in the cause of stabilizing Iraq.

The U.S. cannot do this as occupiers or as agents of contracting and oil interests. We can do this only once we have stated our intention to end the occupation. Next week I will be presenting to this Congress a workable plan which can enable our Nation to bring the troops home, assure an international peacekeeping force and begin to close this perilous chapter in our Nation's history.

CONGRESS IS ACTUALLY GOING TO WORK 5 DAYS A WEEK TO MAKE AMERICA BETTER

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, as Democrats take control of Congress this week, the American people are going to see some stark differences in how we run this institution compared to the way it has been run for the last 6 years.

First, the House is actually going to be in session 5 days a week most weeks. Last year, the Republican Congress was known as the do-nothing Congress because it met fewer days than any Congress in 6 decades.

Not only is this House going to be in session more often, it is actually going to do its job while we are here. For years, Republican Congresses refused to conduct proper oversight of the Bush administration, instead choosing to rubber-stamp its policies.

Democrats take oversight responsibility seriously, and are prepared to hold this administration accountable for its successes and its failures. In hearings, we're going to ask administration officials some tough questions so that we can make government work again for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when our Nation is at war and with so many domestic and international issues that must be addressed, the American people rightly want us here doing our job. The new Democratic Congress will not disappoint.

On a personal note, as one of the new freshmen elected here, America, you have a great freshman class, a great deal of talent, and I think you can feel proud of your new Speaker, Madam PELOSI.

HOUSE DEMOCRATS PLAN TO RESTORE DEMOCRACY IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SOLIS. Good morning, Mr. Speaker, and buenos dias.

You know, folks, this is the people's House, but for much of the last 6 years, House Republican leaders chose to run it with an iron hand—one where only the voices of the special interests were heard in this House. Opposing voices were always ignored.

House Democrats vowed to restore democracy in this House and today we live up to that promise by committing to a fair and democratic process and the end of the 2-day workweek. Our proposal specifically prohibits holding votes open for the sole purpose of affecting the outcome. We all remember the Medicare prescription drug vote. I

do. I remember staying here in the wee morning hours, 3 hours, when that vote was held open in 2003 so Republican leaders could twist enough arms to win their vote. That is not how democracy is supposed to work, and our rules change would prevent that from ever happening.

We are also going to give Members more time to read bills so that they actually know what they are reading. It should be par for the course to get a bill of a thousand pages and then begin to vote on it. We need to have more time to review that.

Today, Mr. Speaker, democracy returns to the House.

DEMOCRATIC AGENDA ON HONEST LEADERSHIP AND OPEN GOVERNMENT

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, this week with pride the new Democratic House opens this congressional session by bringing ethics reform measures to the House floor that will sever the unhealthy ties between lawmakers and lobbyists.

We made a promise to the American people that we would drain the swamp of unethical behavior here in Washington, and we begin this Congress by living up to that promise by banning travel and gifts from lobbyists, getting tough on special interest earmarks, and ending the abusive processes that have destroyed democracy.

The American people sent us all a message last November. They want us to work for them and not for the special interests. I would hope that our agenda for reform would garner the support of both Democrats and Republicans. We should all be interested in policies that will ensure that the outrageous abuses of power that have taken place over the last couple of years do not continue.

These important reforms are only the beginning.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STUPAK). Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 5, proceedings will now resume on the resolution (H. Res. 6) adopting the rules of the House of Representatives for the 110th Congress.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed on Thursday, January 4, 2007, the portion of the divided question comprising title II had been disposed of.

Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 5, the portion of the divided question comprising title III is now debatable for 60 minutes.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

□ 0945

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

Mr. Speaker, here in the first hours of the 110th Congress we rise to restore decorum and civility to what has been from its founding the greatest deliberative institution. In doing so, we open a new chapter in the history of the House of Representatives, one that is dignified.

Mr. Speaker, the American people spoke loud and clear this past November, and I am proud to say that the Democratic majority is responding to that call. This legislation marks a new beginning. The Democratic reform package, H. Res. 6, enacts long overdue congressional reform: restoring an open government, an honest government, an ethical government; and it marks the restoration of the American people's priorities to the people's House. It is my hope that by enacting these changes we will be able to change the tone of how we conduct business in this Chamber and with each other.

I recall a time in the House of Representatives and not too long ago when Members had friends on both sides of the aisle. Our children played together, they got to know each other, they became friends. Our families ate dinner together. We treated each other as friends and colleagues, and debate on the House floor reflected mutual respect even when we disagreed and an understanding that we all have a role to play in the legislative process.

We are here today to say that this sense of civility and decorum is not dead. This institution is too great to permit any tarnish of its honor to become permanent or to allow the slights of yesterday to interfere with our efforts to build a better tomorrow. Civility can return to this great institution with the right style of leadership.

As we turn here and now in the first hours of the 110th Congress, part of that process is making sure that House rules can prevent the abuses of prior Congresses. This is the overarching intent of H. Res. 6. In particular, there are several provisions in title III of that resolution that will begin to restore civility and decorum to the legislative process and which will honor this Chamber's place as the people's House by making us more accountable to the people who sent us here.

The first provision of title III prohibits floor votes from being held open for more than 15 minutes for the sole purpose of changing the outcome of a vote. Voting is a Member's core responsibility and our primary means of giving voice to the view of our constituents. This reform is important and long overdue.

The other two provisions address the handling of conference reports, with the goal to end backroom deals for special interests. In the 110th Congress, conference committees will be conducted in an open and fair manner, and conference reports containing last-minute provisions will not be considered on the House floor.

A Chamber worthy of the title the people's House is one which conducts its business within the people's view. By making this reform package the very first item considered in this Congress, our new leadership is sending a strong message to all of the American people, Democrat, Republican, Independent, that we have heard the message you have sent us, demanding honest and ethical leadership, and we are heeding that call.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by, now since I have the first opportunity to formally see my California colleague here on the floor, to congratulate her and all of the members of the new majority. I have congratulated Ms. SLAUGHTER and of course Ms. PELOSI, and now I join in extending congratulations to Ms. MATSUI for her move into the majority, and to say as I did yesterday that I anxiously look forward to working in a bipartisan way as was said by Speaker PELOSI and Leader BOEHNER here yesterday.

I believe it is absolutely imperative that we meet the demand that was put forth by the American people in the November election. The message that I received from that election was that they want us to work together, they want us to solve their problems. Clearly, there needs to be a clash of ideas which was envisaged by James Madison, and I believe that that is something that we can't forget, because we are not supposed to pursue what I like to call the Rodney King view of the world: can't we all just get along. The fact of the matter is we do need to recognize that there are disparate views and they need to be voiced on this House floor.

Now, the question is, can we in fact do that and at the same time maintain civility? And I think that is what title III is all about here. It is titled ''civility'' and it is something that I have always prided myself on, and I will say that I am saddened that it is something that has been often lacking in this House.

Frankly, as I have seen the debate take place even yesterday, I was concerned that some of the statements made would indicate a lack of civility, and that is all I am going to say about it. I hope very much that the title ''civility'' used for this title III is one that is recognized by Members on both sides of the aisle.

Let me get into some of the specifics now, Mr. Speaker, if I might. In February of last year, almost a year ago, Ms. SLAUGHTER, the then-ranking minority member of the Rules Committee, and all of the members of the Rules Committee joined in introducing House Resolution 686. It is a resolution which called for virtually all of the things that my colleague, Ms. MATSUI,

outlined are very important for us to pursue: openness, transparency, disclosure, making sure that we meet our obligation to vote here on the House floor, that we have it done in the light of day.

The concern that I have is that what has happened here is we have unfortunately gotten a package which does not have the kind of enforcement mechanisms that were envisaged by H. Res. 686 as introduced by the members of the Rules Committee in the last Congress, and I believe unfortunately it really is not reflective of anything other than sort of the spirit of what it was they were talking about. And the spirit is of things that we all can agree on. I am supportive of those.

The fact is when they were in the minority, Resolution 686 calls for consultation and agreement with the minority. Now that they are in the majority, unfortunately, this measure does not in any way reflect the need to have consultation with the minority.

For example, on this notion of keeping votes open beyond the 15-minute period of time, when they were in the minority they called for it to only take place if they had consultation with the minority. Well, unfortunately, this measure does not call for that. And what I am reminded of as I look at these items which touch on the issues that were raised in Resolution 686, I am reminded of again the experience that I had in the past on this when I moved from minority status to majority status 12 years ago. We had something known as the Contract With America. Some may remember that. What we said was that there would be 10 items that we would bring to the floor and we would have up or down votes on those items because, frankly, we were denied the chance for many, many years to consider them. They were items that were supported by broad-based backing of the American people.

Frankly, at the end of the day, President Clinton, who was President at that time, signed over 60 percent of the measures that were incorporated in the Contract With America. What we did is we outlined in detail what that would consist of. We said it would be considered under an open amendment process, and that is exactly what we did. It is exactly what we did with those measures that came forward.

So, Mr. Speaker, we unfortunately with this measure have not seen the same kind of reflection of the goals that were outlined by the then-minority in this measure, and I thought I would take a moment just to go through a few of those items specifically and say that, unfortunately, this package is not what they called for.

Now, in the package that we had introduced in 686, it called for a requirement that conference reports contain an itemized list of any provisions in violation of the Scope rule. That is not included in this measure. It said that a rule prohibiting the Rules Committee from reporting martial law rules could not be in order. That is not included here.

A rule prohibiting the Rules Committee from waiving points of order against the conference report were a serious violation of the Scope Rule, or additions or deletions made after final agreement. That is not included here.

Another provision in Ms. SLAUGHTER's resolution as introduced in February of last year: a rule prohibiting the Rules Committee from waiving points of order against a conference report where the minority party managers of the House were not allowed to fully participate in the conference. Well, they of course said they want to have this happen, but the kind of specificity and enforcement mechanisms that were outlined in the Slaughter Resolution, H. Res. 686, introduced in February of last year, not included in this measure.

A rule permitting consideration of a conference report only if a roll call vote in open meeting was held on its final version and the results included the accompanying joint explanatory statement of managers. Well, sounds great, we are all for that, but that wasn't included in this resolution that we are now considering.

A rule prohibiting the Rules Committee from calling up a rule within 24 hours of reporting it. Well, everybody talked about that. We know that on the opening-day rules package that we considered, we received it maybe 19 hours before we brought it up or something like that, but it clearly was in the violation of the 24 hours that was insisted upon by the then-minority.

A rule requiring the Speaker of the House to publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a log of all voting activity occurring after the first 30 minutes of any recorded vote whose maximum time for voting exceeds 30 minutes. That is not included in here at all.

A rule prohibiting suspensions costing more than $100 million. I don't see that in here at all.

A rule requiring the Speaker of the House to allow an equal number of bills and resolutions sponsored by majority and minority parties under suspension.

A repeal of the Gephardt rule. A rule requiring a 24-hour layover of unanimous consent requests.

A rule prohibiting the Rules Committee from reporting a rule unless at least one minority party member of the committee is allowed to offer an amendment to it.

Now, again, I know that we are hearing words from the new majority that they want to do all these things, but when they introduced House Resolution 686, they made it very clear that they had to have enforcement mechanisms and that they were going to provide guarantees of minority rights. Unfortunately, while the word ''civility'' sounds great, this measure falls way, way short of that.

So I again go back to when we went from minority to majority and I looked at the fact that we were able to maintain our promise, we were able to keep our word. And I am very proud of that fact. The thing that troubles me, while I am supportive of what we are trying to do here, is that it does not comply with the promises and the commitments and the vision and the goals that were set forth in February in House Resolution 686 as was introduced by the then-minority.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few comments so that all Members may keep in mind the heart of what we are doing today.

These two days of debate on the House floor mark a historic moment for reform of the people's House. The American people grew tired of a Republican Congress too unethical to conduct its business in the light of day and too deaf to hear the people's complaint. And so this past November the people exercised their right to vote in order to send a message. It was a mandate for change, to restore civility, decorum, and ethical behavior to Congress. Democrats are acting swiftly in response to their call.

When it passes the House later today, the Democratic ethics package will be the greatest reform of this institution in history. There will be no more corporate jet travel paid by special interests, no more roll call votes held open for hours in the middle of the night so that Members could be arm twisted on the floor, no more anonymous earmarks, no more last-minute provisions slipped in conference reports.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Democratic reform package is far tougher than anything Republicans ever proposed or enacted, and it will restore integrity to this sacred institution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman, our new Member from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

□ 1000

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Together, we have a lot of work to do: To help working families get ahead, restore America's standing in the world, and bring our budget back in balance. Making progress is what our constituents in 435 districts around this country have elected us to do.

To be sure, our differences will be intensely debated. However, our mutual obligations is to do everything we can to move our country forward by confronting directly and immediately the challenges before us. To succeed in the job our constituents sent us here to do, we must lay out rules in a regular order that Members can count on. These ground rules will not guarantee an outcome, but they will set out a framework where we, as an institution, make progress and serve the public.

That is why the Democratic leadership embraces three very simple,

straightforward principles that will help us succeed. As the Member from California has laid out, we set out today to establish a regular civility in this body.

Civility, it is mutual respect, really, requires straightforward ground rules to guide debate. It requires adherence to rules that apply to all. Each of us will know and be able to assure the citizens who elected us when it comes to votes in this, their representative body: Members will have time to read what they are voting on; Members will have time to vote, but votes will not be held open for the purpose of changing the outcome; and Members will vote on conference reports that are the ones agreed upon by the conferees, not ones altered after the fact.

These rules, applied to all, will help us do the work of the people we represent. Our debates at times will be intense, as they should be, but we must strive to have our debates on the merits. The rules we propose for your consideration are basic. They are rules that apply to legislators in Vermont where I am from, and probably rules that your own legislators take for granted: Time to read and review before voting, timely voting procedures, and considering conference reports as signed.

Mr. Speaker, I served 13 years in the Vermont legislature, sometimes in the minority and sometimes in the majority. We in Vermont were proud of the legislative process and standards that we set. Those in the majority couldn't do things simply because they had the power. Minority voices were heard, Members were kept informed, and our legislative process was respected. We did have intense debates on the issues, but more often than not, not always, at the end of the day, good ideas were considered and we were able to move Vermont ahead.

These changes that we present for your consideration today are not just about process, they are about passing good, substantive legislation.

These new rules to establish civility to this body are essential for Congress to do the work of the American people and to build the trust of those we serve.

We face looming challenges in America, to the security of our families and to the security of our country. And nobody and no party has a monopoly on the good ideas required to steer us forward. The simple and straightforward rules of engagement will help all of us do that.

Yesterday, the minority leader, in handing over the gavel to the new Speaker, was graceful and was wise when he reminded us that we can have disagreements without being disagreeable. Both the Speaker and the minority leader stated on our behalf what we all know to be true: All of us are here for the common purpose, to make America a better place. There is and must be room for all of our voices to be heard to achieve our common purpose.

The rules we propose will help us do that. How? By establishing very clear ground rules that apply to all, the majority as well as the minority, to every Member, committee chairs and ranking members, House veterans and House freshmen. One and all alike.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by reminding my California colleague that yesterday we passed the ethics package about which she spoke, indicating that we would be voting on it later today. We voted on that yesterday. It has already gone into effect, I am very happy to say. And we did it with very strong bipartisan support.

I am proud that the ethics reform legislation, of course, was based on and incorporated most of the items that were already passed in the House last year. Again, a year ago this month, Speaker HASTERT and I stood in the well and we outlined our call for ethics and lobbying reform, bringing about the kind of accountability and transparency and disclosure, calling for the ban on gifts and dealing with the travel and all of these problems that were out there. We recognize that they are there in a bipartisan way, and yesterday we voted that out in a strong bipartisanship way.

I am very pleased to see the distinguished Chair of the Rules Committee here, and I will again, as I did yesterday, extend congratulations. And, Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of civility that we are pursuing, I think it is very important for us to debate these issues, and I would like to engage my distinguished new Chair in a colloquy, if I might.

Mr. Speaker, as I look at the resolution that is before us, the thing that I find most troubling as we focus on the issue of civility is the fact that those items that I outlined that were included in H. Res. 686 that was introduced on February 16, 2005, which called for the litany of items, and I can go through them again quickly: A requirement that conference reports contain an itemized list of any provisions in violation of the scope rule; a rule prohibiting the Rules Committee from reporting martial law rules; a rule prohibiting the Rules Committee from waiving points of order against a conference report with a serious violation; and it goes on for basically two pages.

What I would like to ask my distinguished Chair is why it is that those items that were incorporated in the base of H. Res. 686, the commitment that was made by the then-minority as to what would be done if they were to move to majority, are not included in this title that we are considering here, and not, in any way, included in the opening day rules package.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I think, Mr. DREIER, my good friend, that we have done a remarkable job considering we have been sworn in less than 24 hours.

We are, by no means, through when we finish the 100 hours, and we will be moving toward, again, a more just democracy in this House in the future. We have never said this is all of it.

Frankly, everybody has known what is in this package since we first unveiled it at the Library of Congress last January.

In addition, many of our colleagues in the House on both sides of the aisle are already on record through votes on many of the things that we want to bring up. Certainly minimum wage, absolutely stem cell research, and what we want to do on ending the war. And the war itself is not addressed.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me just say I have been supportive of stem cell research, and I have supported the minimum wage increase. That is not what I am talking about here.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of our civil debate, which I think is very important, we are talking about the opening day rules package which is going to set forth, Mr. Speaker, the guidelines around which we will consider all of these items.

Now I would ask my friend, am I correct from inferring from the statement she just made that there is a commitment, a commitment that as we proceed forward to modify the rules of the House to include those items in H. Res. 686, which were really the cornerstone of the package that was introduced by Mrs. SLAUGHTER and the other then-minority members of the Rules Committee, which guarantee these rights to the minority that they believed were so critically important when they were in the minority; and, unfortunately, are not included in the package.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. You really liked those, did you, my colleague? You thought those were good reforms, the ones you are talking about?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, in the spirit of civil debate, let me say that I believe these measures that were authored by Members of the new majority as being critical rights that the minority should have, that those Members in the majority who believed them to be so important should obviously stand by them.

All I am asking is that the promise that was made in the 109th Congress by the then-Members of the minority about what they believed minority rights should be should be, in fact, implemented. Because, unfortunately, while we can talk about these great things, when you go down the line seriatim, looking at each individual item, making sure that we do have Members of the minority guaranteed to have a right in conference committees to be there, bringing an end to considering measures without a 24-hour waiting period, these kinds of rights that the

then-minority believed were imperative for the minority to have are, unfortunately, not included in this package. This is what I find to be very troubling.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished Chair.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am sure you recall the time in the Rules Committee when we took this package and broke it down vote by vote, and the majority, led by you, voted down every single one of them. This seems somewhat hypocritical to me.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time so I might respond, these were not my proposals, Mr. Speaker. These were not my proposals. These were proposals put forward by Members of the new majority, and they were the commitments, the promises, and the obligations that they made as far as enforcement of minority rights that they believed to be so important. That was the platform on which they ran in November, Mr. Speaker.

I believe that what we should do is do all that we can to simply point to the fact that this title III on civility, which is supposed to be reflective of these notions, is in no way emblematic of H. Res. 686 that was introduced by the Members.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to Ms. SLAUGHTER to respond.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Let me say, just watch us, Mr. DREIER. I want to reiterate what I said last night: We have no intention of keeping our foot on your necks the way you did us. And you are just going to have to watch us and see. But you have voted against every one of these, along with many other things.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the chairman of Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and thank her for her wonderful job.

Mr. Speaker, today we are taking up the third title of the new Democrat rules package which will restore civility to this body.

The House was always intended to be a place where civil discourse and the courteous exchange of ideas would be the normal state of affairs.

But referring to this portion of our rules package as the ''civility'' title is actually a civil term for what we are talking about: The restoration of democracy itself in the House of Representatives.

Over the last several years, parliamentary procedure has broken down here, and I don't know anybody who can deny that. The standard practices of this body, carefully designed rules that are fundamental to our democratic process, fell by the wayside. Far too often, they have been shunned and ignored whenever doing so fit the needs of the former majority.

At the end of 2003, the House took up a Medicare prescription drug bill. It is a perfect example of the broken legislation produced by a broken process.

Instead of proceeding in an open and transparent manner, conference discussions were held behind closed doors for months, excluding all Democrats. On one occasion, Democratic conferee CHARLES RANGEL and MARION BERRY, men who have spent their lives and careers fighting for the good of the Nation, were not let into the conference room and were physically prevented from coming inside, even though they had been appointed to be there. Why? Because the lobbyists were in the room. The lobbyists were writing the bills, not the Members of Congress, and certainly not the minority who had no fingerprint at all on the Medicare prescription drug bill.

That abuse of secrecy was for a good reason: It was bad for the country and the Republican conferees didn't want anybody to find out about it. But one group that did learn of its dangerous provisions was the Republican conference, and when the bill was brought to the floor on November 21, a significant number of principled Republicans refused to vote for it.

□ 1015

And so once again civil and democratic procedures were denied. The Republican leadership had lost the vote after the standard time allotted; so they simply kept it open. I have never seen anything like that in my years in the House. There were Cabinet Secretaries all over the floor. There were strangers or people we didn't even know on the floor as for over 3 hours they worked on people who were in tears, many of them, to make them vote for that bill. There was also a blanket liability exemption for drug manufacturers inserted into the language without the approval of the conference about 5 hours after the conference had been signed off on, and so absolutely the process was broken. According to reports, the President of the Senate simply walked over to the House side and inserted 40 pages into the bill. It amounted to a multi-billion dollar gift to drug companies.

Mr. Frist's liability exemption had been brought up during the conference process, but it was rejected, just like the Medicare legislation of 2003 had, in truth, been rejected by this House. But in each case, Members of the Republican leadership wanted something they couldn't get through the democratic process, and so they ignored the process. By doing so, they did more than pass flawed legislation. They undermined our democracy itself.

This democracy is a system designed to prevent abuses like these from occurring, a system constructed and improved over two centuries so that bad legislation could be exposed and voted down.

If we profess to care about democracy, the proof will be in the process. And, Mr. Speaker, we must save the democratic process in this House. How hypocritical is it that we try to spread democracy to other parts of the world when we disallow it in the American House of Representatives?

The civility portion of the Democratic rules package before us today will prevent the abuses of recent years from happening again. It will prohibit the Speaker from holding open votes just so the outcome can be changed. Democracy is the art of compromise, not the art of coercion.

We are also going to insist that conference committees operate in an open and fair manner and that House conferees sign final conference papers at one time and in one place. In other words, they have to be present at the conference to do so. Never again will the esteemed Members of this body on either side of the aisle be locked out of this democracy. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it does not go too far to say that about half of the American public was disenfranchised. Because of the closeness of the majority and minority, we left half of America out of the room.

This package prohibits the consideration of any conference report that was altered after it was signed by the conferees. If a conference can't agree on a legislative provision, it should not be in the conference report, period. If the Members of this body believe in the power of their ideas, there will be no need for tactics like those we have seen of late. An open, democratic, and civil process will promote good ideas and good legislation and will eliminate corruption and influence peddling.

In this new Congress and with this new rules package, we are standing up for our system of government and the needs of the people it serves and bringing back the government that they think they had, up until this last November. Democrats are going to return civility and common sense to this body, and I encourage everyone on both sides of the aisle to join us.

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

Once again, I am very enthusiastic about this return to civility, and I am very proud of engaging in civil debate on a regular basis. And I thank the distinguished Chair of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for engaging in debate with me on this issue once again.

And I would say that as I listened to her prepared statement, I was struck with, once again, how the notion of not keeping votes open for a long period of time is an admirable one. It is a great one. But guess what, Mr. Speaker. There is not one single item in this package that guarantees enforcement. In fact, Speaker PELOSI introduced her legislation, H.R. 4682. I remember very well looking at that legislation. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you exactly what it said. It said that if a vote is kept open beyond a 20-minute period of time, there had to be consultation with the minority. Now, that is not something I proposed. That was the proposal of Speaker PELOSI. Now, the sad thing is

that in this measure there is no enforcement mechanism.

Now, of course, people are busy. They come over here for a 15-minute vote. They would like to have it take place within 20 minutes. We are hearing that votes won't go beyond that period of time for the sole purpose of changing a Member's vote. But, again, there is no enforcement mechanism. And, again, the enforcement mechanism was not my proposal. It is a proposal that the then-minority offered. But now that they are in the majority, they just decide to say, well, we want to keep this process going and we want to keep doing it, but we are not going to consult with the minority. So, again, those aren't my proposals. Those are their proposals.

Mr. Speaker, at this juncture I am very happy to yield 4 minutes to my very good friend from Marietta, Georgia, a former member of the Rules Committee, who is very thoughtful on these issues, Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I want to also commend the majority in regard to title III and the overall civility tone as it pertains, of course, to conference committees and having the opportunity for Members of the minority conference team to be present, not to have things added at the last minute after all the conferees signatories have read the report and designate it as complete and then add something at the midnight hour. All of these things are good.

I was in the Georgia State Senate in the minority, and I remember the Democratic president of the senate appointing me to my first conference committee. I was thrilled. It was an issue on which I had worked very hard with the majority, and I couldn't understand why I was never called to a conference committee. And then at the sine die hour, all of a sudden this conference report was stuck under my nose and asked for my signature without even reading it, and I was absolutely appalled at that. So I commend the majority for wanting to clean that up, and I support it.

But I agree with my former chairman, now ranking member, of the Rules Committee in regard to the argument that was proffered just a minute ago that it doesn't really go quite far enough. But let me spend a little time continuing to make the point that he just made in regard to this issue of holding votes open.

Now, during the last 2 years, during almost the entire 109th Congress, after we passed an historic prescription drug benefit for 38 million seniors who had been waiting for 45 years because the now majority, when they were in control, could never deliver on that promise, all we heard for 2 years were these complaints of, well, you held the vote open 3 hours and 28 minutes. You were breaking arms of a former Member from Michigan, Mr. Smith, and others, and it was inappropriate, how appalling that was.

And now maybe you are right. Maybe holding the vote open for that purpose is inappropriate when the concerns of our constituents might be that when a Member in good conscience is opposed or in favor of a particular controversial piece of legislation and his or her vote is not going your way and so you get him in a corner or a back room and say, hey, what can we do for you? Or maybe what can we do to you if you don't vote with us? Like removing you, a good productive Member, from a certain select committee, or maybe we promise to put you, who is not quite qualified, on a good select committee that you have been wanting and pushing for for a number of years, and all of a sudden you grant them some earmark that is absolutely egregious, maybe almost as bad as the ''bridge to nowhere.''

So I would say to my friends in the majority, why the modifier ''sole'' purpose? If you really believe this, as the gentleman from California just pointed out, take out that modifier. Let us not hold votes open beyond 15 minutes for the purpose of breaking an arm and trying to change someone's mind when they in good conscience have had plenty of time to consider the bill, to think about it, indeed, maybe even pray about it. I think it is inappropriate, and I agree with you. But let's get serious about this. Let's make sure we really change it and it is not just some window dressing to kind of make your argument that you have been trying to make over the last 2 years. Let us take out the modifier, close the loophole, get serious about this, and that is real reform.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the next speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to show my support for the House rules, as we are dealing with them today, but I am also calling for an independent investigating arm for the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lend my full support to these changes to our House Rules.

These rules are the foundation that will govern how this body operates, but also serves as a reflection of our collective values and character.

I have served almost 6 years on the House Ethics Committee.

I have seen more investigations than I care to in the last 6 years of Members on both sides of the aisle.

These rule changes should restore a tone of civility and honesty in this chamber and that is why I am supporting this package and urge all my colleagues to do the same.

However, I would like to raise an issue that is not contained in this package today.

I strongly believe that the House Ethics Committee needs an independent investigative office.

Currently, my colleagues on the Ethics Committee and I are tasked with determining whether rumors and innuendos have any merit to launch investigations that at times bring disgrace to this body and end the careers of our colleagues.

We are the Court of Congress, yet we serve as both the investigators and the judges of our colleagues. This is no easy task.

Those of us on this Committee have accepted this position and stand poised to enforce the Rules of the House and preserve the integrity of this body.

However, it would be beneficial to the Members of the Ethics Committee and this House if we had an independent investigation arm so we may have unbiased, thorough information regarding any accusation of impropriety by a Member of this body.

I believe this would help remove any partisan sentiments regarding origination of investigations and may help restore America's faith in our ability to enforce our rules.

With this information the Members of the Committee would then determine whether or not there is sufficient information to further the investigation, or take action on the issue before the Committee.

Allowing an independent investigating office to begin investigating then bring information to the Ethics Committee would not make our job easier, but it would help us have this nonpartisan information to do our job better.

I strongly support the changes proposed today, but I believe it is necessary for us to begin a dialogue on creating an Independent Investigative Office to serve the House Ethics Committee and the House of Representatives.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding.

Of the many concerns my constituents had as they looked at the Congress over the last few years, one of the most important and troubling had to do with the minimal amount of time we were repeatedly given to address important pieces of legislation. Indeed, it seemed often that the more important the legislation before us, the less time we had to read it.

My colleague from Georgia talked momentarily ago about the Medicare prescription drug benefit. During debate on that bill, there were important elements of it that no one seemed to understand. I asked repeatedly if people could explain it. I was told by one speaker on the then-majority side, You will have to ask somebody on the Ways and Means Committee; I am only on the Rules Committee. But we all voted on it. We voted on things repeatedly that we had not been given a chance to read, that were not allowed for amendment, and that was wrong. And I commend our leadership for trying to set a new tone, and I welcome the support of our colleagues on the minority side as they commit to trying to work with us.

Included in this rules package is a commitment by our leadership to allow adequate time for consideration of legislation before it comes to a vote. The situation here is this: we ought to make sure that we can look our constituents and our colleagues in the eye

and say that before we voted on this legislation, we had ample time for ourselves and our staff to study it and we knew what was in it.

For too long lobbyists have written legislation. On some of the legislation I have talked about before, I had lobbyists calling me to say I should vote for a bill, the text of which was not even available to the Members themselves.

Members of Congress have the responsibility to give themselves and one another time to study legislation, to debate it, to hear from both sides, because there are good ideas on both sides and, frankly, there are bad ideas on both sides. So let's work together in this new Congress to set a new tone and a new precedent and a new practice.

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

I would like to engage in colloquy with my friend. I wonder if the gentleman has had an opportunity to look at what we consider to be the opening-day rules package that we are considering.

He has talked about, Mr. Speaker, some very important provisions. I believe that the 24-hour layover idea which was propounded by the then-Members of the minority is an important one. It is not guaranteed here; so it is not provided.

Number two, if you look at title V of the measure that is before us, title V provides 5 minutes of debate on five closed rules. The Rules Committee will not even be giving the minority the opportunity to have its amendments defeated in the Rules Committee, and we are not going through the committee process at all.

Now, I will acknowledge that the items that we are going to be addressing, a majority of which I support, are very important for us to proceed with, and an argument has been made that this was debated and discussed in the last Congress. Well, look at the tremendous number of new Members of the House that have come in, especially on the majority side. They are denied any opportunity to participate in this process at all. So as I hear my friend talk about, yes, we need to proceed in a civil manner, and I am all for that, I believe we need to proceed with fairness. I believe these things are all very important. It is just unfortunate that the facts are not reflected in the rhetoric that we are getting on the need for civility and openness and debate.

If my friend would like to respond, I would be happy to yield to him.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to respond. And let me say I acknowledge the gentleman's concern and I share it to a significant degree. Personally, I would prefer that there had been more time and more opportunity for debate in some of these measures and more opportunity for input from the minority side.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate that.

□ 1030

What I would say is that based on the fact that we have never before, in the 230-year history of this republic, we have never had the greatest body known to man come forward with five closed rules in an opening day package denying Members an opportunity to participate in any way.

So that is why I would argue this notion that we are beginning with a new tone, we are going to have an openness and all, is, in fact, not reflected in what we are facing in the next few days.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. I appreciate the gentleman's point. I would just echo the sentiments of the gentleman from New York earlier.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us in these early opening days of this session is legislation that has been debated extensively and been available extensively over the past couple of months, indeed, some of it was passed in the last Congress. I would suggest that we have had time to look at this.

I would concur, and I will say that in the future, when future measures come up, especially measures that are new to this body, I will work very vigorously to ensure that the minority has adequate time to study, to debate and offer amendments to that legislation.

Mr. DREIER. Let me just respond. I know his time has expired.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to respond.

We haven't seen any of the items. Maybe you all have those items, but we have not seen those items that we will be voting on. They haven't been submitted to us at all.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2½ minutes to my very good friend from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I do have to speak up for Iowa, although I wish Iowa was playing in the national championships coming up.

Mr. Speaker, not long ago, Members and leaders of the current majority party of the House spent countless hours attempting to draw the attention of the American people to what they defined as a culture of corruption here in Congress. Hoping to use this, they wanted to turn this phrase, usher in a new Democratic majority. That was their wish on election night that Members of the new majority stood in this Chamber prior to that, and on numerous soap boxes across the country and promised that if the American people gave them the chance to run things here on Capitol Hill, they would do things differently.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that things should be done differently here in this body. Last year in the 109th Congress, I introduced H.R. 4967, the Sunlight Act, and that was of 2006. This bill would have, on a number of things, required that bills, conference reports, joint resolutions and amendments be available to the public on the Internet in a searchable format before a bill could be voted on.

It also would have required and will require, if passed, privately funded travel be approved in advance by the Rules Committee with the costs being fully disclosed in 5 days. It would require that Members report exact assets and liability values on their financial disclosures instead of vague ranges, vague ranges that allow a Member to report between $5 million and $25 million in assets. That is too broad a range.

A $20 million range would require the subject of debate to be projected on the wall so it is visible to Members and people that are in the gallery. It would require that donations to political campaigns be reported in a searchable, sortable format on the Internet and have that within the last 30 days each day, within each 24 hours a report be filed.

I believe that passage of my Sunlight Act would do much to raise the levels of transparency in the affairs of this body, and it would also restore the public's confidence in our Members. It is disingenuous for the majority claim that they want to change things when they don't want to give a consideration of commonsense reforms like those outlined in this bill.

Yet this bill, as I worked it hard last year, could not earn one signature from a single Democrat as a co-sponsor. Now, I am refused the opportunity to even offer this as a bill. This is my only opportunity to even make the argument.

So I would make this argument, Mr. Speaker, that there were a lot of campaign promises that were made. It seems to me that the one that is the most obstructive to all of us is the promise to accomplish this series of things in the first 100 hours. The first 100 hours has been redefined. Many of these promises will be also given up on, and it will be difficult, and in many cases, impossible to keep those promises.

Mr. Speaker, why don't we just waive this promise of accomplishing all these things in the first 100 hours so the people of America can be heard on the floor of the Congress.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 1 minute to a new Member, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

(Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of the civility provisions offered in part today as one of the new rules of the 110th Congress. I applaud the new Democratic leadership for offering this reform package, because our country needs a fair and functioning Congress if we are ever going to meet these huge challenges that we face as a Nation.

When my constituents in Connecticut's Second District voted for change, they knew to create that change. We need a legislative body that allows real debate and discussion, not a rush to judgment that deprives our democracy of good ideas. To achieve that goal, this rule will curb past abuses of this Chamber's processes.

This rule will prohibit votes being held open for the sole purpose of affecting the outcome, a practice that in the past damaged the public's confidence in laws passed by this institution. It will reform the conference committee process, a reform that will give all Members, the press and the American people, the opportunity to understand the content of legislation at its most critical moment, right before passage.

Mr. Speaker, the Gallup poll that came out recently December 19 ranked the Congress' performance that only 20 percent of the American people rated it good. It is time to fix the broken branch by adopting these rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the chair how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Illinois). The gentleman from California has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of our time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to one of our new Members, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BRALEY).

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to be here today to talk about the need for more civility in this body. I would like to remind the House that the last Member to be sanctioned for being assaulted on the floor of this House was Lovell Rousseau, who was involved in an assault on a representative from Grinnell, Iowa, the city I was born in.

I think we can all think back to those days and be grateful that we now serve in a body where respect is a daily part of the operations. I think it is never too late to learn from the past and to make sure that we continue to express the importance of treating each other in a manner that provides respect to this body and also brings honor to it.

When I was out on the campaign trail, I often talked about growing up in my hometown of Brooklyn, Iowa. When people had a problem there, they never asked if you were Republican or a Democrat, they asked for your help, and they got it. I think that is the purpose this body, to solve problems and to do it in a way that brings respect and honor on this body.

I am very honored that this new rules package promotes greater civility and does it in a manner that is consistent with House rule XXIII, which requires us to conduct ourselves at all times in a manner that shall reflect credibly upon this House, and by promoting an atmosphere where we are required to be on guard against abuses in voting time and reforms to the conference committee process. We will all do more to bring respect for the people who elected us to this body to serve.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I had no idea that we had used so much of our time, so I am going to continue to reserve our time.

I would ask my colleague from California how many speakers she has remaining.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, so if the gentleman from California would like to use his time.

Mr. DREIER. At this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to a very hard-working Member, who will continue on the Rules Committee, my good friend from the Big D, Mr. SESSIONS.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. DREIER, I appreciate the opportunity for you to yield time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit shocked and surprised with the reformers that have come to Congress, the brand-new Democrats who are talking about all these things that they are going to get done. Yet it seems to me that with the respect we would have for the voters who sent us here, that we would not be asked to approve and get ready to vote on things without even seeing the bills.

The new Democrat party, in their openness and trying to do things right, is asking Members of this body to vote for and approve getting rules to the floor without even knowing what the bills are about, the substance.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this. I rise in opposition because I think it is a step backwards, not a step forwards. It represents less transparency and is a slap in the face for regular order to this House.

Section 503 of this flawed package rolls back the Sunlight reforms implemented by the Republican Party in 1995, and it creates a secret ballot in the Rules Committee for votes that are taken right upstairs, Mr. Speaker, where we would meet, where rules, as they are debated and brought before this House, Members always had to make sure that the votes that they were going to support would be recorded. That is not going to happen. There is no compelling reason for this bait-and-switch that has happened now by the new Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this. I think it is a step backwards, and it is my hope that the newest Members of this body will listen to what is being said, that their rhetoric about the openness and change in this body is simply a step backwards. What a shame. They thought they were coming to Washington to change things, and what they are doing is to make it more like central government that we are told what to do by a few people in the Democrat leadership.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time. I do so to say that I am supportive of this title called civility. We will be having a vote on that. Mr. SESSIONS was very appropriately raising concern over title V. We only had 5 minutes of debate on that. So he raised concern about the closed rules and shutting down operations of the Rules Committee that would record votes and make them public.

My concern about this measure we are going to have, which as I am going to support, because I am not going to oppose civility, is that when we look at the promises that were made by the then minority to do things like have a 24-hour waiting period before measures are brought up, it is denied in this rules package itself, because we got it about 19 hours before, so the spirit of that was denied there.

The whole notion of ensuring that we have consultation with the minority when it comes to keeping votes open, when it comes to the issue of ensuring that we will have minority participation conference in committees. As we go down the line and look at these items, Mr. Speaker, it does trouble me.

But there is a little bit of hope, and that hope was offered by the distinguished Chair of the Rules Committee, when she told me there has been such a short period of time between the election and opening day and consideration of this package, that we in the Rules Committee will have an opportunity to do more.

So I always hold out, where there is light, there is hope, you know. I will tell you, I would do everything I can to help her maintain that commitment, and we will continue to do that.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, these 2 days of House floor debate will culminate in a reform of House Rules unlike any other in history. This reform is a response to the American people to their mandate. This past November, the people exercised a right to vote in order to send the message. It was a mandate for change to restore civility, decorum and ethical behavior to Congress.

As I said in my opening remarks, debate on House floor must reflect mutual respect, even when we disagree. I look forward to restoring decorum and civility to this House, restoring integrity to what is truly the people's House. I urge all Members to join us in that effort.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Title III of H.R. 6, the Rules of the House of Representatives for the 110th Congress. With the adoption of this title, we begin to make good on our pledge to restore civility, open government, and honest leadership to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, it is critically important that we adopt the civility rules contained in Title III because Americans are paying for the cost of corruption in Washington with skyrocketing prices at the pump, spiraling drug costs, and the waste, fraud and no-bid contracts in the Gulf Coast and Iraq for Administration cronies.

But that is not all. Under the previous Republican leadership of the House, lobbyists were permitted to write legislation, 15-minute votes were held open for hours, and entirely new legislation was sneaked into signed conference reports in the dead of night.

The American people registered their disgust at this terrible way of considering and voting on legislation last November and voted for reform. House Democrats picked up 30 seats held by Republicans and won the majority. Restoring open government and honest leadership is one of the top priorities of the new majority of House Democrats. That is why we have included Title III in the Rules of the House of Representative for the 110th Congress. We seek to end the excesses we witnessed under the Republican leadership and to restore the public's trust in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Chairman SLAUGHTER and the members of the Rules Committee for their excellent work in preparing the rules package. The reforms contained in the package are necessary to ensure that all Members of Congress, each of whom is elected to represent the interests of nearly 600,000 constituents, have sufficient time to consider important legislation before casting an informed vote. The reforms we are considering also will discourage manipulation of the voting rules to alter the outcome of roll call votes.

Mr. Speaker, I support the elements of the civility package, which (1) prohibits holding votes open for the sole purpose of affecting the outcome; and (2) reforms the conference committee process by requiring adequate notice of meetings, ensuring information is available to all conferees, and prohibiting changes to the text of signed conference reports.

Mr. Speaker, under the previous House Republican leadership, several votes were held open for hours in order to change the outcome. The most notable example was the November 2003 vote on the conference report on Medicare legislation (PL 108–173) that was held open for two hours and 53 minutes, the longest recorded vote since electronic voting began in 1973. After the expiration of the 15 minute time limit, the measure lost 216 to 218. But the vote was held open hours to afford House Republican leaders, the president, and the Health and Human Services Department, enough time to lobby enough Republican members to change their votes, or cast votes, in favor of the measure, eventually achieving a majority of 220 to 215. This kind of unfair manipulation of the rules would not take place under the voting rules package we are considering today.

With respect to Conference Reports, the rules package we consider today includes provisions intended to ensure that conferees have notice of conference meetings and the opportunity to participate, as well as to prevent the insertion of material into a conference agreement after the conferees have completed their work but before the House votes on the measure. These new rules also require House managers to ensure that conference meetings occur under circumstances that allow every House conferee to have notice of the meetings and reasonable opportunities to attend. Under the prior Republican leadership, Democratic conferees frequently were not invited to meetings of conferees, which prevented U.S. from having a meaningful role in crafting an agreement.

The rules also require conferees to ensure that all provisions on which the House and Senate have disagreed be considered open to discussion at any meeting of the conference committee. Additionally, House conferees will be required to ensure that papers reflecting a conference agreement are held "inviolate to change," unless there is a renewal of the opportunity of all House managers to reconsider their decision to sign or not to sign the agreement. This change is designed to prevent material from being inserted into a conference agreement after conferees have "closed" the measure. In this connection, the new reforms requires that House managers be provided with a single time and place, with access to at least one complete copy of the final conference agreement, for the purpose of recording their approval, or lack of approval, on the signature sheets that accompany the conference report and the joint statement of managers.

Last, the new reforms bar the House from considering a conference report if the text differs materially, except clerical changes, from the text that reflects the action of the conferees when they signed the conference agreement.

Mr. Speaker, to restore public confidence in this institution we must commit ourselves to being the most honest, most ethical, most responsive Congress in history. We can end the nightmare of the last six years by putting the needs of the American people ahead of partisan political advantage. To do that, we must start by adopting by Title III of H.R. 6, the civility reforms to the Rules of the House of Representatives for the 110th Congress.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 5, the previous question is ordered on the portion of the divided question comprising title III.

The question is on that portion of the divided question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. MATSUI. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The portion of the divided question comprising title IV is now debatable for 60 minutes.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

□ 1045

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the minority leader, my friend, or his designee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Title IV of our rules package is one of the ones of which I am most proud. Over the past 12 years, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, while allegedly praying to the gods of fiscal responsibility, have nearly sunk our ship of state in red ink. Today we begin to right this ship and staunch the unmitigated gall of telling the American people that, on the one hand, they need to be more responsible with their money, but, on the other hand, Congress should face no such obstacle.

Today we will say "no more" to spending money that the government doesn't have, only to pass down to the young people of America, some of whom we saw here yesterday afternoon, passing it on to them before they even have a say in how their money is being spent.

Yes, today we say to the American people that Congress, like you at home, Jane and Joe Lunchbucket, will not spend money that we don't have. Our credit card is maxed out and we start to reduce it today.

My fellow Democratic colleagues will provide more details about this new set of House rules presently, but there is one more point I want to make perfectly clear. I am not going to, and I hope my colleagues aren't going to listen to my friends on the other side of the aisle lecture us about not doing enough here today.

I have read some of their "talking points" from the Budget Committee. And while I may not be a whiz kid, I know a little something about being lectured to.

And having this particular group of Republicans lecture us on fiscal responsibility is a little like having the horses on the farm complain to the ranch hand that he is not using a big enough shovel to clean up.

This analogy is not only appropriate, Mr. Speaker, it is perfect.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of our time to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, Mr. RYAN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) is recognized and will control 30 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss this title IV part of the package. And I learned, when we were in the majority, watching the minority speak and criticize virtually every move we made, I thought it would be wrong if you thought there were good elements of a package to criticize it. There are good elements in this package, and I want to start off by talking about those good elements that are contained in this package before I start my criticism.

First, the earmark reforms. I am an earmark reformer. I was one of the parts of the team that reformed earmarks, that negotiated the earmark reforms we passed last fall. I think these earmark reforms in this package that the majority created are very good. They are very commendable. They work. So I want to compliment the majority for their serious earmark reform package that they have in here.

I think it is high time that when a Member of Congress requests an earmark, that that Member's name be associated with that earmark, that that Member's justification be associated with the earmark, and that we, as Members of this body, have the opportunity to vote on whether or not that earmark should be funded or not. We need more transparency and more accountability in the way we spend taxpayer dollars.

I am very pleased that in the last Congress, in the 109th Congress, we in the House passed those rules, and I am very excited that the majority has decided to continue those rules and build on that success by improving the package of earmark reforms we passed in the last Congress. So that part of this package, I want to compliment the gentleman from South Carolina and the others who put this together.

I want to direct my comments on the PAYGO part of this. I had high hopes for this part of the package. I had high hopes that the PAYGO rules that we are about to vote on would provide much needed fiscal discipline to Washington and to the way we spend taxpayer dollars. Unfortunately, this package just doesn't cut the mustard. I see this as a timid, weak, watered down, paper tiger PAYGO. What I mean when I say that, Mr. Speaker, is I believe this will have the practical effect of simply raising taxes.

Let me be very clear, Mr. Speaker. We don't have a tax revenue problem in Washington. We have a spending problem in Washington. Tax revenues have been coming into the Federal Treasury at double digit rates over the last 2 years. That is not the problem. We are getting plenty of money from workers' paychecks, from families in their taxes. It is leaving the Treasury too fast. That is our problem, and that is where the budget discipline ought to be placed, on spending.

The problem with this PAYGO is it will have the practical effect of simply having higher taxes to chase higher spending. It does absolutely nothing to address the deficit we have today. It does absolutely nothing to address today's level of spending. It does not address the uncontrollable and unsustainable rates of spending that we have with our entitlement programs today.

Now, I realize that the last majority wasn't perfect on spending. I will be the first to note that because many people saw me coming to the floor saying that in the last Congress. But when we enact spending discipline, and when we are telling the American people that we are now going to get tough on spending, we are going to be fiscally conservative, that is what we should do; and this does not do that.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this PAYGO regime, if it does actually work, will make it clear that the tax relief of 2001 and 2003, which got us out of a recession, which brought new revenues into the Federal Government, which created seven million new jobs, will go away. This is putting the American taxpayer on a collision course with higher taxes. And why is it doing that? Because this system, this PAYGO system, will make the pressure toward raising taxes to pay for new entitlement spending. And so for that reason, I am opposed to this PAYGO regime, Mr. Speaker. There are many others I would like to speak about.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, for purpose of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, one of the true rising stars in Democratic politics today, HEATH SHULER.

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, the times of reckless and unchecked spending in Congress are over. With my fellow Blue Dogs, we are cutting our Nation's credit card. It is time to have a commonsense budget, just like our families, and just as we do in business, have a commonsense approach of budgeting.

Congress followed these rules in the 1990s. George H.W. Bush signed on, and in 2 years we saw a record budget surplus. Unfortunately, Congress has abandoned these rules and started financing spending increases with borrowing money from China.

China's share of the U.S. debt has grown faster than any other nation, from $61.5 billion in 2001 to $165 billion in 2004. We cannot borrow ourselves out of debt.

This is an important first step of implementation of a statutory PAYGO. Congress should be able to justify every line item of every spending bill to the American people. This should be supported by all Members for the future of our children and grandchildren.

This rules package also prevents inserting earmarks into bills in conference, and requires that all Members be given time to examine all bills before voting on them.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Wisconsin, the ranking member on the Budget Committee, on which I have had the pleasure of serving for the past 2 years.

And it is ironic that I follow another colleague from North Carolina who is in favor of the Pelosi PAYGO plan that we have before us here today on the House floor. It is unfortunate that it is being offered in a closed rule, in a setting whereupon Republicans cannot offer any constructive amendments or perfecting amendments to ensure that tax increases don't arise out of this Pelosi PAYGO plan.

According to the Wall Street Journal editorial today: ''Under her,'' PELOSI's, ''PAYGO plan, new entitlement programs and all new tax cuts would have to be offset by either cut-backs in other entitlement programs or tax increases. This version of PAYGO is a budget trapdoor, designed not to control expenditures, but to make it easier to raise taxes while blocking future tax cuts.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask to include the Wall Street Journal editorial from today, entitled ''Tax As You Go,'' for the RECORD.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 5, 2007]

TAX AS YOU GO

Congressional Democrats are dashing out of the gates to establish their fiscal conservative credentials. And as early as today House Speaker Nancy Pelosi will push through so-called ''pay-as-you-go'' budget rules for Congress. Keep an eye on your wallet.

''Paygo,'' as Washington insiders call it, sounds like a fiscally prudent budget practice: If government spends more on program A, it has to spend less money on program B, and thus budget deficits will be restrained. We're all for that. But when Republicans proposed exactly that budget rule in recent years, House Democrats voted it down.

Ms. Pelosi has something different in mind. Under her paygo plan, new entitlement programs and all new tax cuts would have to be offset by either cutbacks in other entitlement programs or tax increases. This version of paygo is a budget trapdoor, designed not to control expenditures but to make it easier to raise taxes while blocking future tax cuts.

Supporters of paygo claim it will help restrain entitlement spending. It won't. Paygo doesn't apply to current entitlements that will grow automatically over the next several decades. Ms. Pelosi's version of paygo applies only to new entitlements or changes in law that expand current programs. And on present trajectory, Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, food stamps and the like are scheduled to increase federal spending to almost 38 percent of GDP by 2050, up from 21 percent today. Paygo won't stop a dime of that increase. This may explain why one of the leading supporters of paygo is the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, a liberal outfit that favors far more social spending.

Paygo enthusiasts also claim that when these rules were in effect in the 1990s the budget deficit disappeared and by 2001 the budget recorded a $121 billion surplus. Sorry. The budget improvement in the late 1990s was a result of three events wholly unrelated to paygo: the initial spending restraint under the Republican Congress in 1995 and 1996 as part of their pledge to balance the budget; a huge reduction in military spending, totaling nearly 2 percent of GDP, over the decade; and rapid economic growth, which always causes a bounce in revenues. Paygo didn't expire until 2002, but by the late–1990s politicians in both parties were already re-stoking the domestic spending fires.

What paygo does restrain are tax cuts, by requiring that any tax cut be offset dollar-for-dollar with some entitlement reduction. Congressional budgeteers always overestimate the revenue losses from tax cuts, which under paygo would require onerous budget cuts to ''pay for'' the tax cuts. As a political matter, those spending cuts will never happen.

First on the chopping block, therefore, would be the investment tax cuts of 2003 that are set to expire in 2010. Last year Democrat David Obey of Wisconsin, the new Appropriations Committee chairman and a prodigious spender, gave this strategy away when he urged paygo rules so he could enact new social spending and pay for it by canceling the Bush tax cuts for those who make more than $1 million.

Never mind that, in the wake of those capital gains and dividend tax-rate cuts, federal revenues climbed by a record $550 billion over the past two fiscal years. Incidentally, thanks to the current economic expansion and the surge in tax revenues, the budget deficit has fallen by $165 billion in just two years—without paygo.

Given all of this, it's especially puzzling that even some conservatives seem tempted by paygo's fiscal illusions. Our friends at the Heritage Foundation have of late become obsessed with future entitlement forecasts and have advised Ms. Pelosi to enact paygo rules to stop it. But Heritage notably did not insist that tax increases be excluded from any paygo rule. Had such logic prevailed in 1980 or 2003, it's possible that neither the Reagan nor Bush tax cuts would ever have become law. As a political matter, paygo is about returning Republicans to their historical minority role as tax collectors for the welfare state.

That's not to say that new budget rules aren't highly desirable. The line-item veto, a new Grace Commission to identify and eliminate the billions of dollars of waste and failed programs, and an automatic spending sequester if the budget rises above agreed baselines would all help to restore spending discipline. But it is precisely because these rules would restrain spending that they are not on the Democratic agenda.

Paygo, by contrast, gives the appearance of spending discipline while making it all but impossible to let taxpayers keep more of their money. It should really be called ''spend and tax as you go.''

The fundamental budget problem here is spending too much, not taxing too little. Federal revenues climbed by $550 billion over the past two fiscal years because of the 2001 and 2003 tax relief packages. Now, this has led to a robust economic growth for our country; and as a result of that economic growth, we have had higher tax revenues to government. In fact, government revenue this year is the largest it has ever been in the history of man. Not just the history of the United States, but we have more revenue flowing into government.

So we have a spending problem, Mr. Speaker. And with this PAYGO trapdoor, the Pelosi PAYGO plan ignores the annual appropriations, and it only applies to new spending. So this is an absolute trapdoor that will lead to tax increases put forward by this new Democrat majority.

I urge us to vote this down and to actually have real constructive budget reform.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PATRICK MURPHY).

Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as an original cosponsor of this vital measure.

Mr. Speaker, this vote is about one of the most important issues facing America today, fiscal responsibility.

PAYGO is straightforward. If Congress is going to buy something, we need to figure out how we are going to pay for it. That is what the small business owners, farmers, and families in the Eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania do every single day.

If the Mignonis in Bristol want to expand their store, they have to roll up their sleeves and figure out how they are going to pay for it. When the Russos of Fairless Hills started saving for their daughters' college tuition, they had to figure out how they were going to pay for that.

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what we are voting on here today. If you or I have a good idea, we are going to have to roll up our sleeves, just like the Mignonis and the Russos, and figure out how we are going to pay for it first.

□ 1100

As most of you know, I have a 6-week-old daughter, Maggie. Maggie and every other newborn born in America are saddled with $28,000 in debt. That is immoral. Voting ''yes'' to implementing PAYGO is the first step toward getting our fiscal house in order.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains between the two parties?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. And the gentleman from Florida?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 26 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the distinguished budget chairperson, I want to respond to Mr. RYAN by saying, we don't have a spending revenue problem. I would remind him, when he said that, that he and his colleagues, with this President, have run up a debt larger than the previous 42 Presidents combined.

No problem, Mr. RYAN? Please.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the distinguished budget chairman, who knows more about this process than all the rest of the Members in this body combined, Mr. SPRATT.

Mr. SPRATT. I thank the gentleman for the compliment and wish I could accept it, and I am glad to have the time to explain what is before us.

The budget summit in 1990 ended up with a 5-year deficit reduction plan and a kit of budget process rules known as the Budget Enforcement Act of 1991. Among these process changes was something that we have come to call the PAYGO rule, or pay-as-you-go.

Basically, the pay-as-you-go rule provides that any increase in entitlement benefits has to be paid for by a new revenue source, and that any cut in taxes has to be offset by equivalent cuts in entitlements or by equivalent increases elsewhere in the Tax Code. In other words, entitlement increases or tax cuts have to be deficit neutral. They cannot worsen the bottom line. This is the basic principle of PAYGO; a common-sense, truly conservative principle.

PAYGO was originated by Democrats, but it was embraced by the first President Bush in 1991, in the Budget Enforcement Act. It was adopted by President Clinton in the Deficit Reduction Act of 1993. It was confirmed again by Clinton and by this Congress in a bipartisan way in the Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997. It was even endorsed by the second President Bush in his 2001 budget submission: Reinstate PAYGO. That is what the President requested.

But the Bush administration soon found that if we did that, it would get in the way of its huge tax cut agenda, and that was its driving force behind all the budget policy of this administration. So in 2002, even though it had worked, demonstrably worked, and brought the deficit down, in 2002, the Bush administration and this Congress, under Republican leadership, allowed the PAYGO rule to expire.

PAYGO had been renewed three times. From 1991 to 2001, it was the law of the budget. It worked. But it was allowed to expire. The result was a deficit that soared. President Clinton handed over to President Bush a budget that was in surplus, in surplus by $236 billion the year before President Bush took office. By 2004, without the PAYGO rule, without the strictures of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1991, the surplus was gone, wiped out, replaced by a deficit of $413 billion. That was a swing of more than $600 billion in the wrong direction.

In an effort to diminish these debts and to rein in the deficit, Democrats tried repeatedly over the last 6 years to reinstate the PAYGO rule. And Republicans, just as repeatedly, rebuked us at every turn. Today, with a new majority, we want a new commitment to fiscal responsibility. We want to pay as you go. We want to quit stacking debt on top of debt.

The statutory debt, on the watch of this administration, has increased by 60 percent, 60 percent since President Bush took office, more than $3 trillion in new debt. This is not a sustainable course. Nobody in this House would rise to support this course. So let us reverse course. Let us start today. Let us enact something that worked for 11 years, the PAYGO rule that was adopted first in 1991.

Today, we add two new rules to the rules of the House, section 402 and section 405 of title IV in the package before you. The original PAYGO rule was statutory. It set up a scorecard on which tax cuts and tax increases, entitlement cuts and entitlement increases were all entered. At the end of the fiscal year, the tally was taken by the Congressional Budget Office, and if there was an adverse balance, it had to be rectified. If it was not rectified and removed, then it would result in across-the-board abatement or sequestration cuts.

Why not just reenact the statutory rule, since that is the form that worked? I wish we could. But it is not at all clear we can pass a statutory change or reenactment of the PAYGO

rule in the Senate, where 60 votes are needed. And it is even less clear, and extremely doubtful, that the President would sign a statutory PAYGO rule if it reached his desk.

So what we propose today is the art of the possible. What we propose is a House rule, setting up a point of order to any PAYGO violation. We also correct here the practice of using the reconciliation process, an extraordinary process in order to do things, that would worsen the budget deficit. But I want to focus mainly on the PAYGO result.

The ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, and I look forward to working with him, he is a good man who knows his stuff, and I look forward to a good relationship, but I have to take exception when he says this rule does not reduce the deficit. By itself, it may not. But it establishes in the rules of this House a commonsense, truly conservative principle that when the budget is in deficit, deep deficit, at the very least, we should avoid making it worse. We should avoid entitlement increases that are not paid for and we should avoid tax cuts that are not offset.

This rule is not immutable, it can be waived or modified, but it establishes a strong working presumption in favor of fiscal responsibility and it holds accountable every Member who votes otherwise.

Mr. RYAN claims this bill will set a double standard favoring higher spending. But in truth it is a double-edged sword. It applies to entitlement increases as well as tax cuts. So if you want to start the 110th Congress on the foot of fiscal responsibility, the right thing to do is to vote to reinstate PAYGO. Vote for this package and its fiscal responsibility provisions.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

First of all, I want to start off by saying I appreciate the gentleman from South Carolina. He is a good man, knows his stuff, and I very much look forward to working with him. I just want to respond to a couple of points.

In fact, we attempted to put PAYGO in place, PAYGO on spending. So if you try to increase spending somewhere else, you should cut spending elsewhere and not raise taxes. That went down in 2004, largely because of the minority opposing it.

Second point. The reason PAYGO worked well in the 1990s is because it was statutory. If you did not comply, an across-the-board sequestration would take place, and the threat of that was one of the reasons why PAYGO was successful.

The third point I simply want to make is, you are going to hear a lot of talk about we had a surplus, we handed it to the Republicans and they squandered it. What was the surplus? The surplus was projected. It was projected. And in those economic projections they did not foresee the Enron scandals, they did not foresee the dot-com bubble bursting, and they did not foresee 9/11. Of course, they did not foresee that. They did not see the perfect storm of economic calamity, and that is what evaporated the surplus.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, last night, I came to the floor and joined my Democrat colleagues in supporting meaningful ethics reform. As a former law enforcement officer, I understand as well as anyone the need to abide by the strongest ethical guidelines, and I agree with and commend my Democrat colleagues for presenting a rules package that brings much-needed transparency to earmarking process.

In the last Congress, I consistently supported greater public disclosure of Federal spending. I will be the first Member of this body to stand up and attach my name to earmark requests and justify the need for the expenditure. The taxpayers in my district and across our Nation deserve to know how the government spends their hard-earned dollars.

But I rise against title IV because I cannot stand and support a reform package that irresponsibly attaches a rule known as PAYGO that will almost certainly lead to higher taxes on these same hard-working taxpaying Americans.

Tax cuts unequivalently spur economic growth and create jobs. The tax relief Congress enacted in 2003 produced tremendous growth and a record high stock market. These tax cuts created nearly 6 million jobs across the Nation and 88,000 jobs in Washington State alone.

Again, I agree with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that we need more fiscal discipline. That is why I supported the balanced budget amendment in the last Congress and I hope to work to enact that in this Congress. But the way to reduce the deficit is to rein in spending and cut taxes, which has proven to increase revenue. It is not to raise taxes on families and small businesses, and I fear that this provision will do that.

I am deeply disappointed the earmark reform contained in this title was not attached to the ethics reforms that I enthusiastically joined my Democrat colleagues in supporting. While I support the earmark reforms that have been proposed here, I must urge my colleagues to oppose this measure so that we can work together to enact significant earmark reform.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5¼ minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, what I would like to do is to take some time on the floor today to separate fact from fiction with respect to earmarks.

Let me start by saying that I think my record is clear. I have tried as long as I have been in this Congress to restrain both the dollar amount spent on earmarks and the number of earmarks that we have had. But I want to make certain that if we are looking at earmarks we are asking ourselves the right questions.

I do not want anyone on this floor, or anyone else, including the White House, to suggest that if you eliminate funding for earmarks you save one dime. You do not. The right question to ask about earmarks is simply whether that money is put in the right place or not. And let me explain what I mean.

When the Appropriations Committee, for instance, brings out its appropriation bills, each subcommittee operates under a spending ceiling. And if that bill exceeds that spending ceiling, then a single Member can knock the entire bill off the floor. That means that earmarks, if they are provided, are provided within the predetermined ceiling for that bill. So, for instance, if the committee decides that it is going to earmark 50 after-school projects, those after-school projects are financed within the predetermined ceiling, not above that ceiling.

So if people want to pose for holy pictures on the issue of earmarks, be my guest. Just make sure you have your facts when you do so. That is all I ask.

A second thing I would point out. If we are going to talk about earmarks, then let us talk about the guy who does the most earmarking. That is the guy in the big White House at the other end of the Pennsylvania Avenue. He is called the President. And I want to give you an example of what happens with the President's budget.

The biggest earmarker in the land is the President of the United States of America. Let me give you one example. Last year, the administration provided 18,808 FIRE grants in districts represented by Republican Members of Congress. It provided 11,470 FIRE grants in districts represented by Democrats. Every single one of those FIRE grants is the functional equivalent of an earmark.

Now, does anybody believe that that ratio of FIRE grants in Republican versus Democratic districts was not political? If you do, I have got a lot of things I would like to sell you after the session is over.

□ 1115

Let me also make one additional point: What is an earmark? If the President sends down an Army Corps of Engineers' list of projects, let's say he suggests 800 projects for the Army Corps of Engineers. Let's say the Congress, after its hearings, determines that 16 of them don't make any sense and so they substitute other projects. Are the 16 which the Congress substituted the only earmarks in that bill? What about the original President's list? He has selected those. Doesn't that represent an earmark on the part of the executive as well?

So I would simply ask, if we are going to start talking earmarks, let's

not have the pot calling the kettle black. Let us remember that the Congress has a right to make policy judgments, indeed it has an obligation to make policy judgments, that direct money to one place or another.

When I was chairman of the Appropriations Committee 12 years ago, the Labor-Health-Education appropriation bill didn't contain a single earmark. Last year, our Republican friends on the other side of the aisle were planning to have 3,000 earmarks in the Labor-Health bill. I think that is a gross exaggeration of what our staffs have the ability to review.

I don't want a single earmark in any bill that the committee staff cannot review to make certain that the reputation of this House and the reputation of the committee is protected. That is why we have the provision in this language that says if any Member asks for an earmark, he also has to certify that that earmark will provide no financial advantage to him or his spouse. To me, that is the way you protect the integrity of the institution and still protect the power of the purse and still protect the prerogative of the Congress. That is the way you protect the prerogatives of the Congress, while also protecting the reputation of this institution.

So, please, keep your terms straight. Keep your facts straight. Let's not claim things that are not so about some of these changes. Let's recognize what the definitions are and the fact that this is a very complicated matter.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to a new Member, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a word of caution about the proposed PAYGO rules which will hurt this body's ability to keep our economy moving forward. By putting more money into the hands of families and taxpayers, the tax cuts of 2001 and 2003 have helped stimulate our economy, create jobs and cut our Federal deficit in half. The proposed PAYGO rules wrongly identify these types of tax cuts as ''deficit spending'' and will all but eliminate our ability to provide additional tax relief to the families and taxpayers we represent.

It will also set the framework for repealing the tax cuts that have already been enacted. This amounts to a two-pronged threat to the pocketbooks of the families and taxpayers across Ohio and across America.

Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I wholeheartedly support the earmark reform contained in this rule, and I strongly support the spending restraint at the heart of the PAYGO concept, but I believe these rules will, in effect, take money out of the hands of families and taxpayers, hurting our ability to grow our economy and cut our deficit in a fiscally responsible way.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to my good friend the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague.

Mr. Speaker, an important part of the honest leadership, open government rules package is the new commitment to more stringent fiscal responsibility under Democratic leadership and Speaker NANCY PELOSI.

Under the current administration and past Congresses, the Nation's debt has been climbing out of sight. Currently we are faced with a nearly $3 trillion national budget deficit. The rising interest rates and a projected individual share of the national debt of more than $28,000 per person is outrageous.

As a mother with two young daughters, I am concerned, like so many other parents today. You see, the personal cost of spiraling debt to the American public is overwhelming. Families are working to provide the best opportunities for their children, while juggling mortgages, credit card debt and student loans, as well as rising health care costs and housing costs.

How can our neighbors back home decrease their debt loads until the Federal Government begins to do its part? That is why the restoration of pay-as-you-go budgeting is the right step in a new direction. Pay-as-you-go is not entirely new, however.

Let me close by saying that these rules changes are essential to assure our neighbors that Congress is working earnestly to do our part to relieve the financial crunch on working families, while providing a transparent framework in which to do it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, two plus two does not equal six, but if I were to assume that it did, I could take care of the budget. Easy.

PAYGO assumes that when you increase taxes, revenue goes up, and when you lower tax rates, revenue goes down. But history shows that that is not what happens, because there are economic factors, and people change behavior.

Since the tax cut-rate cuts of 2003, revenue has been up every year, and in 2 of the last 3 years has been up by double digits.

Two plus two does not equal six. PAYGO does not equal fiscal responsibility. What PAYGO does equal is tax increases that will hurt the economy and will not raise revenue and will not help the deficit.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, PAYGO is a budget enforcement tool that has both a history of success and a history of bipartisan support. In its original form, PAYGO was part of an agreement between the first President Bush and a Democratic Congress. A Democratic President and Congress extended it in 1993, and a Democratic President and Republican Congress extended it in 1997. Unfortunately, it was allowed to expire in 2002 and the results have been a disaster. Deficits and debt have reached historic levels and the debt limit has been raised four times.

This rule takes the first step toward restoring fiscal responsibility in the Federal Government by requiring the House of Representatives to pay for the bills that we pass.

I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the passage of this rule.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the element of the rules package that we will consider today, but I do so conflicted; conflicted, because as a long-time advocate of earmark reform and fiscal discipline, I am in large measure encouraged by the efforts of my colleagues in the new Democratic majority to step forward in good faith and open the process whereby we spend the people's money to greater transparency, particularly in the area of earmarks.

I say from the heart that I appreciate the substantive reforms and transparency and accountability that my Democratic colleagues will bring forward today on earmark reform. That being said, I will oppose this element of the rules package having to do with the pay-as-you-go provisions, which, while they sound in a common sense way attractive, this particular version I believe is lacking for three reasons:

Number one, I believe it is a weak and watered down version of PAYGO proposals of the past, including Democrat party PAYGO proposals of the past.

Number two, it doesn't reduce current spending levels or require a reduction of current spending levels.

Number three, it is, as so many of my colleagues have said, a means of justifying tax increases on working families, small businesses and family farms. In a very real sense, the American people ought to know that this proposal translates to you-pay-as-Congress-goes on spending.

In the category of a watered down provision, other PAYGO versions were enforced by across-the-board spending cuts. That is what created the incentive to control spending. But the Democrats PAYGO proposal is only enforced by a point of order, which can be waived fairly easily, as we all know.

Secondly, it only applies to new spending. Mr. Speaker, I say with some pain, having been a part of the former majority, but we currently don't pay for what goes out the door now. The 2007 budget right now is projected at $286 billion in deficit. This does nothing to require us to address our current deficits.

Lastly, as others have argued, I truly believe that by assuming that the 2001 and 2003 tax relief will automatically expire, this Democrat PAYGO provision will cause a substantial tax increase for working families, small businesses and family farms.

The American people just simply need to know, however well-intentioned, and I assume good intentions by my colleagues in the newly-minted majority, however well intentioned, I believe this PAYGO provision comes up short. It is, in a very real sense, the American people pay, as Congress goes on spending.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, and I appreciate the opportunity to talk. I was just trying to clarify a couple of things on the package to make sure that we understand what it is we are actually doing to ourselves.

I spent 2 years on the Budget Committee, and it was a very informative time. I sat through hours and hours of conversation by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle touting the virtues of PAYGO and that they thought this would solve the problems of the world, knowing all along that their version of PAYGO that they talked about was, in fact, a stealth tax increase, given the current Code that we have in place with respect to the taxes on capital gains and dividends, as an example, and the death tax that will come back in full force in 2011 unless we actually do something to it.

So as we consider this PAYGO concept, I would like for the American people to know that the devil is in the details, as with everything that we, in fact, do.

When I campaigned, when most of my colleagues campaigned, none of us campaigned on increasing deficits. We all campaigned, on both sides of the aisle, on reduced spending, on smaller government, all those kinds of things that both sides are saying during this debate today. But I am not sure this PAYGO version will, in fact, do that.

Also the point we were trying to check right now, I believe in addition to the rules included in this rule is a change in the Rules Committee itself to allow for votes in the Rules Committee to be not reported out in the rule. So the Democrat-controlled Rules Committee can waive this PAYGO rule and we won't know which of the members actually voted to do that because of the way this rule is.

It is interesting yesterday that the word ''transparent'' was used often by the folks on the other side of the aisle, and yet one of the areas in which transparency seems to have been reduced is with respect to the rule that is included in here with respect to the Rules Committee.

So with respect to PAYGO, I want my colleagues and others to know that this is a stealth tax increase that is being foisted upon our economy.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 1 minute to a gentleman that was a sheriff that had to pay as he went with reference to equipment for his department, BRAD ELLSWORTH from Indiana.

□ 1130

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

I thought I was going to get to follow a fellow Hoosier, Mr. PENCE, until we changed the rules. But as a proud member of the Blue Dog Coalition, I am proud to stand today to voice my support for restoring the pay-as-you-go budgeting. Inclusion of the PAYGO provision in the new House rules will undoubtedly force us to make tough decisions, but quite frankly we have no choice. The total National debt is an astounding $9 trillion, and tough decisions need to be made by Congress. By restoring PAYGO budgeting, we will take a positive step toward reducing and easing the Federal deficit. Hoosier families in my district make tough decisions every day about how to balance their budget, and it should be no different from the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation to be fiscally disciplined in implementing pay-as-you-go budgeting, and this is a great place to start.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Republican Study Committee, Mr. HENSARLING of Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wish to join a number of my colleagues in congratulating the new Democrat majority for their work in the area of earmarks. We know that earmarks are perhaps a small portion of spending in this body, but they are a large portion of the culture of spending. And I certainly salute them for that work; but, Madam Speaker, I must reluctantly oppose this rule because of the so-called PAYGO provision which has been adequately pointed out is really a tax-go provision.

If PAYGO indeed lived up to its name, it would be worthy of support, but it is not. I fear that it is nothing more than false advertising. I listened very carefully to our new Speaker yesterday when I believe she said that there would be no new deficit spending under the watch of the Democrat majority. But as I look at this so-called PAYGO provision, I see nothing that deals with entitlement spending, which threatens to bankrupt future generations, our children and our grandchildren, with either massive debt or a massive tax increase.

Over half of our budget deals with entitlement spending. There is nothing that deals with that. It doesn't deal with baseline budgeting. Now, most Americans don't know what that is, it is inside baseball, but it is an accounting concept that would make an Enron accountant blush. It puts in automatic inflation for government programs, yet we don't call it new spending. And yet there is nothing in this so-called PAYGO provision dealing with that. And we don't even have a statute.

It is also false advertising, Madam Speaker, because it doesn't live up to what the Democratic majority advocated when they were in the minority. We have a rule; we don't have a statute, the rule that will end up being waivable. We don't have the sequester mechanism of earlier PAYGO. We don't have the wedding with the discretionary caps that we had. And, indeed, what we have is a subterfuge here. What we have is a Trojan horse for more tax increases on small businesses and American families that threaten the jobs of Americans, and we must vote this down.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to one of 13 members of the physicians in the House of Representatives, the distinguished colleague, my friend, Mr. KAGEN.

Mr. KAGEN. Madam Speaker, my good friend Mr. RYAN from Wisconsin, I was elected to send a message to Congress to balance its budgets and to be fiscally responsible. As PAUL RYAN notes, in Wisconsin thousands of hard-working people have lost their jobs; and when they lost their manufacturing jobs offshore, much of the wealth of this Nation was sent offshore along with those jobs.

We need a positive change in America, and it needs to start now, right here and right now in the people's House. Let's begin to build a better future for everyone by dedicating ourselves to becoming fiscally responsible today, not next week. And then when we do, let's ship our values overseas and not our jobs.

I rise before you today to urge you to support pay-as-you-go as a means to become fiscally responsible. We cannot realistically begin to solve the many problems we face until we completely reverse the misguided fiscal policy of borrow and spend, and borrow and spend, and borrow and spend, which has driven our country into more debt than our children can possibly repay. Let us agree to live within our means here in the House as we do in our own homes back in Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Madam Speaker, I think everyone will agree, when it came to earmarks, the big concern

about the abuses of the past were two components: one is transparency or the lack of transparency in previous proceedings when it came to earmarks. The other was the issue of what is called air drops, those that could be in a conference and at the last minute add things into the budget without going through the review of the committee or subcommittee and a public review of that aspect.

I have to compliment both sides of the aisle when it comes to transparency. I think that both Republicans and Democrats are working together to make sure the public knows who has asked for earmarks to be included. But I ask that at the same time, and to say we are a little let down, I think the public is going to feel let down, because both sides, both Republicans and Democrats, have not addressed the air drop issue. In fact, let's face it, why put your earmark or your request through the review process of committee and subcommittee if you can get put on the conference committee at the last minute, and just before the votes are brought to the House floor add your item in without going through the review process?

So I would ask the majority and the minority to take a look at this aspect and not move this bill without having it specific that unless an item has been voted on in the House or the Senate before it got to conference, that it shouldn't be added in at the last minute. And I come from the 50th District of California, as you know, and we saw the crisis in credibility and government that was created by the Member that preceded me, and one of those crises was the fact that the game here was get on that conference committee so you could add your item in, in an air drop, at the last minute.

So I would ask the majority to go back and take a look at this item and bring back something that stops the abuse of air drops, the last-minute inclusion of earmarks that doesn't go through the review process, doesn't allow the public to know about it, and doesn't allow you and me as Members to be able to address this issue individually.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the chance, and I ask you to reconsider that before we move this item.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to one of the co-chairs of the Blue Dogs, my friend from California (Mr. CARDOZA).

Mr. CARDOZA. I thank my friend and gentleman from Florida.

Madam Speaker, as a fiscally conservative Blue Dog Democrat, I rise in strong support of reinstating pay-as-you-go budgeting and the rules that accompany it.

As Blue Dogs, we believe, as do the American people, that restoring fiscal responsibility in Washington is an urgent national priority. For far too long now under the previous leadership of this Congress and of the current White House, we have seen reckless fiscal policies that have undermined the future of America's economy. Now the time has come to take our country in a new and responsible direction.

PAYGO rules are the centerpiece of the Blue Dog 12-point reform plan for putting an end to deficit spending. We know PAYGO rules work because they have in the past. During the 1990s, with PAYGO rules in place, the massive deficits that we were seeing at that time were converted into record surpluses. We saw the greatest period of economic growth and prosperity in American history. We can do that again, and we must. This will do, in fact, that.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And first I want to compliment the Democrats for earmark reform that is stronger than the Republicans did. Democrats in this way had more guts than we did to tackle earmark reform in a meaningful way, and I compliment them for that. And let me just note, though, with regard to earmarks something that was said a little earlier. It was said that we can't save money by eliminating earmarks. That is simply not true. It was not true when it was said on this side of the aisle last year, and it is not true when it is said from that side of the aisle today.

It is like saying, and the best analogy that I think of is if you go to McDonald's and you order a combo meal and you are sitting there and you say, I am going to save money by not eating the French fries I just ordered, you are correct, you can't. That is the same analogy that is being made on that side. Once you get to the appropriation process, once the 302(a)s and 302(b)s are already set, that is right, you are not going to save money. But you can save money by not ordering the combo meal, by saying, We are going to be spending, we spent last year $3 billion in earmarks in this bill, let's lower our allocation and let's spend less.

So this notion that we can't save money by deciding not to spend money on a teapot museum or the Wisconsin procurement initiative is simply not right.

But I appreciate, and again I want to compliment, the Democrats for doing stronger earmark reform than we did.

Let me make a few comments about PAYGO. If you are going to do PAYGO, I would argue do it whole hog. Let's apply it to mandatory spending; let's apply it to automatic adjustments that come up in the appropriation process every year. This PAYGO reform is incomplete, and it may simply lead to tax increases because you will say the only way we can make this mandatory adjustment is to increase taxes. So the PAYGO restrictions, it is disappointing that they aren't stronger. I would support PAYGO on spending. There is a difference between saying you can keep your own money or we are going to spend your money. And that ought to be made plain in PAYGO.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to my friend from Utah (Mr. MATHESON). JIM came here fighting for fiscal responsibility and continues that effort.

Mr. MATHESON. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this provision. This is a great first start. It is a great first start that this is in the rule; but I agree with my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), this ought to be done in a statutory way. And, quite frankly, if we want to replicate the success of the 1990s, you have got to include spending caps, too, and I hope that we work together in a bipartisan way to do that. Because that is really, if we want to have fiscal responsibility, you have got to put some teeth in this and you have got to make us all live under what are going to be some tough circumstances. But as a first step, I am pleased this is part of the rules package. I endorse it, I encourage people to support it, and I hope we recognize this as a first step and we are all going to work together to employ all of the 12 points of the Blue Dog plan that are really going to give fiscal responsibility back to this country.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise reluctantly in opposition to title IV. I am a fiscal conservative and I strongly support a balanced budget, fiscal discipline, and earmark reform; but I am afraid that this version of PAYGO means taxes will go up.

I think that the problem that we have had between the two sides of the aisle is over what is spending and what is tax relief. And I think that we see tax relief as tax relief and that it is the people's money and they know best how to spend it; and the other side of the aisle includes tax relief as spending. So I think until we can iron out that difference, I think we are going to have problems.

Madam Speaker, the Wall Street Journal today in an editorial called ''Tax As You Go,'' that is January 5, puts it best and much better than I can say it and I would just like to quote a couple of lines from there. It says: ''PAYGO, by contrast, gives the appearance of spending discipline while making it all but impossible to let the taxpayers keep more of their money. It really should be called spend and tax as you go.'' I would urge everyone to look at this Wall Street Journal, and I submit it for inclusion into the RECORD.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 5, 2007]

TAX AS YOU GO

Congressional Democrats are dashing out of the gates to establish their fiscal conservative credentials. And as early as today

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi will push through so-called ''pay-as-you-go'' budget rules for Congress. Keep an eye on your wallet.

''Paygo,'' as Washington insiders call it, sounds like a fiscally prudent budget practice: If government spends more on program A, it has to spend less money on program B, and thus budget deficits will be restrained. We're all for that. But when Republicans proposed exactly that budget rule in recent years, House Democrats voted it down.

Ms. Pelosi has something different in mind. Under her paygo plan, new entitlement programs and all new tax cuts would have to be offset by either cutbacks in other entitlement programs or tax increases. This version of paygo is a budget trapdoor, designed not to control expenditures but to make it easier to raise taxes while blocking future tax cuts.

Supporters of paygo claim it will help restrain entitlement spending. It won't. Paygo doesn't apply to current entitlements that will grow automatically over the next several decades. Ms. Pelosi's version of paygo applies only to new entitlements or changes in law that expand current programs.

And on present trajectory, Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, food stamps and the like are scheduled to increase federal spending to almost 38% of GDP by 2050, up from 21% today. Paygo won't stop a dime of that increase. This may explain why one of the leading supporters of paygo is the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, a liberal outfit that favors far more social spending.

Paygo enthusiasts also claim that when these rules were in effect in the 1990s the budget deficit disappeared and by 2001 the budget recorded a $121 billion surplus. Sorry. The budget improvement in the late 1990s was a result of three events wholly unrelated to paygo: the initial spending restraint under the Republican Congress in 1995 and 1996 as part of their pledge to balance the budget; a huge reduction in military spending, totaling nearly 2% of GDP, over the decade; and rapid economic growth, which always causes a bounce in revenues. Paygo didn't expire until 2002, but by the late 1990s politicians in both parties were already restoking the domestic spending fires.

What paygo does restrain are tax cuts, by requiring that any tax cut be offset dollar-for-dollar with some entitlement reduction. Congressional budgeteers always overestimate the revenue losses from tax cuts, which under paygo would require onerous budget cuts to ''pay for'' the tax cuts. As a political matter, those spending cuts will never happen.

First on the chopping block, therefore, would be the investment tax cuts of 2003 that are set to expire in 2010. Last year Democrat David Obey of Wisconsin, the new Appropriations Committee chairman and a prodigious spender, gave this strategy away when he urged paygo rules so he could enact new social spending and pay for it by canceling the Bush tax cuts for those who make more than $1 million.

Never mind that, in the wake of those capital gains and dividend tax-rate cuts, federal revenues climbed by a record $550 billion over the past two fiscal years. Incidentally, thanks to the current economic expansion and the surge in tax revenues, the budget deficit has fallen by $165 billion in just two years—without paygo.

Given all of this, it's especially puzzling that even some conservatives seem tempted by paygo's fiscal illusions. Our friends at the Heritage Foundation have of late become obsessed with future entitlement forecasts and have advised Ms. Pelosi to enact paygo rules to stop it. But Heritage notably did not insist that tax increases be excluded from any paygo rule. Had such logic prevailed in 1980 or 2003, it's possible that neither the Reagan nor Bush tax cuts would ever have become law. As a political matter, paygo is about returning Republicans to their historical minority role as tax collectors for the welfare state.

That's not to say that new budget rules aren't highly desirable. The line-item veto, a new Grace Commission to identify and eliminate the billions of dollars of waste and failed programs, and an automatic spending sequester if the budget rises above agreed baselines would all help to restore spending discipline. But it is precisely because these rules would restrain spending that they are not on the Democratic agenda.

Paygo, by contrast, gives the appearance of spending discipline while making it all but impossible to let taxpayers keep more of their money. It should really be called ''spend and tax as you go.''

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Bush administration has turned a projected 10-year $5.6 billion surplus into a nearly $3 trillion deficit, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would come here and complain that we are cleaning up their mess.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from California, the distinguished gentleman, Mr. SCHIFF.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise to speak very strongly in favor of these PAYGO rules as a very strong step to restoring fiscal responsibility to this House.

Over the last 6 years, the President and the Republican-controlled Congress essentially had a policy of borrow and spend. We didn't have the discipline to turn down new spending requests; we didn't have the discipline to pay for additional tax cuts. We even had, in the most ironic of weeks, a situation where we voted to increase the national debt by $800 billion in the same week we voted to cut taxes by $800 billion, and we made it very clear that we were borrowing the money to fund these additional tax cuts.

□ 1145

This is not the way to restore fiscal responsibility to this House. PAYGO is. The first rule of PAYGO is when you are in a hole, as we are in, when you are in a budgetary hole, stop digging. If we want new spending, we need to find a way to pay for it. If we want new tax cuts, that is great, too, we need to find a way to pay for it. And we cannot pay for it by asking these young men and women fighting for us in Iraq and Afghanistan and elsewhere to come home and pay for it later and have their children pay for it. Because right now all we are doing is shifting this obligation onto our children and grandchildren. That has got to stop.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to a gentleman from Indiana whose committee was called, ''Bring back Baron'' and I am very glad we brought back Baron.

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I thank you for waiting for 12 years to sit in the Speaker's chair. I also thank you for the opportunity to speak on an issue that I think is one of the most important actions we can take for the American people.

I am a proud member of the Blue Dog Coalition. I have been advocating, along with my colleagues in the Blue Dogs for years that the House implement rules that ensure that the Federal Government's expenditures equal its revenues, otherwise known as PAYGO.

PAYGO rules will not only help us rein in out-of-control spending that has led to record deficits, but they will also help us clearly outline our country's priorities.

Including PAYGO rules as part of the House rules package is a great first step. And I, along with my Blue Dog colleagues, will work with leadership to ensure that they are followed. However, it is a first step. We must also work together to enact statutory rules for PAYGO as well as discretionary spending limits.

Madam Speaker, thank you again for this opportunity for the House and the country to get its spending in check.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I am glad to be here, and I am glad that the Democrats are interested in fiscal discipline. That is a good thing. It is a good bipartisan debate. But there are three flaws in the Democrat PAYGO approach that I think are very important.

Number one, this tax issue that just won't go away. You know, based on scoring and based on reality and based on fact, when Kennedy cut taxes, when Reagan cut taxes and when Bush cut taxes, revenues went up.

Now we all know that scoring in this town counts a tax cut as a spending increase. How silly in the face of economic reality over the past 40 years.

Maybe the Democrat Party could look at scoring and change that. I think that is something we were unable to do as the majority. It would be a good idea for you to pursue it. But you and I both know that revenues went up in 2005 14 percent, in 2006 11 percent, and it was because of the economic growth brought about by the 2003 Bush tax cuts. PAYGO ignores that. How silly. How disingenuous.

Number two, I want to talk about entitlement reform. The big money, while I think we do need earmark reform and have supported it, but the big money, as we know, are in entitlements: 53 percent of the budget.

The Democrats were getting a lot of good credit for what I would say is kind of a golden oldies agenda, bringing out no original ideas, minimum wage, stem cell and student loans. And I understand those are safe things. But it is kind of like starting out the World Series by bunting instead of trying to get on base with real serious hits.

The reason why I submit that criticism is there is nothing in your agenda about immigration reform, Social Security reform, Medicare reform, the heavy-lifting ideas of entitlement, and PAYGO completely ignores those as well.

Number three, the real world, where is the Senate on PAYGO? My friend from Florida may know, but isn't it possible that unless they are going to do PAYGO, it is a silly exercise. It is boilerplate. It looks good, but the truth is if the Senate is not on board, which they are not, we are wasting time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I say to my friend from Georgia that what I do know is he is not proud of the $3 trillion deficit that his party ran up in this country that we have the responsibility of cleaning up. I hope he is not proud of that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, a new Member, whose district abuts mine, Mr. MAHONEY.

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today representing Florida's 16th District in support of title IV of the House rules package to return fiscal responsibility to Congress.

As a former businessman, as of a couple of days ago, I cannot overstress the importance of restoring fiscal discipline and accountability to our government. Over the past 6 years, this House has allowed record surpluses to be turned into record deficits that have increased our national debt to a nearly staggering $9 trillion.

Earmarks, an important prerogative of this great body, have been abused for the purposes of greed and as a tool to hold onto power, costing Americans billions of their hard-earned money. Make no mistake, our debt is a tax on America's future as it threatens both the security and prosperity of our country.

Today we have the opportunity to demonstrate to the American people that we have heard their voices this past November and we are prepared to make our government live within its means, just like every American family. For this reason, I urge my colleagues to support title IV.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. BEAN).

(Ms. BEAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BEAN. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the House rules package, and especially title IV which reinstalls PAYGO budget rules.

One of the reasons I came to Congress was to bring real world business perspective to government. In the business world, accountability and results matter. To get our fiscal house in order, Congress must do what every business does: Balance its books. If it is worth doing, it is worth paying for. We must pay as we go. It is a simple concept with a proven track record.

I am pleased Congress is returning from the recent borrow-and-spend irresponsibility to fiscal soundness and the accountability our constituents expect.

I want to thank the Blue Dog Coalition and my colleagues for their leadership on this issue. Today's vote is a result of their steadfast guidance of our Democratic Caucus and Congress on the importance of fiscal responsibility.

I urge my colleagues to follow the Blue Dog's lead and support reinstituting pay-as-you-go budget rules. Now accountability in government will be more than just a catch phrase.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida.

I rise basically to support my colleagues for introducing this important and long overdue rules package. This sets the tone for a more open and ethical Congress. In addition to other changes, the resolution creates important pay-as-you-go rules to clean up our fiscal house.

As a successful business owner, I learned the importance of balancing the books. If I hadn't, I would not have been successful in business. Our government needs to live by the same rule, and I join my fellow Blue Dogs to push PAYGO as part of the solution to the problems we are experiencing today.

We know it works. When PAYGO was on the books in the 1990s, we saw the deficits disappear. Now with an out-of-control national debt, we need PAYGO more than ever. We need fiscal responsibility in America.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First off, I want to start off by congratulating the majority on the very commendable earmark reform legislation that is contained in this title. I just want to emphasize that. But this PAYGO package is woefully inadequate. It is a paper tiger.

Three quick points. Number one, this protects all current spending, even the programs that are scheduled to expire. However, it assumes that expiring tax relief will lapse; and, thus, require offsets to continue. This is a double standard that reflects their preference, protect higher spending but not lower taxes. It is a recipe for tax increases.

Number two, it contains a huge loophole. Spend now, save later. You can enact new spending now and come up with savings down the road, which we know never really happens. Big loophole.

Number three, this is a weaker version of PAYGO than what the majority was proposing just last year. They were not allowing points of order to be waived when you violated a PAYGO rule in their earlier version. But now when they are in the majority, you can simply waive it with a majority vote upstairs in the Rules Committee.

This is a much weaker version of PAYGO. But I want to address a few other things.

Number one, you are going to hear this all year: They gave us a surplus. We inherited a surplus; we squandered the surplus.

Madam Speaker, what was the surplus? The surplus was a projection. It was a projection by economists at OMB and CBO that said we are going to have all of this money coming in.

You know what they didn't project, they didn't project 9/11. They didn't project war. They didn't project the dot-com bubble bursting or the recession or the Enron scandals. What did that do? It was a fiscal train wreck for America, and our numbers went down and we had to spend more money when we went to Afghanistan and Iraq.

Where are we today? The budget deficit went down 40 percent. In 1 year, the budget deficit went down 40 percent off projections. Why, Madam Speaker? It went down that much because revenues increased. Why did revenues increase, because we let the American people keep more of their own hard-earned dollars. They were able to keep more of their tax dollars.

There is a very deep difference between our two parties on principle and on philosophy. We believe that the money in America in the Federal Government is the people's money. That the money we spend is not our money, it is the money of our constituents. It is their money.

When you see rules like this, which I want to quote from the Wall Street Journal: PAYGO, by contrast, gives the appearance of spending discipline while making it all but impossible to let taxpayers keep more of their own money. It should really be called spend and tax as you go.

This bill does nothing to control current spending. It does nothing to reduce the current deficit, and it puts us on a path to raise taxes.

We believe the priorities ought to be different: That we ought to control spending and reduce spending to balance the budget, not raise taxes because after all, the money that comes to the Federal Government is not our money. It is the people's money. It comes from the paychecks of working Americans, men and women, small businesses, farmers and businesses. By letting people keep more of their own hard-earned dollar, our economy grows, revenues grow. We have to watch spending. That is where the priorities ought to be placed. This does not deliver that.

Hopefully we can work together in the future to have a real spending

mechanism that actually controls spending rather than puts us on a pathway to higher taxes.

Madam Speaker, I reluctantly oppose this legislation because of the honorable earmark reforms.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would say to Mr. RYAN that the Democrats are 2 days in the majority. The Republicans were 12 years in the majority with the purse strings, and this deficit ran up on your watch.

On the second day that we are here talking about what we are going to do as a first step to clean up your mess, you would complain? Cut me some slack.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) such time as he may consume.

□ 1200

Mr. EMANUEL. Six years, $3 trillion in new debt. The largest accumulation of debt in the shortest period of time in American history. That is the legacy. And the one thing you can say about George Bush and this economy is we will be forever in your debt. That is the one thing that is clear.

Now, folks, I am glad that you have the sentiment to be for this, but you had the inability to do it. We are going to do something you talked about, but we actually are going to walk the walk and not just talk the talk. We are going to put this fiscal house in order.

And you did get handed a surplus prior to total Republican control. You got handed a surplus. It wasn't illusory. Nobody could not find it. We knew exactly where it was. And you spent it. You did something no American President and no Congress had ever tried in American history. Three wars, three tax cuts, $3 trillion in new debt. I don't know what your fixation is about that. You have got a fixation for the number three. I have no idea why. But that is what you did. You had a war in Iraq, a war on terror, a war in Afghanistan. You tried three major tax cuts, and you got $3 trillion in new debt. And on day number two, the Democrats have said enough is enough with running up the debt and the deficit of this country. We are going to begin to take steps to put our fiscal house in order.

And let's start with number one, and that is earmark reform. When the Republican Congress took over in 1995, throughout the entire Federal budget, 1,400 earmarks. At the end of the Republican Congress, there were 13,997 earmarks. Now, I know your kids know the explosion on those numbers from 1,400 to nearly 14,000 earmarks. And we are going to use the disinfectant of sunlight. And everybody is going to know everything they need to know about these earmarks.

Now let me use one quote over the years when we were dealing with earmarks. A famous lobbyist called earmarks ''an ATM for lobbyists.'' Well, folks, that is part of ethics and lobbying reform, and we are going to change that. It is not going to be an ATM machine for the special interests anymore because this Congress, that gavel, is going to open up the people's House, not the auction house. And that is what has happened here over the years.

Number two, pay-as-you-go rules. I worked for an administration that had pay-as-you-go rules. It created discipline not just for Republicans, not just for Democrats. For the government. For the American people's money. And we created a surplus through hard work and discipline. These two steps, pay-as-you-go rules, no new spending without the revenue to pay for them; and earmark reform, will actually change our fiscal house and also the attitude in which we deal with things, and there won't be this insidious relationship between lobbyists and the American people's money. We will do what we need to do. And step one is lobbying and ethics reform, to change how Washington does the people's business; and step two is to put their government's fiscal house in order. That is what we are doing, and I know in your heart of hearts because I know you as individuals, and I see a number of Members here who are nodding their heads ''yes,'' you would like to be for this, but you just can't seem to find that little green button. So this is a chance to vote for it.

Remember all the rhetoric and all the speeches you gave on earmark reform, fiscal discipline. You believe what is going on here is the right thing to do. You know it is the right thing to do. But because of party loyalties, you won't do that. That is exactly what we applauded yesterday was to put partisanship aside and join us in the act of patriotism. I know you would like to vote ''yes.'' In your heart of hearts you would like to vote ''yes.'' And I am proud that we are doing what you have only talked about because we will not just talk the talk. We will walk the walk.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Pay-as-you-go was the law of the land from 1990 until 2002, paving the way for a balanced budget in the late 1990s, 4 years of budget surpluses, and bringing down the national debt by $453 billion. The Bush administration has turned a projected 10-year $5.6 billion surplus into a nearly $3 trillion deficit. America's debt has already climbed 50 percent to more than $28,000 per person, and President Bush has borrowed more from foreign nations than the previous 42 United States Presidents combined.

Something has to change and that change is coming now. The pay-as-you-go budgeting with no new deficit spending is just a first step, a key first step, in reversing record budget deficits.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of Title IV of H.R. 6, the Rules of the House of Representatives for the 110th Congress. With the adoption of this title, we begin to make good on our pledge to restore fiscal responsibility, open government, and honest leadership to the House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, it is critically important that we adopt the ''pay as you go'' or ''paygo'' rules contained in Title IV. We must restore budget discipline with no new deficit spending as the first step to reversing record budget deficits that are passing trillions in debt on to our children and grandchildren. We must also amend House rules to require full transparency in order to begin to end the abuse of special interest earmarks.

Madam Speaker, the Bush Administration has turned a projected 10-year $5.6 billion surplus into a nearly $3 trillion deficit. Under this Administration, America's debt has climbed 50 percent to more than $28,000 per person, and the United States has borrowed more from foreign nations than the previous 42 U.S. presidents combined. Rising interest rates caused by Bush deficits cost middle-class families as much as $1,700 a year on credit card and mortgage payments, with interest payments on the debt becoming one of the fastest growing categories of spending in the federal budget.

Madam Speaker, pay-as-you-go was the law of the land from 1990 until 2002, paving the way for a balanced budget in the late 1990s, four years of budget surpluses, and bringing down the national debt by $453 billion.

Forty-two percent of the American public says reducing the deficit should be a top priority. On November 5, 1990, President George H.W. Bush signed a deficit reduction bill imposing pay-as you-go discipline in a bipartisan deal supported by 47 House Republicans and 19 Senate Republicans. Republicans such as former Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan and Senator JOHN MCCAIN support pay-as-you-go budgeting. It is supported by the Concord Coalition, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, and the Committee for Economic Development.

Madam Speaker, earmark reform is needed to bring transparency and accountability for special projects. The status quo has permitted some Members of Congress, with no transparency and accountability, to provide favors to special friends through earmarked special projects—putting special interests ahead of the public interest. The American people deserve to know who is sponsoring earmarks to begin to stop the cases of flagrant abuse of earmarks.

The number of earmarks has exploded under the Republicans, climbing from 3,023 in FY 1996 to 13,012 in FY 2006, and the lack of transparency and accountability has led to problems—of which Rep. Cunningham is an example. Former Representative Duke Cunningham pleaded guilty to accepting bribes from defense contractors in return for his help in securing defense contracts.

The Democratic reform package will amend House rules to clearly define what constitutes an earmark, along with its proper use. Specifically, the package will prohibit earmarks that personally benefit Members and their spouses.

Earmark reform under Democrats will ban earmarks that benefit lobbyists who chair a Member's Political Action Committee.

Madam Speaker, to restore public confidence in this institution, we must commit ourselves to being the most honest, most ethical, most responsive, most fiscally responsible Congress in history. We can end the nightmare of the last six years by putting the needs of the American people ahead of partisan political advantage. To do that, we must start by adopting Title III of H.R. 6, the fiscal responsibility reforms to the Rules of the House of Representatives for the 110th Congress.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this rule change and real Pay-As-You-Go or ''Pay-Go'' budget requirements.

Madam Speaker, the 109th Session of Congress left behind a legacy that is certain to go down in the annals of history as the height of fiscal irresponsibility. Unless you consider an additional $781 billion extension of the debt limit, the fourth of a series approved since 2003 that added an additional $3 trillion in new debt, the 109th Session can boast of no budgetary accomplishment.

In fact, it failed in its most basic responsibility: passing a budget for the Federal Government and failing to enact 9 of the 11 regular spending bills that fund the government's operations.

But, it simply didn't just fail pass a budget, it actually made the Nation's fiscal problems worse. It took what it already knew were large projected deficits and passed legislation that makes them even larger in future years. According to the Congressional Budget Office, legislation enacted last session actually increases the projected budget deficits by $452 billion above what they would have been between 2005 and 2011 had they never been in session.

Over the course of the past 5 years, with full control of the White House and both chambers of Congress, the Republican leadership inherited an estimated 10-year budget surplus of $5.6 trillion and after 5 years has turned the same 10-year period (2002–2011) into a projected budget deficit of $3 trillion—a disastrous $8.6 trillion turnabout.

This explosion of budget deficits is largely the result of 2 irresponsible budget policies of the former Republican majority:

First, was its decision to waive all budget rules and not to pay for the current war in Iraq and Afghanistan, letting emergency spending bills be enacted within the discipline and restraints on the regular budget process; and

Second, was to make tax cuts its highest priority, enacting a series of tax cuts, targeted primarily at the wealthiest Americans and corporations that need them the least, with no offsets.

According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, the 3 major tax cuts enacted over the past 5 years cost $1.5 trillion between 2001 and 2014. The actual number is somewhat higher once you tack on the additional costs of debt-servicing.

I don't pretend to have all the answers to solve our fiscal problems. But, one thing we should not do is more harm. We should not increase the amount of debt our children will inherit.

Adopting a real Pay-Go requirement as part of the Rules for the 110th Congress will keep this institution and the White House from digging an even larger budget deficit hole.

The pay-go rule we are considering today is not unlike the original one adopted as part of the 1993 budget agreement that required any spending or revenue measure we consider before the full House be fully offset and not increase the budget deficit.

The first Pay-Go requirements were adopted in 1993 as part of the largest deficit reduction package that Congress ever approved; a package that passed both chambers with a single Republican vote. It included both real spending cuts and real tax increases and placed us on a course toward balanced budgets.

The Pay-Go requirements were subsequently extended as part of the 1995 bipartisan budget agreement and closed the final gap in deficit spending that in 1999 produced the first balanced budget in more than 30 years.

We would be in a much better situation today had the original ''Pay-Go'' rule remained in effect.

Instead, a Republican-controlled Congress allowed the Pay-Go requirements to expire, enabling them to adopt irresponsible tax cuts that are largely responsible for the deficits we face today.

Adopting a true Pay-Go rule today gets us back on track toward responsible fiscal policy. I encourage my colleagues to support its inclusion in the Rules of the 110th Congress.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I rise to express concerns about the budget items in the Democrat Rules package.

I believe that we can do better and this proposal does not go far enough. I am committed to curtailing special-interest, pork-barrel spending and reforming earmarks.

While on the face it appears Democrats are concerned about reducing the deficit because they mention Reconciliation. This is only smoke and mirrors. Simply put, the language in their rules package makes it easy to raise taxes and difficult to reduce them. The language allows the use of expedited procedures (budget reconciliation) to raise taxes. At the same time, the language prohibits using reconciliation for tax relief.

We need transparency, accountability, and better control for the federal spending process. Earmark Reform and Reconciliation are baseless without a Rescission process for cutting spending.

Businesses and families often review their planned budget with actual spending on a monthly basis to spot and eliminate unnecessary spending. While common sense would lead taxpayers to believe that similar oversight exists for our federal budget, this would be wrong. Congress has no formal process that allows members to force votes to trim wasteful spending at any time after federal spending gets signed into law.

Soon I plan to introduce my legislation, the Cut the Unnecessary Tab (CUT) resolution, that would make any unspent federal funding vulnerable to a recorded vote for cuts at the beginning of each fiscal quarter. Any Member of the House could offer an amendment to these quarterly bills to cut spending.

Under my bill, Members of Congress will have four opportunities every year to propose elimination of programs that are superfluous or incompetent. This gives Congress a tool that individual Members can use to bring the chamber into commonsense spending cuts. No longer would any Member of Congress have the excuse that one individual acting alone would not have a way to reform the Federal Government's spending.

It is my hope that the Democrats live up to their promise for no new deficit spending. However, I fear that it's a plan to raise taxes. The resolution allows Democrats to increase spending as much as they like—as long as they ''pay for'' it by cutting other spending or—more likely—by chasing that spending with ever-higher taxes. This watered down PAYGO proposal does not reduce current spending—it stops tax cuts. This PAYGO applies only to NEW spending. All previous PAYGO versions were enforced by across-the-board spending cuts—that's what created the incentive to control spending. But the Democrats' PAYGO is enforced only by a point of order—which they can easily waive for their pet spending increases.

Congress can and must do better. The easiest and best way to stop the growth of federal spending and let American families keep more of their hard earned taxpayer dollars is to make these tough decisions now.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Title IV Sec. 405 Pay-As-You-Go rules before the House today. I support these rules that will enable us to patch a sinking ship. The Republican tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans have driven us into permanent deficit spending. These rules will stop the sacrifice of the nation's well being for the benefit of the few.

I continue to be concerned about our weakened economy and the shrinking industrial base. I believe Congress should be enacting measures that will expand the economy, revitalize the rust belt, expand our manufacturing base, prime the pump when needed in recession, and invest in infrastructure improvements. I believe Congress should enact universal healthcare for all and universal pre-kindergarten. Unlike the irresponsible tax cuts in the past 4 years, I am prepared to ensure these programs do not run up deficits over the long term. This can all be accomplished under these rules.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California). Pursuant to House Resolution 5, the previous question is ordered on the portion of the divided question comprising title IV.

The question is on that portion of the divided question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The portion of the divided question comprising title V is now debatable for 10 minutes.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, since the title of the rules package that we are seeking to debate now includes five closed rules for legislation that we haven't seen and we only have 10 minutes to debate this title, I ask unanimous consent for 1 hour of debate, at least 1 hour of debate, for these, in effect, five closed rules.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

''The disinfectant of sunlight,'' Madam Speaker. I just heard that term.

The alternation of power can sometimes be healthy, often be healthy in democracy. Progress is made by the cumulative efforts and reforms of succeeding generations in this Congress, often from both parties. But retrogression, Madam Speaker, from progress is neither healthy nor certainly commendable.

As I mentioned before, in this section of the rules package brought forth by the new majority, first of all, the Rules Committee will no longer be required to disclose roll call votes on rules brought forth or amendments in committee. I believe, and I haven't heard it from the other side because no pretext has even been brought forth here in the House, but I believe that the pretext is for closing out sunshine completely in the Rules Committee, that some mistakes were made reporting in the past roll calls. In the last 12 years, there were over 1,300 recorded votes in the Committee on Rules, and not once, Madam Speaker, did the committee file a report with incorrect vote totals.

And then, as I made reference before, this title of the rules package that the majority brings forth includes five closed rules for legislation that we still haven't seen. And we have received a lot of criticism. I have heard a lot of criticism over the last years when we have come to the floor from the Rules Committee with closed rules, but at least we have had Rules Committees meetings and there has been an opportunity for Members to go to the Rules Committee and present amendments.

Well, now we are, in this rules package, in a totally unprecedented manner, seeing that the majority is bringing forth five closed rules for bills that we haven't seen. And in addition, they are waiving all points of order, all points of order, against all of those five bills that we haven't even seen. So that is most unfortunate, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would ask how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished friend from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this proposal. For the first time in more than a decade and in recent memory, the new House leadership, and this is hard to believe, is attempting to keep secret the votes of one of our most important committees, the Rules Committee. It determines which bills are sent to the House floor, for how long they may be debated, and what amendments the people's House will consider. It is a critical part of our democratic process. Hiding these votes from the public, cloaking this committee in secrecy where backroom deals are shielded from the American voter, is an outrageous and arrogant step backward from open and honest government. This is abuse of power that must be stopped. And, sadly, I will file a Freedom of Information Act request on every Rules Committee vote so that the American public can see what this committee is trying to hide.

We ought to defeat this proposal.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me respond to my colleagues from Florida and Texas by simply saying you are wrong.

Let me ask, has the gentleman yielded back all his time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. No, I have not.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

So not only can we not have an hour, but now we have to finish our debate before hearing our opponents.

No, again, we heard ''the disinfectant of sunlight'' has arrived. An interesting definition for what has arrived, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, what we are voting on today, this rules package, this provision, this title V, constitutes serious retrogression from progress made in this Congress throughout generations of work, of reform, from both parties, that has brought openness and transparency. The Rules Committee now is closed off from the public, and closed rules are brought to this floor in this rules package before we have even seen legislation. Most unfortunate, Madam Speaker.

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

I appreciate the words of my colleagues from Texas and Florida. And I should remind my colleague from Florida when you are in the majority, you get to close debates. And he should have known that since he was in the majority for 12 years.

And I think for anybody to talk about abuse of power, it takes a lot of chutzpah. I would suggest to the gentleman from Texas to look at what happened over the last 12 years in this Congress.

Madam Speaker, this is the final title of the rules package. It consists of basic technical changes to the House rules.

First, this title gives the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform authority to adopt a rule, allowing committee members and staff to conduct depositions in the course of committee investigations.

□ 1215

Second, it shields the Rules Committee reports from a point of order if they are filed without a complete list of record votes taken during the consideration of a special rule. This provision allows the Rules Committee to publish recorded votes taken during committee hearings and committee reports and/or through other means, such as the Internet.

Third, it allows for the consideration of several pieces of legislation that are part of the first 100 hours agenda, if special rules for those provisions are not separately reported.

Fourth, this title continues the budget deeming resolution for the second session of the 109th Congress until such time as a conference report establishing a budget for the fiscal year 2008 is adopted.

Fifth and finally, this title renews the standing order approved during the 109th Congress that prohibits registered lobbyists from using Members' exercise facilities, which is something I know is very important to the Members on the other side of the aisle.

Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle have focused a lot of attention incorrectly on the second provision regarding the publishing of votes taken in the Rules Committee.

Let me explain in detail what this provision actually accomplishes and why we have included it in this package. Section 503 is a straightforward clerical change to clause 3(b), rule XIII, that will make it a little easier for the Rules Committee to transmit its work product to the House in a timely manner.

Despite what you may hear from the other side of the aisle, this section will not reduce the amount of information available to the public about what we do in the Rules Committee, and it will not stop us from taking public votes in the committee.

Let me make something else clear. The House rules already require committees to keep a record of all recorded votes and to make those votes available publicly.

That requirement has been in the permanent rules since 1953. The Rules Committee has always and will always comply with that rule. In fact, it is our goal to make Rules Committee votes available to the public more quickly

than they do under the current practices. Our committee often meets on short notice and under severe time restrictions.

Unlike other committees, which usually have several days to put together reports, our committee is often required to assemble large, complex reports in a matter of hours. The proper reporting and filing of these reports in the House is essential to the efficient operation of the House.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. No, I will not. We sometimes report and file a special rule late one night, and the next morning the rule and the bill are on the House floor. There is just not much room for even minor clerical errors when you are under such tight deadlines. This rules change does not mean that the public will have any less access to what happens in the Rules Committee, Madam Speaker.

We plan to include record votes in the Rules Committee reports and, even better, we intend to post committee votes on the Rules Committee Web site as soon as they have them, so that the American people will know what is going on.

Even better than that, we plan to have more meetings during the daylight hours so that the public and the press know what we are doing in the Rules Committee.

Well, let me say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, if you feel that the votes taken in the Rules Committee are not being made public fast enough, or are clear enough, you have my word that we will work to fix it, and we will work with you. You have my word on that.

More importantly, Madam Speaker, after our business here in the House concludes today, we will have made historic progress. We will have ended the culture of corruption that has plagued this House for the past dozen years. We will have paved the way to accomplishing what the American people voted for, to give minimum wage workers a raise.

Right now the average CEO of a Fortune 500 Company earns $10,712 in 1 hour 16 minutes. It takes an average minimum wage worker 52, 40-hour weeks, an entire year, to earn the same $10,712. It is wrong, and we are going to fix it.

We will have paved a way to make college tuition and prescription drugs more affordable, to make our homeland safer, by implementing the 9/11 Commission recommendations, and to invest in lifesaving stem cell research. All of these measures, Madam Speaker, have been the subject of hearings. Many of them have been voted on. But the majority on the other side has stalled and undermined these measure at every step. No more.

Finally, Madam Speaker, let me assure my friends, including the distinguished gentleman from Florida, that we will conduct the business of this House in a much more fair, civil and open way than has been the norm of the last 12 years. Your views will be heard more than ours were. Your ideas will be given more consideration than ours were. Your voices will be more respected than ours were, because that is the right way to run the people's House.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to Title V of H. Res. 6 and encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this measure.

Since the election we have heard promises of grandeur from the new Democrat majority. They have promised to usher in a new era of civility, bi-partisanship, and cooperation into the halls of Congress. They have repeatedly stated that the American people want a civilized tone in Washington. But it appears the Democrats are ignoring their own message.

In the opening hours of this Congress, with their very first piece of business, the Democrats have put forth a resolution that is the opposite of civility and transparency—indeed, a total contradiction of the way they pledged to conduct business. For the first time in the history of this body, Madam Speaker, the Democrats have included closed rules governing future debate in the House rules package, and have even gone so far as to prevent the Rules Committee from meeting to deliberate these rules or the larger rules package.

But they did not stop there, Madam Speaker. After promising an open and fair process, the Democrats have allowed just 10 minutes of debate—that's 5 minutes per side—on Title V of this resolution.

This is no small measure, Madam Speaker. Included in Title V are closed rules governing debate on stem-cell research, the recommendations of the 9/11 commission, the cost of prescription drugs, and the federal minimum wage. Certainly the American people expect a debate of ideas and the proper congressional process for some of the most important issues facing our Nation. Instead, the Democrats will deliver 10 minutes of debate.

Further Madam Speaker, Title V of this resolution will prevent the votes of the Rules Committee from being made public. A veil of secrecy will fall over this critical committee they now control. This is not the transparency and accountability in our political process the Democrats have promised.

So, Madam Speaker, it appears the new age of the Democrat majority will unfortunately not live up to its much-hyped billing. Instead of more openness, fairness, and transparency, the Democrats have revealed the hypocritical nature of their disingenuous promises with their very first piece of legislation. Reneging on their campaign promises in the opening hours of this session is no way to build the spirit of trust and cooperation across the aisle.

Madam Speaker, I hope for the sake of the American people that the Democrats start adhering to their pre-election rhetoric and conduct the business of this body in a civilized manner.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 6, the House Rules Package for the 110th Congress. With the passage of this resolution, we are committing ourselves to restore honest leadership, civility, and fiscal responsibility to the U.S. House of Representatives. It is a commitment that we owe to our constituents and to our Nation.

Unfortunately, over the past several years, the House of Representatives was transformed from the people's House into a legislative body where those who could afford to make their influence felt far too often held sway. Legislation was enacted that benefited the wealthy few instead of the vast majority. Legislation was enacted—often in the middle of the night—without time for review or careful consideration. Legislation was enacted to benefit those who could afford to pay for fancy meals and golf vacations while legislation that would improve wages and the quality of life for working Americans was ignored. The process was abused, votes were held open, and amendments were prohibited from being offered. The losers have been the American public.

Perhaps the single best example of these abuses is the Medicare Modernization Act, a law which actually prohibits Medicare from negotiating for drug savings, as the VA and large employers do today, and by doing so guarantees that senior citizens and persons with disabilities will pay more than they should for the drugs that they need. This law would not have been enacted if pharmaceutical companies had not been allowed to use undue influence, if Democratic conferees had not been locked out of the negotiations, if Members had not been intimidated on the House floor, and if the final vote had not been held open for nearly 3 hours to change the outcome.

During the first 100 hours of the 110th Congress, we will eliminate this prohibition and require that Medicare use its bargaining clout on behalf of consumers. Today, we are taking steps to make sure that the procedural abuses that were used to enact that prohibition will become a relic of the past.

We also begin the 110th Congress by putting our financial house in order. The past 6 years of fiscal mismanagement has turned a $5.6 trillion surplus into an over $3 trillion deficit. The passage of H. Res. 6 will help us get our current debt and financial crisis under control while allowing us to make the investments needed for American families and our economic future.

With the restoration of pay-as-you-go budgeting, Congress will not be able to increase the deficit and make future generations of Americans carry a debt load so that today's wealthy can get tax cuts like the ones passed over the past few years. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, those tax cuts, which primarily benefit the very rich, are the main cause of our country's fiscal reversal. Reining in the spiraling debt will give us a chance to invest in our communities, create jobs, provide retirement security, and stimulate our economy.

Transparency requirements for earmarks will also help us make certain that taxpayers' dollars are put to good use while eliminating wasteful spending. I believe that district-specific earmarks on appropriations or other legislation should not be provided unless they directly improve our communities. Requiring better disclosure of sponsorship of earmarks and ensuring that Members have no personal financial interest in the request will help us guarantee that the funding is targeted to essential infrastructure improvements, community development, vital research, and other important programs. Congress has a long history of providing earmarks for such projects, and I support their continued funding and eliminating

the abuses of earmarks like the "Bridge to Nowhere."

H. Res. 6 is the first action of the 110th Congress. By its passage, we are demonstrating to the American public that we are going to return the House of Representatives to its rightful role as being the people's House—not just in procedures but also in policy.

Mr. HALL of New York. Madam Speaker, today the House of Representatives will consider an important package of reforms that, when adopted by this chamber, will take the first necessary steps toward restoring fiscal responsibility in our government. I am proud to be a cosponsor of these measures, which will allow us to undertake the critical tasks of balancing our budget and controlling our national debt.

For too long, our government has operated under a "buy now, pay later" philosophy that, if left unchanged, will force our children and grandchildren to foot the bill with increasingly dire consequences. The fiscal responsibility provisions put forward today will help us avoid this generational buck passing by imposing some much-needed discipline on the budgeting process. The package of reforms put forward today accomplishes that by preventing the House from considering budget measures that would increase the federal deficit.

One of the most important reforms we are advancing today is the reinstitution of "PAYGO" rules to govern the Congressional budgeting process. Although the overall budget process can be technical and complex, "PAYGO" simply means what it sounds like: you pay as you go. The "PAYGO" provision creates a barrier to passing legislation that would further inflate our huge national deficit and mortgage our country's future.

Congress operated under "PAYGO" rules from 1990 until 2002 with clear results. Under the "PAYGO" constraints on spending, our government was able to balance the budget, create budget surpluses, and reduce the national debt by $453 billion. Since the mistaken move away from the "PAYGO" rules, deficit spending is back and our national debt has spiraled out of control. As of today, the total national debt is almost an astonishing $8.7 trillion or almost $29,000 for every person in the United States. Disturbingly, much of this debt is held by America's economic competitors, including China. Instead of demonstrating the leadership needed to turn this dangerous fiscal tide, our government has not taken steps to curtail earmarks, our President has never vetoed a spending bill, and we have yet to demonstrate the will to do what is necessary.

I am proud to say that with today's reform package we can begin to change that. It is in our vital interest to get spending under control to eliminate deficits and return to paying down our debt. It will require difficult choices and the will to change business as usual in Washington, but it is our responsibility to meet that challenge by passing these reforms.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rules package before us. As we begin the important work of the 110th Congress, it is imperative that we set the tone for how the people's work will be conducted in this chamber, which is the people's House.

In the November elections, Democrats offered Americans a new direction and a more ethical Congress. The American people responded with great clarity. Exit polls revealed that 74 percent of voters in November cited corruption as an important issue in determining their vote.

Now it is our turn to act. That's why we are taking immediate steps to fulfill the promise of a more ethical Congress by passing a comprehensive rules package that bans gifts and travel from lobbyists; requires adequate time to review legislation and bans the insertion of special interest provisions in the 'dead of the night' to ensure that Members have time to read the bills being considered and know exactly what is in them; mandates annual ethics training for all Members and staff; curbs abuses of voting time to ensure that votes are not held open to change the outcome; requires full disclosure of all earmarks, as well as requiring that a Member certify that earmarks do not financially benefit them or their spouses; and reinstates Pay-As-You-Go budget rules to prevent all new spending and tax cuts from adding to the federal debt.

Passage of this legislative package will begin the process of restoring integrity to the House of Representatives, assuring the people of our country that we are here on their behalf, not our own. I urge my colleagues to vote for this rules package.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adoption of title III of House Resolution 6, by the yeas and nays;

Adoption of title IV of House Resolution 6, by the yeas and nays.

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

The pending business is the vote on adoption of title III of House Resolution 6, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on that portion of the divided question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 430, noes 0, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—430

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
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 (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
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-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Norwood
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
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
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
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
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Barton (TX)
Brown (SC)
Buyer
Neal (MA)
Sullivan

□ 1246

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So that portion of the divided question was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on adoption of title IV of House Resolution 6, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on that portion of the divided question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 280, nays 152, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—280

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NAYS—152

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norwood
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Tiahrt
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—3

Brown (SC)
Buyer
Neal (MA)

□ 1259

Mr. WELLER of Illinois and Mr. POE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So that portion of the divided question was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BECERRA). Pursuant to House Resolution 5, the previous question is ordered on the portion of the divided question comprising title V.

The question is on that portion of the divided question.

MOTION TO COMMIT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to commit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin moves to commit the resolution (H. Res. 6) to a select committee composed of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader with instructions to report back the same to the House forthwith with only the following amendment:

After section 510, insert the following new sections, and redesignate the following sections (and cross references thereto) accordingly:

SEC. 511. SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS: SMALL BUSINESS HEALTH PLANS

On January 16, 2007, or, if the House is not in session on such day, the next day on which the House is in session thereafter, following the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, the House shall immediately proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 241) to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve access and choice for entrepreneurs with small businesses with respect to medical care for their employees. All points of order against the bill and against its consideration are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) three hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees, and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions to be offered by the Majority Leader or his designee.

SEC. 512. CONGRESSIONAL EARMARK REFORM.

(a) POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS.—Rule XXI is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

''9. (a) It shall not be in order to consider—

''(1) a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee unless the report includes a list

of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the bill or in the report (and the name of any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who submitted a request to the committee for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits;

''(2) a bill or joint resolution not reported by a committee unless the chairman of each committee of initial referral has caused a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the bill (and the name of any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who submitted a request to the committee for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits to be printed in the Congressional Record prior to its consideration;

''(3) an amendment to a bill or joint resolution to be offered at the outset of its consideration for amendment by a member of a committee of initial referral as designated in a report of the Committee on Rules to accompany a resolution prescribing a special order of business unless the proponent has caused a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the amendment (and the name of any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who submitted a request to the proponent for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits to be printed in the Congressional Record prior to its consideration; or

''(4) a conference report to accompany a bill or joint resolution unless the joint explanatory statement prepared by the managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate includes a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the conference report or joint statement (and the name of any Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, or Senator who submitted a request to the House or Senate committees of jurisdiction for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits.

''(b) It shall not be in order to consider a rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (a). As disposition of a point of order under this paragraph, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (a). The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn.

''(c) In order to be cognizable by the Chair, a point of order raised under paragraph (a) may be based only on the failure of a report, submission to the Congressional Record, or joint explanatory statement to include a list required by paragraph (a) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits.

''(d) For the purpose of this clause, the term 'congressional earmark' means a provision or report language included primarily at the request of a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, or Senator providing, authorizing or recommending a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority for a contract, loan, loan guarantee, grant, loan authority, or other expenditure with or to an entity, or targeted to a specific State, locality or Congressional district, other than through a statutory or administrative formula-driven or competitive award process.

''(e) For the purpose of this clause, the term 'limited tax benefit' means—

''(1) any revenue-losing provision that—

''(A) provides a Federal tax deduction, credit, exclusion, or preference to 10 or fewer beneficiaries under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and

''(B) contains eligibility criteria that are not uniform in application with respect to potential beneficiaries of such provision; or

''(2) any Federal tax provision which provides one beneficiary temporary or permanent transition relief from a change to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(f) For the purpose of this clause, the term 'limited tariff benefit' means a provision modifying the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States in a manner that benefits 10 or fewer entities.

(b) RELATED AMENDMENT TO CODE OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT.—Rule XXIII is amended—

(a) by redesignating clause 16 (as earlier redesignated) as clause 18; and

(b) by inserting after clause 15 the following new clauses:

''16. A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may not condition the inclusion of language to provide funding for a congressional earmark, a limited tax benefit, or a limited tariff benefit in any bill or joint resolution (or an accompanying report) or in any conference report on a bill or joint resolution (including an accompanying joint explanatory statement of managers) on any vote cast by another Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner. For purposes of this clause and clause 17, the terms 'congressional earmark,' 'limited tax benefit,' and 'limited tariff benefit' shall have the meanings given them in clause 9 of rule XXI.

''17. (a) A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who requests a congressional earmark, a limited tax benefit, or a limited tariff benefit in any bill or joint resolution (or an accompanying report) or in any conference report on a bill or joint resolution (or an accompanying joint statement of managers) shall provide a written statement to the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee of jurisdiction, including—

''(1) the name of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner;

''(2) in the case of a congressional earmark, the name and address of the intended recipient or, if there is no specifically intended recipient, the intended location of the activity;

''(3) in the case of a limited tax or tariff benefit, identification of the individual or entities reasonably anticipated to benefit, to the extent known to the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner;

''(4) the purpose of such congressional earmark or limited tax or tariff benefit; and

''(5) a certification that the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner or spouse has no financial interest in such congressional earmark or limited tax or tariff benefit.

''(b) Each committee shall maintain the information transmitted under paragraph (a), and the written disclosures for any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits included in any measure reported by the committee or conference report filed by the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall be open for public inspection.''.

Mr. McGOVERN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 5, the previous question is ordered on the motion to commit.

The question is on the motion to commit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This 15-minute vote on the motion to commit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on title V of House Resolution 6, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 200, nays 232, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—200

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norwood
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller

Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—232

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—3

Brown (SC)
Buyer
Neal (MA)

□ 1320

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BECERRA). The question is on the portion of the divided question comprising title V.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 200, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—232

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—200

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norwood
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—3

Brown (SC)
Buyer
Neal (MA)

□ 1328

So that portion of the divided question was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT T. STAFFORD WHITE ROCKS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Natural Resources be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 159) to redesignate the White Rocks National Recreation Area in the State of Vermont as the ''Robert T. Stafford White Rocks

National Recreational Area,'' and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 159

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

SECTION 1. ROBERT T. STAFFORD WHITE ROCKS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The White Rocks National Recreation Area in the State of Vermont, as established by section 202 of the Vermont Wilderness Act of 1984 (16 U.S.C. 460nn–1), is redesignated as the ''Robert T. Stafford White Rocks National Recreation Area''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the recreation area referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Robert T. Stafford White Rocks National Recreation Area.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I stand here on my first full day as a Member of Congress to say good bye to a great Vermont statesman. Senator Bob Stafford passed away last December at the age of 93. I feel a deep sense of pride to have the first Bill I introduce be one that honors Bob Stafford's commitment to Vermont by redesignating the White Rocks National Recreation Area as the ''Robert T. Stafford White Rocks National Recreation Area''.

Senator Stafford was born in Rutland in 1913. He had a long and distinguished career as a civil servant to the state, serving the state for nearly 30 years first as Governor, Representative, and Senator. Robert Stafford was a man who knew Vermont, and understood how to best serve Vermonters.

It was through his many public service positions around the state that he learned the importance of moderation and bipartisanship. He served as Rutland County State's attorney, as Deputy State Attorney General, and then as State Attorney General. In the late 1950's he was elected Lieutenant Governor, and in 1959 he became Governor.

In 1960, Bob Stafford was elected to Vermont's sole seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. He won five successive re-elections. In September 1971, he resigned his House seat to accept appointment to the U.S. Senate following the death of Senator Winston Prouty. After winning a special election in 1972, he proceeded to represent Vermont in the Senate for the next 17 years.

When he came to Washington, a member of the Republican Party, he formed many close relationships with members of both parties. Senator Stafford was able to be effective because of his reliance on moderation and compromise. He was a leader among his peers, and became an advocate for issues that were close to him and to Vermont. Affordable education and his dedication to the environment became his most important issues. The Stafford Student Loan program has made higher education more accessible for millions of Americans.

While his achievements in the areas of education and federal disaster relief were very important, it is the legacy he has left behind for the work he did in protecting the environment that he was most proud of. Bob Stafford shared Vermonters' belief that we have a moral obligation to leave for our children a cleaner environment than the one we inherited. He was a leader and visionary who helped shape and strengthen some of our Nation's most critical environmental laws for over two decades. Serving as Chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee from 1981–1986, he led the charge to expand and strengthen the Superfund toxic waste cleanup law in the mid 1980's.

Please join me today in honoring the tremendous life and service of Senator Bob Stafford. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and pass the Congress by unanimous consent.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, first I want to congratulate our new Member for getting a bill passed in the first week. That is an incredible thing to get done.

Then I would like to inquire of my good friend and new majority leader, Mr. HOYER, about the schedule for next week.

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, I want to say, Mr. Whip, we congratulate you on your reelection as the whip. I have an affection for whips, as you know, the position, and I am personally advantaged by our close working relationship and respect for one another. And I think the American public hopefully will be advantaged by that. I think this House will be advantaged by that, and I look forward to working with my good friend, ROY BLUNT.

In addition, all of us on our side appreciated the very gracious remarks of your leader, Mr. BOEHNER, when introducing Speaker PELOSI and passing the gavel to her. We know that is a difficult role. It was a difficult role for Mr. Gephardt when in 1995 he had that responsibility, and it was a difficult role for Ms. PELOSI on the two occasions she had to do it. Your leader was extraordinarily gracious and positive in that role, and we appreciate that and we want you to know that.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour and at noon for legislative business. Under the suspension calendar, we will consider a resolution mourning the passing of President Gerald Ford. That resolution, I would tell the Members, the principal sponsor of which is Mr. VERN EHLERS, our colleague on your side of the aisle, who represents the district which was so ably and effectively represented by President Ford for such a long period of time, a quarter of a century.

Mr. Speaker, we will also consider H.R. 1, a bill to implement the 9/11 Commission recommendations, and a resolution to establish a select intelligence oversight panel.

I will tell Mr. BLUNT we expect votes to be not before 3 to 4 p.m. We had originally, as you know, thought we might come in Monday. There was a schedule conflict and we wanted to accommodate that. We are glad we did. We will try to hold votes until 3 or 4, but west coast Members will have a difficult time getting back so they ought to plan on being here on Monday unless they have an important engagement they have to attend.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. We will consider H.R. 2, a bill to increase the minimum wage.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. We will consider H.R. 3, a bill regarding stem cell research.

And on Friday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. We will consider H.R. 4, a bill regarding the Medicare prescription drug program. We expect the last votes to be hopefully no later than 2 p.m.

The practice, as you know, will be that we will come in at 6:30 on Mondays and adjourn no later than 2 p.m. on the day of adjournment. Many times that will be Friday, sometimes it will be Thursday. We understand the need for Members to get out. If it is on Thursday, the expectation is we may go a little later than that, but that will be generally the practice we will try to pursue.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my colleague for responding. As he mentioned, we have had a great working relationship as the whips of the two parties and look forward to working with him in his new job as the leader of the majority.

I, too, thought yesterday was an historic day for the House, and a day that our Members all appreciated the historic nature of the day. Particularly on this side of the aisle, we appreciated the Speaker's comments about moving towards partnership as opposed to partisanship; and we, of course, are eager to see a little more of that partnership again.

We paid close attention during the election and after the election to the commitments to the new majority to have bills available in an earlier way and to have committee and subcommittee markup. I assume the work next week is work the majority decided will not be able to go through the subcommittee process or the committee process, and I yield to my friend to respond to that.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman's assumption is correct. Pursuant to the rule that was adopted today, we will be moving the six items that we obviously

campaigned on, told the American public that we would move on within the first 100 hours.

We believe almost all of those items have been broadly discussed, considered, not only in the election process of approximately 6 months in duration or longer, but also, for instance, the 9/11 Commission report which we will consider in the first order of business next week, vetted by the bipartisan commission, the 9/11 Commission, chaired by Governor Kean and co-chaired by Mr. Hamilton, so that the gentleman's assumption is correct.

But that does not mean, I want to make it very clear, that does not mean that when we get through those items which essentially were the items focused on during the course of the election, that we will not hew to what we believe to be a positive step forward in including both sides in deliberations, in conference reports, in committees and on the floor.

Mr. BLUNT. As you know, most of our Members voted against the rule which brings these issues to the floor without the chance to offer an alternative. We believe there is a desire to create more opportunities for alternatives, but the sooner that can happen, I think the more effectively we will show to the American people that we are finding ways to work together.

We had a pledge also of at least 24 hours of notice on the specifics of legislation. It doesn't seem to me that is quite as onerous a pledge to meet in the context of what my friend just said as going through a subcommittee, going through a committee. We didn't feel like we had that 24-hour access to information this week. We would hope next week to have the specifics of the legislation as early as possible. If in fact this is legislation that doesn't need to go through the committees because it has been so widely discussed and vetted, it would not seem to be unreasonable for everybody in the body, every Member to have a chance to see it even as early as Monday.

Mr. HOYER. I think the gentleman is correct and I am glad the gentleman said ''as early as Monday.'' It is my understanding those bills will be available to you this afternoon, and properly so. We want you to have the opportunity and the American public to have an opportunity to read and see those bills.

It is my understanding that all of those bills will be introduced by the close of business today so they will be available to be read over the weekend and before Monday, and certainly before we come back on Tuesday.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend for the response. Seeing the legislation is obviously helpful. We are really regretful we don't have a chance to offer an alternative in the real-time. We will look at the legislation. We will see if we can find a suggestion that will help meet the goals that we agree with in a more effective way. That 24-hour notice from now on we would hope would be a pledge that the majority will be able to retain.

My good friend Mr. HOYER mentioned the 9/11 Commission report. One of the recommendations of that commission was a realignment of committees. We didn't make that realignment of committees in the rules package. I wonder if there is any plan for that kind of realignment, and I would yield to the leader for that response.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the whip for that observation. That was one of the important recommendations that the commission made. Those recommendations were made, of course, over a year ago, I think. I am not sure of the exact date, but over a year ago. Your side did not implement that particular recommendation.

The gentleman is correct, we have not implemented the recommendation as recommended. What Speaker PELOSI has done, she has discussed with Leader BOEHNER what I would refer to as a hybrid of that, not perfect from I think the Commission standpoint, but meeting in spirit what the Commission wanted to do. What the Commission wanted to do was empower the Intelligence Committee with a participation in the appropriations process, which the Commission perceived would give them a greater relevance and greater influence.

We agree with that; so as you know, we have suggested and are implementing a hybrid where the members of the Intelligence Committee and members of the Defense Appropriations Committee will meet and work together to accomplish that objective. We hope that will move towards effecting what the Commission wanted to achieve, while, at the same time, maintaining the jurisdictional issues which, as you know, in this body can become very, very acutely debated.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend for the response.

You may very well have said and I may not have heard, in terms of us seeing the bills for next week, would you expect that to happen by what time today?

Mr. HOYER. They are being introduced today and very frankly, Mr. Whip, I can't give you a time because I don't know. If I knew, I would give it to you.

Mr. BLUNT. Do you expect them to be introduced all at once, or will some be available earlier than others?

Mr. HOYER. I am told H.R. 3 was just introduced, is already in the hopper, and obviously others will come. It is my belief, it has been represented to me that all of the bills that will be considered next week will be introduced as of close of business today so that you will have the balance of today, Saturday, Sunday, Monday, and most of Tuesday to review those bills.

Mr. BLUNT. Certainly seeing the legislation is a step in the right direction. We believe another step in the right direction will be to be able to offer the amendments and go through the process that the majority assured us in the recent campaign will be part of their procedure.

On the Tuesday schedule, I have had one Member come up to me during our discussion and wanted me to ask if there is any possibility that 3 to 4 votes could slip closer to 5 just because of a number of travel concerns that Members have, particularly west coast members.

Mr. HOYER. We could try. But let me say in all fairness, our original intent was to meet and have votes at 6:30 on Monday. There is a very important event happening Monday night, particularly for those who live in Ohio and Florida.

In the spirit of comity, and I know if Maryland were playing, I would want to be accommodated and I want to accommodate my friend, Mr. BOEHNER. So we have done that; but it has put us in a position where we thought we would have come back Monday. That is not the case. We will have votes as late as possible, but we cannot guarantee. That leaves us a shorter period of time to do the work we have scheduled. So I cannot guarantee, but we are going to try to keep it for your Members' sake, for our Members' sake, and we understand the west coast travel issue, as late as we can in the day, but cannot guarantee later than 3:30 or 4 o'clock.

□ 1345

Mr. BLUNT. Well, I would suggest to my good friend, having tried to put these schedules together for a while, that particularly for our west coast Members, if they get here on Monday to be here for a 3:30 vote on Tuesday and then find that that Tuesday vote doesn't occur until 5:30 or 6 o'clock, there is always real anxiety about the day that costs their families, and I know my good friend is going to try his very best to give us the best schedule. My only suggestion would be if you do see that it might slip into that later time that that will be helpful to Members who, frankly, are having to decide when to leave their districts and to come a day early just to be here for that 3:30 vote as opposed to a 5:30 vote or 5 o'clock vote that might have allowed them to leave that day.

And with that, does my friend have any response to that?

Mr. HOYER. The good news is I know that I will get great empathy from you and Mr. BOEHNER on this challenge. The second response would be I want you to know, and you know this from our personal relationship, we will work very closely with you and Mr. BOEHNER to try to accommodate our Members. If we are going to be a civil body, if we are going to have civility, that means that we are going to have an understanding of the challenges facing each and every one of our Members irrespective of party and we intend to do that. I personally intend to do that, and we will work towards that. Obviously, there are times when Members are inconvenienced because we have 435, and

it is just tough to accommodate everybody's interests; but to the extent we can do so, it is our absolute intent to do so. And I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for his response. I would say that there clearly will be days in this Congress when we just simply don't agree with the goal that we are trying to achieve on the two sides of the aisle, but I think we can find many more days when we do agree. We are optimistic about the concept of partnership as opposed to partisanship and look forward to having the bills today for next week and an extended debate in the future beyond the debate that we feel we will be allowed to have next week.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JANUARY 8, 2007

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, January 8, 2007.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

STAFF SERGEANT EDWARD C. REYNOLDS, JR.

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, ''To be born free is an accident, to live free is a privilege, and to die free is a responsibility.'' Powerful words spoken by Brigadier General James Sehorn that are embedded into the minds of our valiant soldiers protecting nations from a cowardly enemy that burrows beneath the Iraqi desert sands, those individuals that seek to annihilate our freedoms that all people should have.

The American soldier believes in freedom more than any other individual on Earth because they witness the inhumanity of tyranny. They see it in the fierce trenches of battle. Our soldiers secure life and liberty, and they give it to those folks in Afghanistan and Iraq.

U.S. Army Staff Sergeant Edward Charles Reynolds, Jr. was one of these soldiers. He was an 8-year Army veteran. Staff Sergeant Reynolds had been stationed among the terrorist Iraqi insurgents, fighting against them to ensure a free nation of Iraq.

He is a native of Port Arthur, Texas, and he was a 1997 graduate of Thomas Jefferson High School, where he was a star tight-end and middle linebacker on the football team. As a Texan, Staff Sergeant Reynolds spent fall football seasons cheering for one of the greatest teams in college football, the University of Texas Longhorns. Those who knew him knew a man who took care of others, whether it be his family, his friends, or his country. Staff Sergeant Reynolds was their protector.

Family was the most important thing to Staff Sergeant Reynolds. He was a devoted father to his children, two daughters and a son. He was dedicated to his fiancee. He was the guardian of his older sister. Friends knew him as the man that kept them out of trouble, pushing them to succeed in life. And his country knew him as a defender of our freedoms.

In December 2005, Staff Sergeant Reynolds was deployed to Iraq, worlds away, but he remained a constant presence in the life of his family and all of his friends. He sent out cards and letters, constantly reminding his fiancee of their New Year's Eve wedding date. During the next 10 months, assigned to the U.S. Army 1st Battalion, 67th Armor Regiment, 2nd Brigade, 4th Infantry Division, Staff Sergeant Reynolds dodged bullets, IEDs, and Iraqi outlaws throughout the Baghdad desert.

But on September 26, less than 2 months from coming home to Texas, Staff Sergeant Reynolds and a fellow soldier were crossing a Baghdad bridge in a military convoy when that bridge collapsed, plunging their vehicle underwater, trapping both soldiers inside. 27-year-old Staff Sergeant Reynolds and his colleague were killed in action, becoming victims in the struggle for Iraqi freedom.

A decorated soldier, Staff Sergeant Reynolds was the recipient of the Combat Infantry Badge, the Kosovo Campaign Medal. He was also awarded the Iraqi Combat Campaign Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, and the Bronze Star. He was a lifelong member of the Borden Chapel Missionary Baptist Church. And like his mother and father, Staff Sergeant Reynolds had a devout faith in his Almighty God, believing that everything he was given was a gift by Him.

On October 7, the Borden Chapel Missionary Baptist Church in Beaumont, Texas, and the Reverend Airon Reynolds, Jr., gave this brave soldier a hero's memorial and homecoming. Family and friends were not the only ones who memorialized and honored Staff Sergeant Reynolds. The Patriot Guard Riders and the Southeast Texas Veterans Service thanked him for his valor. More than 200 Patriot Guard Riders, with flags of tribute raised, stood in honor of Staff Sergeant Reynolds, the son of Texas, an American soldier, as he reached his eternal resting place.

Mr. Speaker, I have a photograph of Sergeant Reynolds, the way that he was when he was protecting freedom across the desert sands of Iraq. American citizens are born into the privilege of freedom, and we must remember that the sacrifice given by Staff Sergeant Reynolds and all American warriors is responsible for the continuation of this great Nation.

Staff Sergeant Reynolds chose to protect the freedom that he was born into from the violent militants robbing nations of life and liberty. So God bless Staff Sergeant Reynolds and his family.

In the words of George Orwell: ''We sleep safely in our beds because rough men stand ready in the night to visit violence on those who would do us harm.''

And that's just the way it is.

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.)

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE RUTGERS SCARLET KNIGHTS FOOTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to say that my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS, is the Speaker this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this afternoon to congratulate the Rutgers Scarlet Knights on their recent victory over Kansas State in the Texas Bowl. Last Thursday the Scarlet Knights cruised to a 37–10 victory over the Kansas State Wildcats, capping their memorable season with the first bowl win in school history.

Running back Ray Rice led the winning effort with 170 yards rushing and a touchdown. Wide receiver Tim Brown scored two touchdowns, which, combined with Rutgers' stifling defense, was more than enough to put away Kansas State. The defense held Kansas State under 200 total yards and did not allow an offensive touchdown.

Coach Greg Schiano led his team to an 11-win season this year for only the second time in Rutgers' history. In his five short years since becoming head coach at Rutgers, Coach Schiano has turned the program around from a 2–9

record in the basement of the Big East to an elite football program near the top of the BCS standings. And Coach Schiano has received national recognition as the coach of the year, as well as Big East honors as coach of the year.

Mr. Speaker, also deserving of recognition are university president Richard McCormick and Rutgers athletic director Bob Mulcahy. During their tenure, Rutgers athletics, particularly the football program, has reached a high standard athletically and academically. The American Football Coaches Association has recognized Rutgers football for a high level of academic achievement among student athletes. Additionally, Rutgers student athletes have played a large role in the community by becoming involved with toy drives, hospital visits, and blood drives.

Mr. Speaker, the hard work, dedication, and teamwork exhibited by the Rutgers football program embodies the highest traditions of scholar athletes and serves as an inspiration to all New Jerseyans.

And once again I would like to congratulate the entire Rutgers athletic program and the university as a whole for this remarkable achievement. I look forward to cheering them to even greater success in the future ''in that noisy college town on the banks of the old Raritan.''

THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein is dead. So are 3,000 Americans. The regime in Iraq has been changed; yet victory will not be declared. Not only does the war go on; it is about to escalate. Obviously, the turmoil in Iraq is worse than ever and most Americans no longer are willing to tolerate the costs, both human and economic, associated with this war.

We have been in Iraq for 45 months. Many more Americans have been killed in Iraq than were killed in the first 45 months in Vietnam. I was in the U.S. Air Force in 1965, and I remember well when President Johnson announced a troop surge in Vietnam to hasten victory. That war went on for another decade. And by the time we finally finished that war and got out, 60,000 Americans had died. We obviously should have gotten out 10 years sooner. Troop surge then meant serious escalation.

The election is over and Americans have spoken: enough is enough. They want the war ended and our troops brought home. But the opposite is likely to occur. With bipartisan support, up to 50,000 troops may well be sent. The goal no longer is to win. Now it is simply to secure Baghdad. So much has been spent with so little to show for it.

Who possibly benefits from escalating chaos in Iraq? Neoconservatives unabashedly have written about how chaos presents opportunities for promoting their goals. Certainly Osama bin Laden has benefited from the turmoil in Iraq, as have Iranian Shiites who are now in a better position to take control of southern Iraq.

Yes, Saddam Hussein is dead, and only Sunnis mourn. The Shiites and Kurds celebrate his death, as do the Iranians and especially bin Laden, all enemies of Saddam Hussein. We have performed a tremendous service for both bin Laden and Ahmadinejad, and it will cost us plenty. The violent reaction to our complicity in the execution of Saddam Hussein is yet to come.

Three thousand American military personnel are dead. More than 22,000 are wounded, and tens of thousands will be psychologically traumatized by their tours of duty in Iraq. Little concern is given to the hundreds of thousands of Iraqi civilians killed in this war. We have spent $400 billion so far with no end in sight. This money we do not have. It is all borrowed from countries like China that increasingly succeed in the global economy while we drain wealth from our citizens through heavy taxation and insidious inflation. Our manufacturing base is now nearly extinct. Where the additional U.S. troops in Iraq will come from is anybody's guess, but surely they won't be redeployed from Japan, Korea, or Europe.

We at least must pretend that our bankrupt empire is intact, but then again, the Soviet empire appeared intact in 1988. Some Members of Congress intent on equitably distributing the suffering among all Americans want to bring back the draft. Administration officials vehemently deny making any concrete plans for a draft.

But why should we believe this? Look what happened when so many believed the reasons given for our preemptive invasion of Iraq. Selective Service officials admit running a check of their list of available young men. If the draft is reinstated, we probably will include young women as well to serve the God of equality. Conscription is slavery, plain and simple, and it was made illegal under the 13th amendment, which prohibits involuntary servitude. One may well be killed as a military draftee, which makes conscription a very dangerous kind of enslavement.

Instead of testing the efficacy of the Selective Service System and sending more troops off to a war that we are losing, we ought to revive our love of liberty. We should repeal the Selective Service Act. A free society should never depend on compulsory conscription to defend itself.

We get into trouble by not following the precepts of liberty or obeying the rule of law. Preemptive, undeclared wars fought under false pretenses are a road to disaster. If a full declaration of war by Congress had been demanded as the Constitution requires, this war never would have been fought.

If we did not create credit out of thin air, as the Constitution prohibits, we never would have convinced taxpayers to support this war directly by increased taxation. How long this financial charade can go on is difficult to judge, but when the end comes, it will not go unnoticed by any American.

□ 1400

THE MANDATE TO BRING THE TROOPS HOME

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday all of my colleagues and I took the oath of office as a Member of this great House of Representatives, swearing to support and to defend the Constitution of the United States of America. I take this responsibility very seriously.

I take my responsibility to my constituents very seriously, and sometimes that means standing up to the executive branch when I believe it is in error, when it has gone too far or is openly ignoring the wishes of the people of America. This is what our founding fathers expected of the Congress, and, quite frankly, this is what the American people expect from the Congress.

Today I stand here and give my 174th 5-minute special order speech calling for an end to this misguided occupation in Iraq and calling on the President and all of my colleagues to support our troops by bringing them home. Already, over 3,000 American troops have been killed in Iraq, at least 44,000 have been wounded. Reports indicate that anywhere from 40,000 to 100,000 Iraqis, it is probably more, have lost their lives.

How many more families must grieve? How many more children must be orphaned? How many?

The voters sent a clear message on November 7 that Congress must stand up and say no more. The Iraq Study Group also sent a message. I was clear that the situation in Iraq is grave and deteriorating. Even President Bush finally admitted last month that we are, and he said, we are not winning in Iraq, although he also said we are not losing.

Enough Washington double-speak. It is time for action. How about a plan for the future of Iraq from President Bush? We have already spent nearly $400 billion on this occupation, and yet he is asking for $127 billion more. We already have 130,000 troops on the ground, and now we hear that he wants to send even more. He is calling it a surge. Let us be honest here, sending in more troops to clean up the mess the President has already made is an escalation. Enough is enough. No more fuzzy math, no more sloganeering, no more troops dying, no more.

Soon I will introduce a comprehensive package to bring our troops home while supporting Iraqi sovereignty. I urge my colleagues, please work with

me to bring this real and workable bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the voters have demanded an end to President Bush's occupation of Iraq. They don't want more talk, they want a real plan. They want a plan that will bring our troops home. This is our mandate, and this is the oath we swore to yesterday.

HONORING ANATOLE MILUNAS

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, it is great to be back in session and back in Washington. I look forward to a very interesting new Congress.

One of the great benefits of being a Member is the opportunity to talk about our national treasure, which is our citizens. We just lost one who became a good friend of mine, doesn't live in my Congressional district, is from the state of Illinois, name of Tony Milunas.

Now, Tony, is the story of a lot of post World War II era emigres who came from the former captive nations, the former Eastern Bloc countries that immigrated here, became active citizens, not only supported this great country, served in the military, but also was very involved in the 50 years of totalitarian ruling of the Eastern Bloc countries and helped bring freedom to those countries. With that I am going to give a little background on Tony and mention how he was very important in my life.

Anatole Milunas, ''Tony,'' as we knew him, was born August 3, 1936 in the City of Sauliai, Lithuania. During World War II, he left Lithuania to escape the second Soviet occupation and the subsequent 50 years of terror. While in exile in 1946, he finished high school and began studying for a degree in technology in Darmstadt, Germany.

After he immigrated to the United States, he continued his schooling and graduated with a bachelor's degree from the University of Illinois. During the Korean War, he served in the United States Army, stationed in Germany as a translator and adviser to a staff officer.

He actively participated in the presidential election of President Ronald Reagan and President George Herbert Walker Bush, and has been a strong supporter of the Illinois Republican Party. From 1979 to 1985, he was a chairman of the Lithuanian American Republican National Federation, and from 1994 to 2006, Mr. Milunas was the chairman of the Lithuanian American Republican League in Illinois.

He died December 23, 2006. He left a widow, Dana, and two sons, Vytenis and Rimas, two good Lithuanian names, their families and many relatives here in Lithuania as well as friends and so many associates. He leaves behind a lasting legacy.

Now, I met Tony way back in 1992 when he looked at the family name of politicians running for office, and my colleagues here, who I have served with for many years, know that I have focused some of my extra time on Baltic issues, which is Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Not because I have a strong Baltic number of citizens in my district, and, in fact, it is very little, but Shimkus is ethnically Lithuanian.

Tony, seeing that name said, and being Republican, says, oh, I found a guy who will help me remember the persecution of the Baltic countries and help bring freedom, NATO enlargement, EU ascension to the Baltic countries.

He adopted me, in essence, and he encouraged me to not only be involved here on the floor, but really be involved in what for me is four generations removed. He is one generation, I am four generations.

Tony gave me this photo back on October 18, 2002, to the Honorable John Shimkus, we are proud to have you as an honorary member while we continue the Reagan legacy, Lithuanian Republican League of Illinois, Anatole Milunas. This is a photo of President Reagan when he is campaigning in Chicago. Now I am a down-stater, I am more by St. Louis and what we call southern Illinois. This was a picture Tony was very, very proud of. This was at an ethnic festival, then candidate Reagan was there. Tony handed him this bumper sticker that said, ''I love Lithuanians,'' and here is President Reagan holding this up.

As we know, it was President Reagan that was in Berlin and said, Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall, which is all part of the fall of the Soviet empire and the freeing of millions of people in what we call the captive nations.

I was glad to play a small part in the movement to enlarge NATO and bring in the former captive nations that love democracy and freedom, willing to take and pay the sacrifice, transform their militaries and be true allies.

One of the reasons why I was able to do that is because of the mentorship, the friendship, the love, the compassion of this U.S. citizen who was born in Sauliai, Lithuania, who came to this country with nothing, lived the American dream, was a great citizen, but had an appreciation for his homeland.

GAS PRICES

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the new Democratic leadership that will finally allow the U.S. House of Representatives to address high energy prices. Under prior Republican leadership in the House, the oil industry enjoyed years of record profits, record high gas prices and minimal oversight and price manipulation.

Curiously, in September and October of 2006, just before the November elections, gas prices dropped an average of $.60 per gallon compared to the record high prices of last summer. This $.60 drop in gas prices occurred despite the fact that there were pipeline disruptions in Alaska and indications that OPEC would cut oil production. Department of Energy's statistics show us that while gas prices dropped an average of $.60 a gallon in September and October, the crude oil price only dropped 10 cents a gallon.

If you listened to National Public Radio this week, you would have heard that there is evidence that the oil companies intentionally influence gas price fluctuations, and a $.60 drop was done just before the election to influence the November elections.

For years, the American Petroleum Institute, the oil companies' main lobbying group, has spent millions of dollars on public relations campaigns to convince the American people that gas prices are a direct result of crude oil prices, not oil company practices. But yet we have a 60 percent drop in gas prices, but only a 10 percent drop in the price of crude.

Ignoring their own PR, oil companies were able to significantly reduce the gas prices in September and October without a corresponding decrease in their crude oil price. Some consumer advocates, such as the Foundation for Taxpayer and Consumer Rights, have accused oil companies of purposefully reducing gas prices in the months before the election to help Republican candidates.

Since November, gas prices have already increased an average of 15 cents a gallon. This is not the first time the oil companies have been accused of attempting to manipulate markets for their benefit.

Internal memos from several oil companies written in the 1990s have revealed that the big oil companies have worked to limit refinery capacity here in the United States, allowing these companies to control the supply and cost of gasoline.

In May of 2006, the Federal Trade Commission released its report titled Investigation of Gasoline Price Manipulation and Post-Katrina Gasoline Price Increases. In this report, the Federal Trade Commission found that after Hurricane Katrina refiners, wholesalers and retailers charged significantly higher prices that did not result from either increased costs or market friends.

FTC Commissioner John Liebowitz, in a statement on the report, acknowledged that, and I quote, ''that the behavior of many market participants, on balance, leaves much to be desired.''

□ 1415

Democrats have repeatedly urged the House Republican leadership to protect America's pocketbooks and not that of Big Oil. Nonetheless, the Republican leadership refused to take action last fall on high gas prices. The American people have now chosen a new direction with Democrats in charge.

During the first 100 legislative hours of this, the 110th Congress, the House of Representatives will consider legislation to end the tax breaks and special subsidies for oil companies. For too long, oil companies have benefited from weak royalty laws, tax breaks and subsidies, at the same time making record profits at the expense of the American people.

Rather than helping oil companies' bottom lines, these funds that we will recapture will instead be used to promote alternative energy sources to end our Nation's addiction to oil.

Later this year I look forward to having an open and honest debate on my legislation, which I plan to reintroduce soon, to end gas price gouging.

Last year over 120 Members cosponsored my legislation to create a Federal law against price gouging for gasoline, natural gas, and other fuel.

I look forward to continuing to work towards greater oversight of the oil and gas trading, especially off-market trades known as ''over the counter'' trades.

I will be re-introducing my legislation, the Prevent Unfair Manipulation of Prices Act, to improve oversight of these trades and strengthen the penalties for traders who attempt to illegally manipulate markets.

The Federal Government has a responsibility to protect consumers from high gas prices. I look forward to being able to address high energy prices, to provide our constituents with the protection they need and so desperately deserve.

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to enter into the RECORD a one-page article from National Public Radio about how ''in other words, in the run-up to the election, oil companies cut gasoline prices 500 percent more than their raw material costs fell. And it wasn't because refining and distribution costs rose. They were relatively stable. Oil companies simply took less profit from their refineries for a short period of time.''

GAS-PRICE CONSPIRACY? YOU BET!

Commentator and consumer advocate Jamie Court says there IS evidence that oil companies intentionally influence gas-price fluctuations.

TEXT OF COMMENTARY

KAI RYSSDAL: The 110th Congress will be sworn in on Thursday. Speaker-to-be Nancy Pelosi has promised a whirlwind first 100 hours of the session. On the Democrats' list of things to do is cut subsidies to the oil industry. Perhaps as a result, the American Petroleum Institute—that's big oil's main lobbying group—is launching a public relations offensive. Complete with Congressional oil patch tours, and contributions to friendly think tanks. It's trying to convince people rising energy prices are simply the result of higher demand and shrinking supply.

Commentator and consumer advocate Jamie Court says that campaign is too slick by half.

JAMIE COURT: Say you're an oil executive and you want to keep the Republicans in control of Congress. What can you do prior to an election? Well, you can keep your refineries running at full speed, flood the market with extra fuel, and take less per gallon in profit than usual. And guess what: Department of Energy data suggest that's exactly what the oil companies did this fall. By the second week in October, gasoline prices fell 70 cents from summer's record highs. Refineries were running full throttle and America's gasoline inventories were up nearly 7 percent from the three previous Octobers. The rise in supply came despite BP's major pipeline disruption in Alaska. Ordinarily, that's an industry excuse to shrink supplies and raise prices. Now, the oil industry claimed pump prices fell because crude oil prices dropped. But gas prices dropped far more steeply than crude oil. Crude oil comes in barrels. There are 42 gallons in a barrel and the price of each gallon was down 10 cents this October over last. But gas prices fell 61 cents a gallon over the same time last year.

In other words, in the run-up to the election, oil companies cut gasoline prices 500 percent more than their raw material cost fell. And it wasn't because refining and distribution costs rose. They're relatively stable. Oil companies simply took less profit from their refineries for a short period of time. Could it have been to influence a political outcome? Well, right after election day, the price of gas suddenly rose after two months of sharp decline. Post-election, refineries have slowed down, inventories are shrinking, and gas prices are climbing. It's back to business as usual, unless the new Congress starts to do business differently.

RECOGNIZING APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY MOUNTAINEERS AND WAKE FOREST DEMON DEACONS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary efforts of the Appalachian State Mountaineers football team, who recently defeated the Massachusetts Minutemen in a 28–17 victory. What makes this a magnificent triumph is that this is the second straight year the Mountaineers have brought home the NCAA Division 1 football championship subdivision, formerly recognized as Division 1–AA. The Mountaineers finished their season with a 14–1 record, losing only their first game of the season and going undefeated all the way through to the championship game after that.

I am honored to represent Appalachian State University, as they have not only a stellar academic program but also have succeeded in athletics as well. This shows the diversity and accomplishments of Appalachian State as they exemplify a true student body where life lessons are learned through extracurricular activities as well as rigorous academic study.

I am pleased to recognize the momentous accomplishments of junior Kevin Richardson who scored all four touchdowns and had 179 rushing yards that led the Mountaineers to victory in the championship game. Although Massachusetts had started the game with an early lead, the Mountaineers persevered, worked as a team, and never gave up.

The Mountaineers had tremendous support from their fellow classmates, alumni and residents of Boone, North Carolina. Not only have they received this support on their home field, Kidd Brewer Stadium, the gridiron, but also when the Mountaineers traveled for their games. At the playoff game, an enormous crowd of 22,808 included over 15,000 Appalachian State Black and Gold dressed fans at Finley Stadium in Chattanooga, Tennessee. With great anticipation of another Mountaineer victory, the attendance set a record for Finley Stadium at the University of Tennessee where the game was played. While the game was played and won by the Appalachian State football team, the tremendous support of friends, family, alumni and North Carolina residents set an exciting tone and surely assisted the team by showing their dedicated support. Also notable was that this was the 12th time in the 15 games this season that the Mountaineers played before a sold out crowd.

I extend my deepest congratulations to all the Mountaineers who played with dedication, perseverance and, most of all, heart. I also applaud the tremendous coaching staff, including head coach Jerry Moore, who has been with Appalachian State University for 18 years, serving the athletic program with enthusiasm and steadfast commitment. His service, along with the entire coaching staff, has been invaluable in guiding the team to their great successes.

Congratulations, again, Appalachian State Mountaineers for your tremendous success in back to back NCAA titles. You are definitely a source of pride for western North Carolina.

It is also my pleasure to commend the Wake Forest Demon Deacon football team on an outstanding season. Prior to the start of the season, the Deacons were predicted to finish last in their division of the Atlantic Coast Conference. However, they were not discouraged by these predictions and actually seemed to revel in the role of the underdog. Ultimately, Wake Forest shocked the Nation by finishing the regular season 11–2, which placed them at the top of the Atlantic Division in the ACC. They then defeated the Georgia Tech Yellow Jackets in the Atlantic Coast Conference Champion game, making Wake Forest ACC champions for the first time since 1970.

Much of the team's success this year is due to its resilience, tenacity, and impeccable coaching. Wake Forest coach Jim Grobe was unanimously named ACC Coach of the Year and beat out a strong group of national contenders to be named the 2006 NCAA National Coach of the Year. Coach Grobe and the Deacons battled injuries to several key players, including their starting quarterback and starting tailback, but bounced back in the face of adversity to set a school record for victories.

After such an unbelievable season, no one was surprised when the Deacons

were chosen to play the 2007 Orange Bowl. The reigning ACC champs traveled down to Miami, with their fans in tow, to face the champions of the Big East Conference, the Louisville Cardinals. Wake Forest came into the game well prepared and played like the champions they are. While Louisville emerged victorious, Wake fans and players alike left Miami with their heads held high, proud of a season full of accomplishments.

The Orange Bowl culminated a magical season for the Demon Deacons, one that Wake fans will never forget. Finishing the regular season 11–2, serving Florida State its first-ever shutout at home under the leadership of Coach Bobby Bowden, winning the ACC championship and appearing in the Orange Bowl can be considered highlights. But by no means could these achievements capture the spirit and the emotion of this phenomenal season for the Wake Forest Demon Deacons. The sentiments of this season can best be summed up in the 10 minutes following the Orange Bowl on January 2. Even though the Deacons lost, Wake fans remained in the stands after the game, standing and cheering in support of the team that brought them so much joy this season as Wake players walked to their side of the stadium to thank the fans for their steadfast support.

This relationship underlines what it means to be a Deacon fan. Wins and losses ultimately aren't all that matter, but rather the sense of pride and family that comes along with being a Deacon is what makes the Wake Forest team and the fans such a special group.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, Go Deacs.

There may have been a few tears shed in Dolphins Stadium following this year's Orange Bowl, but they were not tears of sadness. They were tears of pride and accomplishment, and they were very hard earned.

Congratulations to Wake Forest, and best of luck next season. We know it will be every bit as exciting as this one. Go Deacs!

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

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

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2007 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2007 THROUGH FY 2011

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2007 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and sections 401 and 501 of H. Con. Res. 376, which is currently in effect as a concurrent resolution on the budget in the House under H. Res. 6. This status report is current through January 1, 2007. An additional report will be filed to reflect any changes in committee jurisdictions.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set by H. Con. Res. 376. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2007 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action by each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H. Con. Res. 376 for fiscal year 2007 and fiscal years 2007 through 2011. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2007 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for 2008 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 401 of H. Con. Res. 376. This list is needed to enforce section 401 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

The fifth table provides the current level of the nondefense reserve fund for emergencies established by section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376. The table is required by section 505 of the budget resolution, and is needed to determine whether an increase in the reserve fund, allocations and aggregates will be necessary for any pending legislation that contains emergency-designated discretionary budget authority.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2007 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 376

Reflecting action completed as of January 1, 2007—[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2007	Fiscal years 2007–2011
Appropriate Level:		
Budget authority	2,283,029	[1]
Outlays	2,325,998	[1]
Revenues	1,780,666	10,039,909
Current Level:		
Budget authority	2,266,002	[1]
Outlays	2,273,560	[1]
Revenues	1,771,853	10,146,069
Current Level over (+) / under (−) Appropriate Level:		
Budget authority	−17,027	[1]
Outlays	−52,438	[1]
Revenues	−8,813	106,160

[1] Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2008 through 2011 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2007 in excess of $17,027,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2007 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 376.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2007 in excess of $52,438,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2007 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 376.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would reduce revenue for FY 2007 (if not already included in the current estimate) would cause revenues to fall further below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 376.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011 in excess of $106,160,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 376.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JANUARY 1, 2007

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

	2007		2007–2011 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
House Committee				
Agriculture:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Armed Services:				
Allocation	45	45	45	45

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JANUARY 1, 2007—Continued

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

	2007		2007–2011 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Current level	−35	150	34	213
Difference	−80	105	−11	168
Education and Labor:				
Allocation	0	1	0	30
Current level	16	119	178	−1,733
Difference	16	118	178	−1,763
Energy and Commerce:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current level	−63	72	39	49
Difference	−63	72	39	49
Financial Services:				
Allocation	0	0	2	2
Current level	0	0	−5	−5
Difference	0	0	−7	−7
Foreign Affairs:				
Allocation	1	1	5	5
Current level	0	−5	0	−12
Difference	−1	−6	−5	−17
Homeland Security:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current level	106	7	0	0
Difference	106	7	0	0
House Administration:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Judiciary				
Allocation	19	16	116	113
Current level	0	0	0	0
Difference	−19	−16	−116	−113
Natural Resources:				
Allocation	0	0	6	6
Current level	26	26	133	133
Difference	26	26	127	127
Oversight and Government Reform				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current level	−6,384	−6,384	−21,500	−21,500
Difference	−6,384	−6,384	−21,500	−21,500
Science and Technology				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Small Business:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure:				
Allocation	13	13	22	22
Current level	0	−3	−4	−19
Difference	−13	−16	−26	−41
Veterans' Affairs				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current level	−2	−2	1	1
Difference	−2	−2	1	1
Ways and Means				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current level	4,622	4,538	6,338	6,282
Difference	4,622	4,538	6,338	6,282

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations Subcommittee	302(b) Suballocations as of June 6, 2006 (H. Rpt. 109–488)		Current Level Reflecting Action Completed as of January 1, 2007		Current Level minus Suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	17,812	19,497	17,803	19,402	−9	−95
Defense	377,357	393,165	377,357	394,244	0	1,079
Energy & Water Development	30,017	31,411	28,926	30,751	−1,091	−660
Foreign Operations	21,300	23,441	19,609	23,144	−1,691	−297
Homeland Security	32,080	38,711	31,905	38,714	−175	3
Interior-Environment	25,889	26,902	25,471	26,566	−418	−336
Labor, HHS & Education	141,930	145,631	150,573	147,619	8,643	1,988
Legislative Branch	4,030	4,013	3,756	3,797	−274	−216
Military Quality of Life-Veterans Affairs	94,705	88,728	86,260	84,457	−8,445	−4,271
Science-State-Justice-Commerce	59,839	62,143	7,709	60,479	−2,130	−1,664
Transportation-Treasury-HUD-Judiciary-DC	67,819	130,069	67,124	128,714	−695	−1,355
Unassigned	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total (Section 302(a) Allocation)	872,778	963,711	866,493	957,887	−6,285	−5,824

Statement of FY2008 advance appropriations under section 401 of H. Con. Res. 376, reflecting action completed as of January 1, 2007

[Budget Authority in Millions of Dollars]

	Budget authority
Appropriate Level	23,565
Current Level	0
Elk Hills	0
Corporation for Public Broadcasting	0
Employment and Training Administration	0
Education for the Disadvantaged	0
School Improvement	0
Children and Family Services (Head Start)	0
Special Education	0
Vocational and Adult Education	
Transportation (highways, transit, Farley Building)	0
Payment to Postal Service	0
Section 8 Renewals	0
Total	0
Current Level over (+)/under (−) Appropriate Level	−23,565

Statement of nondefense reserve fund for emergencies under section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376, discretionary budget authority for FY 2007, reflecting action completed as of January 1, 2007

[Budget Authority in Millions of Dollars]

	Budget authority
Appropriate Level	6,450

	Budget authority
Current Level	0
Current Level over (+)/under (−)	−6,450
Appropriate Level	

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, January 4, 2007.

Hon. JOHN M. SPRATT, Jr.,
Chairman-Designate, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2007 budget and is current through January 1, 2007. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 376, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2007, as approved by the House of Representatives. Although the House and the Senate have not reached agreement on a concurrent budget resolution for 2007, pursuant to House Resolution 818, H. Con. Res. 376 has the force and effect in the House for all purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as though adopted by the Congress.

Pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, and section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2007, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the enclosed current level report excludes certain amounts that affect 2007 spending (see footnote 2 of the report).

Since my last letter, dated November 15, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues for fiscal year 2007:

an act making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007 (Public Law 109–383);

an act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to revise certain repayment contracts (Public Law 109–386);

the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–432);

the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act (Public Law 109–435);

the Blunt Reservoir and Pierre Canal Land Conveyance Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–458);

the Veterans Benefits, Health Care, and Information Technology Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–461); and

the Social Security Trust Funds Restoration Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–465).

In addition, the Congress has cleared for the President's signature the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006 (H.R. 5946) and the National Institutes of Health Reform Act of 2006 (H.R. 6164).

Sincerely,

DONALD B. MARRON,
Acting Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2007 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF JANUARY 1, 2007

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions: [1]			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	1,819,599
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,400,673	1,333,068	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	409,185	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	−549,710	−549,710	n.a.
Total, enacted in previous sessions:	850,963	1,192,543	1,819,599
Enacted this session:			
Authorizing Legislation:.			
An act to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006 (P.L. 109–204)	−1,000	−520	0
Native American Technical Corrections Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–221)	11	11	11
Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–222)	0	0	−32,674
Heroes Earned Retirement Opportunities Act (P.L. 109–227)	0	0	−4
Veterans' Housing Opportunity and Benefits Improvement Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–233)	−3	−3	0
Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–235)	0	0	1
Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–236)	1	0	5
Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–241)	0	−3	0
Returned Americans Protection Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–250)	0	1	0
An act approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom Democracy Act of 2003 (P.L. 109–251)	0	0	−1
An act to provide funding authority to facilitate the evacuation of persons from Lebonon (P.L. 109–268)	0	−5	0
Pension Protection Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–280)	15	119	363
United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (P.L. 109–283)	1	1	−15
Pueblo de San Ildefonso Claims Settlement Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–286)	7	7	0
Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–288)	0	−10	0
National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Maintenance Fund Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–314)	1	1	0
National Heritage Areas Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–338)	3	3	0
Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–347)	106	7	0
John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (P.L. 109–364)	−35	150	0
Fort McDowell Indian Community Water Rights Settlement Revision Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–373)	4	4	0
An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to revise certain repayment contracts (P.L. 109–386)	1	1	0
Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–432)	3,323	3,248	−15,600
Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act (P.L. 109–435)	−6,384	−6,384	0
Blunt Reservoir and Pierre Canal Land Conveyance Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–458)	−1	−1	0
Veterans Benefits, Health Care, and Information Technology Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–461)	1	1	0
Social Security Trust Funds Restoration Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–465)	1,298	1,298	0
Appropriations Acts:.			
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (P.L. 109–234) [2]	0	−14	168
Defense Appropriations Act, 2007 (P.L. 109–289) [2]	377,571	252,047	0
Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 (P.L. 109–295) [2]	32,968	20,406	0
Total, enacted this session:	407,888	270,365	−47,746
Passed, pending signature:.			
Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006 (H.R. 5946)	2	2	0
National Institutes of Health Reform Act of 2006 (H.R. 6164)	−65	70	0
Total, passed, pending signature:	−63	72	0
Continuing Resolution Authority:.			
Continuing Resolution, 2007 (P.L. 109–383)	436,112	262,309	0
Entitlements and mandatories:.			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	571,102	548,271	n.a.
Total Current Level 2,[3]	2,266,002	2,273,560	1,771,853
Total Budget Resolution	2,283,029	2,325,998	1,780,666
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	17,027	52,438	8,813
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2007–2011:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	10,146,069
House Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	10,039,909
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	106,160
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Notes.—n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

[1] The effects of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–171) and the Federal Deposit Insurance Reform Conforming Amendments Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–173) are included in this section of the table, consistent with the budget resolution assumptions. In addition, the scoring for the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 includes savings from corrections to two provisions (in sections 8006 and 10002) not yet enacted, consistent with the budget resolution assumptions.

[2] Pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95, thee Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, and section 402 of H. Con. Res. 376, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2007, as approved by the House of Representatives, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. The amounts so designated are as follows:

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Rocovery, 2006 (P.L. 109–234)	48	39,863	0
Defense Appropriations Act, 2007 (P.L. 109–289)	70,000	40,473	0
Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 (P.L. 109–295)	1,829	943	0
Total, enacted emergency requirements:	71,877	81,279	0

These amounts are generally excluded from the curent level. However, section 402 of the 2007 budget resolution specifies that upon enactment of funding for the global war on terrorism, amounts included in the budget resolution for such purpose shall be considered current law when preparing the current level. Therefore, the current level includes $50,000 million in budget authority and $33,500 million in outlays assumed in the budget resolution.

[3] Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

OUR MISSION IN IRAQ

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor to talk a little bit about national security and where the Nation's defense apparatus stands as of now. But I thought I also might comment on the comments that were made by two of my wonderful colleagues, Ms. WOOLSEY of California and Mr. PAUL of Texas, who preceded me and commented about their position to the effect that we should bring our troops home immediately from Iraq. And implicit in their comments was the message that somehow Saddam Hussein's continued rule of Iraq would have been preferable to the American intervention.

I disagree with that theme, and let me tell you why. In listening to Ms. WOOLSEY talk about the wounded, the KIA, the suffering in that part of the world, and the burden that has been borne by American soldiers, I think it is also important to remember the Iraq that was represented by Saddam Hussein.

And while she has, obviously, the images that have compelled her to take her philosophical position, the image that I have, and I keep in my desk drawer, is the photograph of the hundreds of mothers whose bodies are strewn across the hillside in northern Iraq, holding their children, some of them newborn babies, some of them four, five, 6 years old, dead in midstride where they were hit by poison chemical, poison chemical that was delivered into those villages at the order of Saddam Hussein.

And I have taken, as a guy who sometimes watches the History Channel, to tuning in when I see the History Channel reviewing the exhuming of bodies in these mass graves and putting together this story, this mosaic of Iraq history under Saddam Hussein and the story of how hundreds of people, men, women and children, would be herded across fields and they would be executed and their bodies would be pushed into mass graves. And now we are uncovering those mass graves.

And just like the mass graves that we found in Europe, especially those that were filled by bodies that had been people who had been executed by the Nazis, there are more people now in those mass graves, we find, than what we had projected.

And as I watched the exhuming of some of those bodies on the History Channel, I noticed that the anthropologist who was doing the particular work noted that the mother, in some cases, who was executed would often have a .45 bullet hole in the back of her head, and her small baby that she was holding would also have a bullet hole in the back of his or her head. So the monstrosity that was Saddam Hussein, the mass execution, the killing of people with chemical weapons, is what the American troops displaced when we moved into Iraq.

Now, it is tough to stand up a free nation and stand up a military that is able to protect it, but that is the challenge that we are meeting right now. And we are following the same basic pattern that we have followed for 60 years. Whether you are talking about Japan or the Philippines or El Salvador in our own hemisphere, first you stand up a free government. Secondly, you stand up a military that is capable of protecting that free government, and third, the Americans, not coveting anything that that country has, the Americans leave.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I thought I also might speak just a little bit, as we turn over the control of Congress to the Democrat leadership, not only in the full House, but also the committee chairmanships, and my own committee chairmanship now has been relinquished to the gentleman from Missouri, IKE SKELTON, my good friend and a wonderful person and a person with a real heart for the troops. I thought that I might just comment about where we stand right now. I think it is important for the American people to know where we stand and what this Congress that is going out has accomplished for national security.

First, what have we done for the troops? Well, over the last 8 years we have increased the pay for the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marines, and the National Guard by right at 40 percent, a 40 percent pay increase. We have increased family separation pay, the amount of money that we deliver to our military families when they are separated when people are deployed overseas. We have increased that from $100 a month to about $250 a month. We have increased our combat pay.

Mr. Speaker, I know I have only got 5 minutes, so I will elaborate on some of the accomplishments that occurred during this last Congress in the next hour.

DEFINING EARMARKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, again, thank you for the leadership given today and yesterday by Speaker PELOSI and the House leadership for putting us on the right course. And it is interesting to listen to my good friends, and they are good friends, who are on the other side of the aisle and to listen to the conversation on the Nation's headline stations about the commitment Democrats have made to come to work. And we are delighted that in the last couple of votes we saw almost unanimous votes as relates to our open government.

But let me, as a Member who comes from a district that depends a lot on the interests and concern of this Congress about issues of empowerment of nonprofits and charitable organizations who struggle every day to mentor children, to provide economic empowerment. Sometimes they provide assistance where government cannot. And they are the recipients of earmarks. And I think it is important that we define earmarks so that the maligning that has occurred because of some inappropriate use of earmarks really doesn't hide the value of allowing these tax dollars to go back, not through government bureaucracy but right to the people.

□ 1430

An example of that is the Texas Southern University Laboratory School, a school that is placed in a public housing complex that educates the children and other surrounding children in that neighborhood in a progressive and op-educational system, so much so that their test scores have excelled beyond public school. It is, in fact, formerly a school that had been embraced by the public school system, and now has been spun off to Texas Southern University, a teaching college, and the housing authority.

We have an earmark, of which I am very proud to have all of the scrutiny that anyone might want, that would provide dollars to continue this interesting and provocative way of teaching our children so that inner city children, children that would be pegged as not being able to be creative, are actually passing their science tests, their math tests, and they rush to school because they have a lust for learning. That is an earmark.

What I believe in this bill has been passed on reform is transparency. And any day of the week, I would be willing to associate my name to track where these monies go and determine whether there are any special interests that come back to me. You will find a complete slate in this particular earmark. And all other earmarks as this bill will allow, we will be able to say this is what this earmark is for. It is not a special interest, it does not go back to give any individual Member any kind of advantage.

These earmarks are crucial, such as earmarks for the Northeast YMCA, that deals again in the far reaches of the 18th Congressional District but helps youngsters develop leadership skills; or the earmarks that go to public health clinics that will help create a greater opportunity for first-line health care for the elderly and working Americans in the working class.

Again, this should be a Congress not wracked with special interests but a Congress who really believes in the people who went out to vote in this last election. So I am proud to be associated with this lobbying reform that has as one of its key elements the right for the American people to know where their tax dollars are going. And any day that any one of us is fortunate enough to receive an earmark, you should have the ability to be able to review it.

Let me also say as we move forward into the 100 hours of legislation how proud I am to be part of the overall package. And let me say to those of you throughout the community who have had those kinds of questions, like one of the questions that I have been asked, when are we going to raise the minimum wage, let me respond to the small businesses who might say this is going to be an extraordinary burden. I would remind you that when we raised it in 1997, you survived.

It has been 10 years since we raised the minimum wage. Those individuals who receive an increase in the minimum wage are the consumers of America. They will be in your small stores in your neighborhoods. They will be in your small businesses. They will provide the backbone of your increased economic benefit. So we should not look to the increase in the minimum wage as undermining small businesses. It will not. It will create such an infusion of dollars and provide additional dollars of saving, even though it is a measured increase that it increases over a period of time.

What a difference it will make for those individuals supporting families, single parents, double parents, working families still on the minimum wage. What a difference it will make for them to have an opportunity to grab hold or to aspire some day in their life to the American Dream. We cannot continue to be this great country without having this opportunity.

As I close, Mr. Speaker, let me simply say the minimum wage is vital; as are the 9/11 Commission recommendations, finally to be able to secure America; and, lastly, I look forward to bringing to the floor what America has sent us here to do, which is to find a dignified way of bringing our soldiers home with dignity and respect, with a thank you for what they have done on the front lines of Iraq. That is the challenge for America. That is the challenge for those of us who have come in the majority this time.

EARLY ACTIONS OF NEW DEMOCRAT MAJORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, this is a nice occasion at the end of the week to wrap up what we have been doing and talk about how we have been active this week, but before I start, I would like to yield to the distinguished former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, my colleague from California (Mr. HUNTER), to discuss points that he illuminated in his first 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend Mr. MCHENRY, and again, I thought it was important, as we move into this new era and my great friend IKE SKELTON takes over the Armed Services Committee to reflect on where we stand and what we did in the last Congress.

Again, just to reiterate, we culminated a 40 percent pay increase for the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the United States Marine Corps, and the National Guard in this last 8 years. Along with that, we increased family separation pay, which is the pay a family receives when the loved one is separated, maybe is in theatre, or maybe is deployed far around the world in this global war against terror. We increased that from $150 to $250 per month. We increased combat pay. We increased a number of our insurances. And also, Mr. Speaker, we increased TRICARE coverage for National Guard personnel and for their families.

Along with that, we did something that was really the special project of the outgoing readiness chairman, Mr. Hefley of Colorado, which was to bring in to full flower this privatization of housing on military bases across the country so that military wives and family members could move into really great housing.

I have to tell you, in visiting bases across America, it has been heartwarming to see these military families coming into wonderful new housing that often has an entertainment area in maybe a common area with a pool and tennis courts and reading rooms in the center of one of these housing projects where the families can go for entertainment and take their children for good quality time.

So the quality of life for America's military families has been greatly increased over the last 8 years.

Now, what have we done in terms of firepower? Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that beginning with this administration and meetings that we held with the Secretary of Defense and with the President, one concern that I had, and a number of members of our committee had, was the amount of what I would call precision firepower. That is the ability to deliver a smart bomb or a precise system. Instead of, for example, having to drop 100 bombs on a bridge to knock a bridge out, to be able to send a smart bomb in, hit one strut on that bridge, and bring the bridge down.

We all know now that this is the age of precision firepower, and we wanted to greatly expand our precision firepower because that gives the United States the capability to project enormous power around the world when we have to. So, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to report to the people of the House, to our great colleagues and to the American people that we have in the last 8 years more than doubled, more than doubled our precision firepower.

A lot of that is manifested in what we call LGBs, or laser-guided bombs. A lot is manifested in what we call JDAMs, or joint direct attack munitions. But for our adversaries, that means that America has the power now to send in more than twice the firepower in precise places, at precise targets with enormous effect. That is very important for America's troops and for America's strength.

Now, Mr. Speaker, also people have asked what have we done in terms of enlarging the size of the two ground elements of America's military, the primary ground elements, the United States Army and the United States Marine Corps? We have increased the size of the Marine Corps now from 175,000 personnel to 180,000 personnel. We have increased it right at, in fact, exactly 5,000 Marines. And the last time I checked, we were something like 100 Marines under that limit. But we have gone from 175,000 Marines to 180,000 Marines. We are right at that exact number, a few people short, but we have those Marines actually on the ground, deployed, showing up for roll call each day in their particular position in the war against terror. So we have increased the size of the United States Marine Corps. Now, we may need further increases, but at least at this point we have a 5,000 troop increase.

With respect to the Army, we took the Army end strength from 482,000 to 512,000. That is a 30,000 person increase in the United States Army. Now, a number of us on the Armed Services Committee have done an analysis parallel to the QDR, the Quadrennial Defense Review, and we feel we may have to increase the Marine Corps and the Army further, and you can see those recommendations manifested in that report. But we have actually increased the Army and we have increased the size of the U.S. Marine Corps.

Now, if you ask, and a number of people have asked since Ronald Reagan

made that speech in 1983 and said, in essence, we are entering the age of missiles, and the United States, to secure its people, has to have the ability to shoot down incoming missiles, a number of people have asked us and asked regularly where are we in terms of missile defense. And I am pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that for the first time in the history of the United States, we actually have a very small, very limited, but nonetheless very real missile defense for the first time. It is manifested in the interceptor missiles that we have in place on the Pacific coast and Alaska that could handle, on a very limited basis, a rogue missile or several coming into the United States.

Now, some people may say, well, that is not much. And my answer is, that is more than we have ever had in the history of this country. We have deployed a missile defense and we will be building on that deployment.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just thought it was important to lay out some of the things that this Congress has done and that this Armed Services Committee has accomplished for the American people. A 40 percent pay increase for our troops, increasing the size of the U.S. Army and the U.S. Marine Corps, putting together the first missile defense in the history of the country, and more than doubling the precision firepower of our armed forces.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the President will be making a statement very soon about this adjusted policy on Iraq, and I just wanted to once again tell my colleagues the recommendation that I have made. I know a lot of us have made recommendations to the President and to the Secretary of Defense.

Right now, there are 18 provinces in Iraq. And in half of those provinces, nine of those provinces, there are virtually no attacks taking place. They average less than one attack a day. In those quiet peaceful provinces, there are 27 battalions of Iraqi soldiers located and stationed. Twenty-seven battalions is a lot of soldiers, Mr. Speaker. It is a lot of firepower. It is a lot of personnel.

My recommendation to the President and to the Secretary of Defense for the last several months, and I hope that this has been a part of their conversation, I have urged them, and a number of other of my colleagues have joined with me in urging them to take the 27 Iraqi battalions that we have trained and equipped and move them into the battle. Now, that means that the Ministry of Defense is going to have to give orders to those battalion commanders and those brigade commanders in the quiet peaceful sections of Iraq and tell them to saddle up their forces, get them on the trucks, and move them to Baghdad.

They need to do that. That should be nonnegotiable. It should be a requirement by the American war fighting commanders that cannot be delayed, cannot be finessed, and cannot be put aside. That is something that should be nonnegotiable, especially against the backdrop of the enormous American effort that has given birth to this new government in Iraq.

So I know the President is going to come out with his suggested policy soon, but I thought it was important to lay out this fact, that right now we have 27 Iraqi battalions in quiet areas which can be utilized in the fight, can be put into the fight. In my estimation, their value in an urban setting, especially one like Baghdad, where speaking the language is important, and where knowing the communities is important, their placement in those positions before we move any additional American troops into those urban situations is, I think, something that we should do, and that we should require of the Ministry of Defense of Iraq.

□ 1445

I want to thank Mr. MCHENRY for letting me come out and talk a little bit about these issues and take some of his valuable time. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's allowing me to come out and say a word or two.

Mr. MCHENRY. Thank you, Mr. HUNTER. I certainly appreciate my good friend from California, your friendship in my brief service in the House. It has been wonderful learning from you, and I appreciate your willingness to show national leadership and national involvement as well, far beyond these House walls. Thank you so much for your leadership and friendship.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank you. I also want to thank the gentleman for his great service on our committee. He did a wonderful job.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting moment in our Nation's history, an interesting moment indeed, with a new Democrat majority coming to these hallowed halls of Congress. The American people spoke in November and they wanted a change.

As someone who was formerly in the majority party, now in the minority party, I respect the power of democracy to change our Nation and change the direction of our Nation in important policy areas. I think some of that is going to be beneficial to our economy, and other proposals that the new Democrat majority are putting forward are going to be hurtful to our economy and to our national defense and our family security. But I think it is important that we talk today about some of the early actions of this new Democrat majority.

During the campaign season over the last few years, the last 2 years, the Democrats campaigned on openness and accountability. They campaigned on many things.

In the opening days of Congress, we have seen a far different reality than what they campaigned on over the last 2 years. It is disheartening to me as an American citizen and someone who is hopeful and optimistic about this new Congress, hopeful that we can work on a bipartisan basis, and I think it is important that we talk about these opening day actions and the actions they have taken over the last 2 days of this new Democrat majority.

The first action and the first course of business of this new Congress was to pass a very closed-off process for consideration of the so-called 100-hour agenda of the Democrat party put forward by the new speaker, Ms. PELOSI of California.

What we see in this closed-off package is far different than when they campaigned on. They campaigned on an open process, open and fair debate, a dialogue across the aisle, so that we could work in a bipartisan way for the American people. The first action they took was to lock out all dissenting voices, even within their own party, but also among the Republicans represented here today. The Republicans represent 140 million Americans here in the U.S. House of Representatives. Their first action after campaigning on openness and bipartisanship was to close out dissenting voices, to close out the amendment process.

I was surprised by this, because looking at then-Minority Leader PELOSI'S words, I believed that Minority Leader PELOSI would be a very open Speaker PELOSI. What we see with her words and actions, and I have a visual aid here to that effect, now, Speaker PELOSI, then Minority Leader PELOSI, said a few things about the minority having rights here in this institution.

Then-Minority leader PELOSI said in 2004, her Minority Bill of Rights includes fair principles. ''There is a very excellent chance that the Republicans will be in the minority next year, and what I am saying is this is the way the House should be conducted, in a bipartisan way, and whether he,'' meaning Speaker HASTERT at the time, ''agrees to it or not, this is the course of action that I will take.''

What is striking to me is the date on that is June 2004. We are in the second day of a Democrat majority and we have, instead of a Minority Leader PELOSI, a Speaker PELOSI. What is striking here is ''that is the course of action that I will take.'' Those are the Speaker's words.

To that end, I took the very letter that Minority Leader PELOSI wrote at the time and we filed that legislation and we offered it here on the House floor yesterday, and it was flatly rejected. Every Democrat to the person voted against it.

It is striking to me that in their first day as a majority, as a Democrat majority, they are already going back on the words that they campaigned on, they campaigned on in 2004, 2005 and 2006.

What did they say in 2005? Then minority leader PELOSI said, ''Mr. Speaker, I implore you to end the repeated abuses of the rules by the Republican majority to ram legislation through in such a secretive and unfair manner.'' That is 2005.

What we see today and yesterday by this new Democrat majority is that they have a secretive process, because it says that we cannot offer any amendments on the legislation that we will soon be able to see. We can't even see the legislation in their 100 hours. They have not let us or the American people or even many in their own party see the legislation which we will be voting upon and for which we gave initial approval to today. That is very striking to me, especially after the language and rhetoric used in 2004 and 2005 by Speaker PELOSI.

''Additionally, in 2006, so 3 years running, more than 2 years ago, I first sent Speaker DENNIS HASTERT Democrat proposals to restore civility to the Congress. I reiterate my support for those proposals today. We must restore bipartisanship to the administration of the House, reestablish regular order for consideration of legislation and ensure the rights of the minority, whichever party is in the minority. The voice of every American has to be heard.''

Now, 2004, 2005, 2006, Minority Leader PELOSI talked about openness and bipartisanship. Speaker PELOSI, the first act of office, goes completely back on these very words. This rhetoric did not become reality on the first opening hours of the Democrat majority. I am hopeful, as all Americans should be, hopeful that there is openness tomorrow. As Americans, we are an optimistic people.

I think it would be amazing, in fact, I think we would all be amazed, if their second act was for openness when their first act, their first principle, was closing off debate and closing off any input from rank and file Members of this body and the people that we represent at home.

What I would say is that beyond just the words, we need to look at the values and the principles of this majority. We offered this minority bill of rights that then minority leader PELOSI proposed, and it simply says that legislation should be considered in the committee process and we should have full open debate and discourse.

In essence, we outlined what all fifth graders in this great country are taught about the legislative process here in the House of Representatives, that a bill is filed, it is sent to committee, it is amended and debated and compromised there, it goes to the floor and goes through that same process, when in fact that is not always the course of operation of this House.

So the problem is that it is not simply about the process. The issue today is that the process corrupts the policy. When you stack the deck on the outcome, you corrupt the policy of this House Chamber and the laws of this land. So process and policy are intertwined. When one is corrupted, so is the other. With the Democrats shutting down debate at a critical moment in our Nation's history, we have to question their judgment.

There are a number of proper proposals they are putting forward in the initial 100 hours of debate here in the House of Representatives. One thing that is very important to Americans and our national security is the 9/11 Commission recommendations outlined in the fall and over the last few years. We have heard them very well.

The Democrats campaigned that they wanted to and would, if they were given the majority, fully implement the 9/11 recommendations. No matter whether or not they were good public policy or not, they are going to implement all of them.

Well, as it turns out, the Washington Post reported on November 30, 2006, that ''With control of Congress now secured, Democratic leaders have decided for now against implementing the one measure that would affect them most directly, a wholesale reorganize of Congress to improve oversight and funding of the Nation's intelligence agencies.''

It is striking that just days after the election, they are already going back on their proposal to implement the 9/11 Commission's recommendations. Now they are saying that they will implement some but not all. It is kind of surprising, because the American people heard in an almost unanimous voice from Democrats that they were going to implement all of the 9/11 Commission recommendations. I didn't hear candidates out there and Members of Congress on the Democrat side saying some, but not all. No, they said all 9/11 Commission recommendations.

Only through press reports do we know what this legislation says. They have not given this out, other than their allies on K Street and the lobbying community. But they haven't given this out for the American people and for the press and for all Members of Congress to see. So we have some concerns about this, because there are many of us who want to offer perfecting amendments, to make sure this policy is right and secures our Nation in a proper way.

Thomas Kean, who is a former distinguished Member and Governor of New Jersey, was a cochair of the 9/11 Commission. He called these important overhauls in the congressional process of oversight and intelligence vital.

What we have to do is make sure that the Democrats uphold their promise. We don't want broken promises. We don't want them to campaign on good ideas and be corrupted by an ugly process here that results in bad policy. National security is, of course, of key and utmost importance, and I am glad they are at least bringing that up in the first 100 hours.

Additionally, many of us in this Nation are concerned about research and ensuring that we have medical cures that comfort, that our government policy upholds not just ethical and moral research, but lifesaving research.

Next Thursday, from press reports, the Democrats will vote to enact legislation to expand Federal taxpayer funding for research that destroys human life and human embryos, and they call this stem cell research.

Well, while I don't support the destruction of human life, I do support stem cell research, adult stem cell research that has led to cures. Unfortunately, due to the process that they have here in this new Democrat majority, we are not going to be able to offer amendments to ensure that life is not destroyed and that human embryos are not destroyed in this process of research.

But if you look at embryonic stem cell research versus adult stem cell research, there have been wonderful cures coming out of adult stem cell research, but no cures coming out of embryonic stem cell research. And we are not even questioning whether or not embryonic stem cell research should come about. It is a question of whether our taxpayer dollars should be used to destroy human life, or what many Americans believe to be a destruction of human life.

Even if not all of us agree on whether or not life should be protected at its most basic and precious moment, we should all agree that we shouldn't have unethical processes and research funded by our Federal taxpayer dollars. In fact, the National Institutes of Health spends roughly $600 million per year on stem cell research already, including $40 million for research involving certain types of embryonic stem cell research. But the type of research they conduct does not destroy human life.

□ 1500

Additionally, nearly 100 million of it is for nonhuman embryonic stem cell research. So this is already being done, yet it is a nice rhetorical device, just like the Democrats campaigning on implementing all the 9/11 Commission Report recommendations and just like openness and fairness. American people like the sound of that. But what is concerning, whether it is embryonic stem cell research, the 9/11 Commission, or openness and fairness, is that it was only rhetoric. The Democrats didn't want to implement it and make it reality here in policy and in law for our Nation.

Beyond that, we have another provision that we voted on today, and this is Pelosi's PAYGO legislation. Now, PAYGO is a shorthanded word for pay-as-you-go. It is a nice way that we talk about it here on Capitol Hill. We call it PAYGO. Now, it sounds very good. The American people want us to pay for government policies as we enact them, and so that is a great rhetorical device as well. Pay-as-you-go. Well, what is devilish about this proposal is that it will lead to a backdoor tax increase down the line.

As the Wall Street Journal editorial said today: under Pelosi's PAYGO plan, new entitlement programs and all new tax cuts would have to be offset by either cutbacks and other entitlement programs or tax increases. This version of Pelosi's PAYGO is a budget trapdoor designed to control expenditures but to make it easier, easier, to raise taxes while blocking future tax cuts.

That is from today's Wall Street Journal.

Now, the fundamental budget problem is not spending too little and taxing too little; it is the fact that right now in our country Federal revenues climbed by $550 billion over the past 2 fiscal years, and that is as a direct result of the economic support and economic growth of the 2001 and 2003 Bush tax cuts. As the economy grows and more people are employed, fewer people use government services. As fewer people use government services and are making money on their own, they actually begin to pay taxes. When people are paying taxes, revenue to government goes up. It is a basic process. And through this robust economic growth that has come out of these tax cuts, we have had more revenue come into government.

So pay-as-you-go is a way for the Democrats to establish later the reasoning to go to the American people and say we need to raise your taxes. Now, I think it is a faulty and flawed policy, because the tax cuts of 2001 and 2003 have not limited income to government; in fact, what the American people must know, Mr. Speaker, is that the government revenue to the United States Government is the highest it has ever been in the history of our country. The highest revenue of any time in our country's history. Beyond that, actually to say it more broadly, we have more government revenue coming into the U.S. Treasury, your tax dollars coming into the U.S. Treasury. Even after tax cuts, we have the most government revenue in the history of man and the history of the Earth. No government has ever received as much in tax dollars as ours does today; yet, still, the Democrats put a proposal on the floor today that will let them raise taxes later.

It is so shocking and so surprising that they would do this in their opening week in Congress. Now, I knew there were tax-and-spenders on the other side of the aisle, and that is a liberal focus, to grow the size of government, increase the revenue to government; but I didn't realize they would do this at the very beginning of their new majority in Congress. I think the American people should be shocked by that.

But what this pay-as-you-go, or PAYGO, proposal ignores is that all the appropriations we have made in the past, the current government programs that we have will not be under this rule. So we won't analyze the entitlement programs to see where they need to be reformed; we won't analyze existing government programs to see that they are getting the proper result or they are being efficient with their dollars. It will only apply to new spending.

So let's look at the 100-hour plan and total up the tax value of it and the spending value of it. And what you see as a result of this plan is pretty simple: $800 billion of new spending in this 100-hour plan. Now, think about that. I think the American people should stop for a second, Mr. Speaker, and think about the fact that in 100 short legislative hours, over just a few days, the new Democrat majority will spend $800 billion. That is shocking.

Now, I know that there are these free-spending ways in Washington, and as a conservative I am opposed to that, especially as someone who considers themselves a fiscal hawk. But to spend that much money in such a short period of time has got to strike the American people as egregious, especially when you campaigned as the Democrats tried to in the last election as fiscal conservatives and a party that wants to balance the budget. Yet, they are offering $800 billion worth of new spending in their first acts of office.

So how do they get that money to pay as they go? They are going to come to our tax dollars, our personal tax dollars. They are going to ask more from every American. That means that when you get your paycheck, whether you work in my district in Hickory, North Carolina, or Mooresville or in Cherryville, where I am from, you are going to pay more out of that paycheck to fund the programs that the Democrats who are in control of this place want to implement. So the average working man and woman in this country will pay more under Democrat leadership than they will under Republican leadership.

Beyond that, this 100-hour proposal completely, completely ignores some of the most pressing issues in our country, certainly ensuring that our troops in the field are funded fully. Now, that is very important. Completely ignored in the 100-hour plan in the Democrat agenda for this Congress. What about entitlement reform? Because, after all, that is the largest section of the budget of our Federal budget, Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security. Very important programs. But we need to make sure that they are fiscally efficient, that they are fiscally sound, and it is clear that they are not either efficient nor sound.

So we need to look at entitlement programs, yet the Democrat majority has completely ignored entitlement reform in their agenda. They have completely ignored making Social Security solvent for future generations. And as someone who is eligible for retirement the same year that Social Security goes finally broke, I am concerned about that, and my generation of Americans should be concerned about that as well as all generations of Americans.

What else is missing? Well, obviously the cost of litigation on small businesses across this country, completely ignored that, certainly because the trial lawyers I think have helped write the Democrat agenda for this Congress and there is a big difference between what trial lawyers seek and what the average small businessman or the average family doctor in this country seeks. And so they have completely ignored reforming and limiting litigation and the cost of litigation on the American society. Completely ignored that.

They have also ignored helping small businesses with health care either through health savings accounts where individuals can save tax free, something that we as Republicans have worked very hard, and free-market conservatives like the idea of people being able to save tax free without Uncle Sam reaching into your savings and pocketing that money; or association health plans where small businesses can come together, link up, and increase their affordability and their buying capacity to give their employees health care. Completely ignored with the Democrats' agenda.

In fact, the Democrats came on the floor, some of these that campaigned on the other side of the aisle as helping small businesses, one of their first votes was to vote against letting small businesses pool their resources to buy health care. That hurts. That hurts in the opening days of Congress.

Beyond that, they have ignored border security. I think the American people have demanded border security and a sane immigration policy for this country. There are many leaders on my side of the aisle on the issue of border security, and I think we need to engage in that discussion on how we reform our immigration policy in this United States and how we plan to do that. I think most Americans agree that we must begin with the border, to ensure that we have an immigration policy that is enforceable, realistic, and real for this country.

So though we are just in a few opening hours of this new Congress, some things are clear. Some things are very clear. The rhetoric that the Democrats campaigned on was good. It was good. The American people supported it. The American people put new Democrats in office, Democrats that campaigned some as fiscal conservatives, others as social conservatives, most certainly as moderates in this last election. But their opening hours, their opening hours go back on those pledges for fiscal sanity due to the high cost of their opening plan and proposals, $800 billion worth of spending in just 100 hours.

It goes back on this openness concept. It goes back on fiscal sanity by covering up with this Pelosi PAYGO plan that will raise our taxes later in the year or later next year, certainly tax increases in the future, though. It fully ignores their proposal to fully implement the 9/11 Commission proposals by kind of sort of doing a few of them that they think are politically palatable rather than following through on their promise. It uses a great rhetorical device of stem cell research. But when they come here and they vote, they ignore the cloning issue, whether or not we are funding human cloning, whether or not we are destroying human life.

So the rhetoric in the campaign is very much removed from their actions in this new Congress.

They also ignore their pledge to work with all sides on issues of importance to the American people, to work in a bipartisan way. They even go back on their pledge and demand for minority rights here in this institution. So we see hypocrisy from the Democrat majority. Many would say it is ironic that you campaign as a conservative, yet come in and govern as a liberal, which we are already seeing in just two days of Democrat control.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think the American people are an optimistic and hopeful people. We have a new week, we have a new day coming where the Democrats can change, and I am hopeful that they will, that they will go back to what they campaigned on that the American people endorsed in the last election for bipartisanship, for openness, for national security and the defense of our country, for good strong family values, and fiscal sanity. And when that happens, I will be happy to reach across the aisle and work with my colleagues in the Democrat majority to ensure that these things happen.

But until that day comes, I will point out the fact that they are going back on their words to the American people, and I will not restrain myself from calling it as I see it, and I think as the way the American people should see it as well, that in order to govern effectively you have to fulfill your promises, you have to make sure it is not empty campaign rhetoric, that in fact it is a full implementation of the agenda that you sought in the election.

I think the American people want change in Washington. I don't think they got change in the last two days, though. I think what you saw with this new Democrat majority is this same type of abuse of power that they had in 1993, in 1992, through the 1980s and the 1970s. The majority may be new today, but the Democrat chairmen are the same as they were 20 years ago, on the larger part of the Democrat majority and for the larger part of the committees that they have organized. And the policy proposals that they offer going forward after this 100-hour proposal will be much the same as they offered in the early 1990s and the 1980s and the 1970s.

□ 1515

Those policy proposals are pretty simple: Raise your taxes, weaken national defense, and go the opposite way on family values. But I hope that we can work with moderates on the other side of the aisle, moderates on the other side of the aisle that are willing to look at fiscal sanity, willing to stand up for traditional values and willing to do the right thing for the American people and will work together. I am very hopeful that we will have that opportunity after this 100-hour proposal is done. And hopefully, it will be done quickly.

RANDOM THOUGHTS ON THE PASSING SCENE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, Mr. MCHENRY's input into this dialogue that we have here is essential. I look forward to the pugnacious Mr. MCHENRY's deliveries on this floor and in committee and before the media over the next 2 years of the new 110th Congress.

As always, Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor and privilege to address you on the floor in the United States House of Representatives, the people's House. As I bring up this subject matter that is here before us, I have a series of things, random thoughts on the passing scene, focused on current events will be my message here today.

There are mistakes that are made and there are things said and done in political campaigns that don't always reflect the wishes or the policy, but things are said sometimes to win elections and then you have to follow through on that.

We have had some standards to look back on. The first 100 days of the presidency, many Presidents have made their pledge that in the first 100 days they are going to move pieces of policy, and they have endeavored to keep those pledges.

When the Republicans took over the majority in 1994, they also made a pledge in the first 100 days that they would bring, at least bring to a vote a series of reform changes called ''Contract With America.'' Looking back on that, and it depends on your analysis and definition, but something like two-thirds of that agenda was passed into law. I believe all of it was voted on in this Congress. But yet it was done under a regular order. It was done under an open process, and it was done by bringing the legislation of the Contract With America, which I am comparing now to this first 100 hours of the new majority's agenda, comparing those two initiatives that were brought up in the campaign and the pledges that were made. But they were brought through in regular order in the Contract With America in 1994.

Regular order meaning that the bills were introduced and they were brought to subcommittee where they had a full subcommittee hearing and there was open debate and there was an opportunity for Democrats and Republicans to offer their amendments into the subcommittee on each of those pieces of legislation. As it came out of subcommittee, it went to full committee where there was an opportunity for the full committee members to weigh in. As we know, the committees are where we have established and developed expertise. If you look at the chairs and also the seasoned veterans on committees, both Republicans and Democrats, and I look at the Judiciary Committee where there is a tremendous amount of seniority, and I have the honor to serve on the House Judiciary Committee, there is a replete, not necessarily complete but a very replete body of knowledge within the minds of the members of the committee and the staff. And of course the history and the resources that are there.

That is why we put legislation through the subcommittee and committee processes so we can weigh in with our judgment and bring our individual expertise to bear, and we have an opportunity to hear from our constituents because they will read the language and they will parse the words and let us know where the flaws are.

Mr. Speaker, my first step into public life was going from the private sector, being a construction company founder, owner and manager into the legislative arena as an Iowa senator. And the first thing I learned was the law of unintended consequences.

In other words, you can have a good idea and it sounds perfect to you from your limited perspective. You can put that down into the form of a law, and if I were king for a day as a younger man, I might have offered some of those ideas I had earlier in my political career as an edict that I believed should have been the law of the land and lay that out there and give a bob of my scepter and declare that to be law. But my mistakes would have been as a younger, less experienced man, and sometimes still today those mistakes, I didn't understand the law of unintended consequences. I didn't understand that my ideas needed to be vetted across the spectrum of the other people that I served in the State legislature with, and I carry that experience with me into this Congress. I didn't understanding that I needed to float those ideas out to the various constituency groups that are there to be voices of individuals, and I didn't understand that I needed to float those out to individuals and get those ideas out in the press and publish my bills so that people that are interested can look in and weigh in and make phone calls, send e-mails and write letters, come and visit and lobby as individuals or join up with their various constituency groups that are out there to be able to analyze and be a louder voice as members of a group so that all of the expertise that America has to offer can come to bear on the judgments and decisions that we make here in this Congress.

But that whole process that I have described, the process utilized in 1994 with the Contract With America, that entire open, bipartisan process has been usurped by this rules package that has been brought here to the floor of this Congress. We learned essentially a new term. I don't know if anybody in this Congress understood it at the time. Some did, I imagine, because they came up with the effort on the rules.

I came down here to put up my first vote on a motion to commit. Now I have voted many times on motions to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, if I may describe that. A motion to recommit is a motion that says if you bring a bill to the floor and then it gets debated here on the floor, the motion to recommit says we want to recommit it back to committee and sometimes recommit it with instructions back to committee because there are Members here in the full House that didn't have an opportunity to weigh in on that bill as it came through committee. They didn't sit on the appropriate committee, for example. So they had a viewpoint that needed to be considered. And if a motion to recommit is successful here on the floor, that says a majority of the Members of the full House of Representatives have concluded that there are other ideas that needed to be considered, send it back to committee with instructions so those other ideas can be considered. That is a motion to recommit.

But we voted on a motion to commit, not recommit, a motion to commit. A motion to commit is send it to committee. And the reason it is a motion to commit rather than a motion to recommit is this legislation has not gone through committee. It has not gone through the subcommittee process or the committee process. It simply then is legislation that was held very tight. I don't know if it was in a locked briefcase, but it was something that the public and press didn't have access to. Members of Congress didn't have access to it. In fact, I believe many of the lower ranking Members of the majority party didn't have access to this legislation. It was secret legislation that was thrust upon us and the only opportunity that we have is a nondebatable motion to commit to committee for the first time because it didn't go through the committee process.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that is inconsistent with the pledge that was made throughout the election process and throughout the campaign process.

There are a number of quotes that were identified, and I have some of them. I don't have all of them. One of them by now-Speaker PELOSI was this, and this was on CNN on November 9, so 2 days after the election. That would have been Thursday. She said, ''Democrats are ready to lead, prepared to govern.'' I don't quibble with that part of the statement. But the completion of the sentence is, ''ready to lead, prepared to govern, and absolutely willing to work in a bipartisan way.''

Mr. Speaker, there is no definition of bipartisanship that I can apply to this process unless many of the Members of the majority party were as shut out of this process as the entire minority party was. I suspect that is the case. I don't want to parse the language in there, I just want to say that the spirit and intent of that statement, ''willing to work in a bipartisan way'' has been violated here, but maybe not the technical definition of that. We can expect these things because we have a house full of lawyers that are good with language and they will find a way to convolute this language to be able to defend themselves.

So I point out this process. Motion to commit, nondebatable motion. All you can do is plead for a recorded vote, and that is the only opportunity to voice objection, but there is not an opportunity to improve the legislation. And that is really what we need to do, always, all of us in a bipartisan way, at least provide an opportunity for amendments in the process. That means in the subcommittee process and in the full committee process, and then here on the floor of the House of Representatives in open debate so the public can evaluate this process, not a secret or closed process, but an open process to the public. We owe you that, America. We owe you an open and clean process and we owe you an open dialogue and an open debate.

If we don't do that, you will be drawing conclusions such as they don't believe in what they are doing enough to be able to have an open debate. What kind of work is being done here that we are not able to have it withstand the scrutiny and the criticism that might come from the public if it were an open process.

So I will submit, Mr. Speaker, that promises get made during campaigns. There were many promises made during the last campaign that will not be kept by the new majority party. But the promise that seems to be the one that is sacrosanct is the promise that in the first 100 hours we will do these things. In order to accomplish these promises of achievement within the first 100 hours, which is comparable to the first 100 days in presidential promises or the promise of the 1994 new majority, in order to achieve those goals and keep those promises, the promise we will do it within the first 100 hours, the only way to meet that was to take this bipartisanship and set it aside and suspend it at least temporarily, if not permanently, for the 110th Congress, and to set aside the subcommittee process and set aside the committee process.

We have one more avenue here that there can be an open forum, and that is the rules process. At least a member can bring an amendment to the Rules Committee, explain their amendment in open forum and ask for a vote on their amendment as to whether that amendment can be allowed to be considered here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I was astonished there were this many amendments when I came here as a freshman a couple of Congresses ago. I was astonished that there were so many amendments that were turned down, that did not see the light of day. But there was an opportunity to present them to the Rules Committee, and I did that many times and I got turned down many times as a member of the majority party. But we don't even have a rules process that is open enough that you can present your amendments to the Rules Committee.

In fact, I believe the Rules Committee, as an example already, will not be meeting, it will simply be a decision that is made by the leadership of the majority party, and the recorded votes of the Rules Committee will be secret. That is part of this package, as I understand it, too, Mr. Speaker.

So of all of the promises that will be broken, the one that should be broken is the one that is sacrosanct, the promise of accomplishment in the first 100 hours. If we could just look at that and say we understand your motive, but this is not conducive to bipartisanship or open process; in fact, it is not conducive to good legislation because the good ideas of Democrats and Republicans are shut out of this process.

I will just ask this of now-Speaker PELOSI: Why don't you just break one promise instead of a series that will ultimately be broken, and break that promise about 100 hours so that you can keep your promise about bipartisanship, and keep your promises about an open process and ethical process. That is far more important to the American people than a promise to accomplish certain legislative endeavors within the first 100 hours.

This 100 hours is meaningless to the American people. All of this has to go over to the Senate. The Senate has to be willing to take it up. The Senate has to be able to vote cloture on some of this, and I think it will be filibustered, and it has to get to the President for signature. Timing is not as essential, it is the policy that is important. It is important to have an open process, it is important that we weigh in and that amendments be allowed to be offered and that they be considered and that they be voted on so the American people can have confidence in this process.

□ 1530

And sometimes, sometimes, this body, this great deliberative body of the people's House, will reach the right decisions. In fact, I believe often we will. When we do so with public debate and an open process, we reach the right decision for the right policy for America and we also reach it by using the right reasons, the reasons of open dialogue that allow people's positions and their knowledge to come to that debate.

Sometimes we will make the wrong decision, and when we do that, if we have open dialogue and open debate, then at least it is arguable that we have arrived at the wrong decision, but at least we followed the right process, and we can't fault the reasoning on how we get there.

I would compare Gerald R. Ford, and may he rest in peace, Gerald R. Ford, whom we said good-bye to within this past week, the man who came to the Presidency after having served 25 years here, Mr. Speaker, in the House of Representatives, a man who was almost without guile as President. A President who made decisions at a time when we

needed someone who had absolute integrity. The person who had confidence, the confidence and the endorsement of Democrats and Republicans at the time, Mr. Speaker. And with Gerald R. Ford as President, when he made a decision, when I agreed with him and he laid out his reasoning and his rationale, when he made the right decision, he made it for the right reason.

He thoughtfully deliberated on the components of the information, the interactivity of them and what the result would be and what the constitutional foundation was on that decision. And he made his decision, and he told us why. And that established confidence in the integrity and the judgment, in the intellect, and the character and in the faith of Gerald R. Ford.

When he made the wrong decision, and I will just say when I disagreed with him would be my definition of the wrong decision, he still laid out his argument. And when he laid out his argument, I could not fault him for using the wrong criteria. It was well thought out. He made his arguments well. When we disagreed, I would have a different argument.

But those kinds of debates that he had within himself, he earned that respect of us for President Ford. That kind of deliberation, that kind of integrity so far in the 110th Congress is nonexistent because there hasn't been an opportunity to have that debate on any of this that has come to this at this point and the rules deny there be that kind of debate and deliberation in the future.

So I talked about the new motion, still it was in the rules, but a motion to commit. New to use. You will hear a discussion, Mr. Speaker, about PAYGO. PAYGO means pay as you go. It means something different to Democrats than it does to Republicans. And I will say that when Republicans talk about PAYGO, we mean we want to pay as we go, as do Democrats, but we believe we should constrain spending and slow the growth in government and we should find ways for reconciliation and maybe do a rescissions package so that we can rachet this spending down to keep it within the revenue stream.

We believe that the Bush tax cuts have absolutely flat out been proven to stimulate this economy. Revenue is up. Revenue has increased significantly since the Bush tax cuts were put in place. That is why our deficit has been reduced. It is because revenue has gone beyond our expectations. But the PAYGO argument for me is I want to slow this growth in spending so that we can get the size of our Federal Government back in line with the size of our revenue stream.

For example, last year there were mistakes made by the majority party in the last couple, three Congresses. I believe that there was too much money that was spent, Mr. Speaker, and I think that we should have shut that down earlier. I was surprised when I came to this Congress as a freshman in January of 2003 that there wasn't a balanced budget that I could simply endorse, jump on, and go to work with. It was a condition where we were dealing with the reality of the politics rather than the necessity of balancing the budget.

And in order to produce a balanced budget, I would have had to create my own with my new staff, who didn't really have that time and understanding of this overall 2.7 or $2.8 trillion national budget. But things crept away from a balanced budget, and we know why. We know there was the bursting of the dot-com bubble that took place and it was necessary, and I could go into that perhaps on another date, Mr. Speaker.

And we also know that we faced an attack on September 11 that shut down our financial industry and that the effort was to turn our United States economy into a tailspin. It needed to be brought out of that nosedive, and the tax cuts that we passed brought it back up out of that nosedive. We knew that we had to engage in a global war on terror and it was going to cost hundreds of billions of dollars to be able to defend Americans that had been killed in greater numbers on our soil than ever at any time in history, and we set about to do that.

So three big things sent us into a deficit: the bursting of the dot-com bubble, the attack on September 11, and the necessity to fund the effort in a global war on terror. Those three things. And as the stimulants took place on the tax cuts, it has taken a little while to get them to take hold, but there is no argument that this economy is the strongest and most powerful economy that I have experienced in my lifetime, and it is measurable by a lot of different ways. Anything that goes up and is good for the economy is up. Anything that goes down that is good for the economy is down, and the opposite is also true.

This has been a powerfully strong economy with growth in something like 18 of 19 previous quarters, and all of that growth has been up around the 3 percent level. So this economy has been powerful, and this growth has been really a great position to be in to be able to say let us let the economy grow us out of this. Let us slow this growth of balance. Let us balance this budget.

But let us not balance it, Mr. Speaker, with tax increases. That is what PAYGO means to Democrats. The tax cuts have provided the growth in our revenue stream. Tax increases will diminish the growth in our revenue stream. But their idea of pay-as-you-go is to increase taxes and increase spending, as we heard Mr. MCHENRY say, to the tune of $800 million in this package. That $800 million won't be paid for by cuts in other line items in any significant way. That, in their mind, is paid for by tax increases.

As has been stipulated by the new incoming chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL of New York, none of the Bush tax cuts he would say he would support or endorse. And as you listened to him respond across the media airwaves, it always came back to the only way that you could characterize his position was we are going to increase taxes.

When you increase taxes, you slow this economy. Ronald Reagan once said what you tax you get less of. What you tax you get less of, and what you subsidize you get more of. But I want to talk about the what-you-tax-you-get-less-of component of that, a very wise statement of President Reagan's, and that is in our infinite lack of wisdom here in the United States of America, Mr. Speaker, we tax all productivity in America.

In fact, the Federal Government has the first lien on all productivity in America. And you can measure that by personal income tax, corporate income tax, capital gains, taxes on interest income, taxes on dividend income, taxes on your pension, taxes on your Social Security. I am forgetting some of those taxes. How about your savings and investment? Any way you can describe productivity, the Federal Government is there to tax it; so we get less productivity because we tax our productivity in America, and Democrats are poised to increase the taxes on our productivity. What you tax you get less of.

If you are paying a 10 percent income tax and you are making $50,000 a year and they want to raise that tax up to let's just say 50 percent, why in the world would you try to increase your revenue stream by 50 percent if your taxes are going to go up by the average of 50 percent and 10 percent, say, roughly 30 percent on average? That will not happen in the minds of the American people. That is why organized economies never work. That is why Marxism has failed. That is why socialized economies, managed economies, have always failed. Free enterprise has been the thing that has provided incentives so that people could produce all they could produce and they had an incentive to be able to keep the max amount possible and still be able to provide the services that are necessary to hold our sovereign state together.

Democrats want to raise taxes to balance the budget. Republicans want to cut spending to balance the budget.

So last year I put together the formula that would get us to a balanced budget. And if we just wanted to do it all at once, we need to be looking at what that balanced budget was to do that all at once. And we say, first of all, there is nondiscretionary spending. This is the kind of spending that is already in the formula, that is, what it is going to cost for Social Security, what it is going to cost for Medicaid, what it is going to cost for Medicare. That is most of them, those formulas that are automatic transfer payments that are

already set up in the equation. That is nondiscretionary spending. Many people think you can't affect that. That we shouldn't change it, maybe adjust the rules in such a way that there would be fewer recipients or fewer dollars of Medicaid, for example.

That needs to be addressed, and we have tried to address entitlement spending. That is that nondiscretionary spending and the other phrase for it: you are entitled to Social Security. You are entitled to Medicare. You are entitled to Medicaid. But the rules of those entitlements are in the code today, and those rules are something that can be changed and adjusted. And I am not here to talk about how to do that specifically, although I do have some ideas on how to approach that, but we need to address entitlement spending.

That was the President's effort when he came out right after his second inaugural address and traveled the countryside and spoke about reforming Social Security. That operation will collapse at some point unless we have the political courage to touch that third rail and fix it. That is an entitlement.

Another one is Medicare. Being from the State that is last in the Nation in Medicare receipts on a per capita basis, there is much that must be done to help our people out who are on the short end of that stick. But entitlement spending is a component of this. They want to increase taxes rather than adjust entitlement spending. And the more they can grow entitlement spending, the more they can take us into socialism. And I don't want to have a managed economy. I want to have a free enterprise market economy. That is what I came here to promote and defend.

PAYGO for Democrats is raise taxes; PAYGO for Republicans is cut spending. And last year for the 2007 fiscal year, which much of that is still ahead of us, we could have left entitlements in place. We could have left defense spending in place at the appropriated levels that we have now and done nondefense discretionary spending. That is the rest of the budget that I haven't mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, nondefense discretionary spending could have been appropriated at the term of 95 percent of what it was for the 2006 fiscal year and we would have had a balanced budget.

Some of the Democrats have pledged to support a balanced budget that does not include increasing taxes, that does include reduction of spending in nondefense discretionary, that discretionary spending that doesn't put our Nation at risk. Ninety-five percent of the 2006 fiscal year, that doesn't mean an increase. That actually means a decrease of 5 percent in funding.

Well, if I have a family budget and all of a sudden I look around and I think I am going into debt here and I guess I am not going to be in a position to pass that debt along to my children, and we should not be, then we need to be willing to live within our means. And whatever your means are, most of us, if we had to look back and think we can have a balanced family budget if we would just reduce our overall spending down to 95 percent of what it was last year, we would willingly make that adjustment, recognizing that we haven't been as responsible as we should have been, and made the budget adjustment.

That is the kind of PAYGO we need to do in this Congress. We need a balanced budget here, yes, Mr. Speaker, but not PAYGO with tax increases. Pay as you go without tax increases. That is the Steve King position, and I believe that will be a core position on the part of many of the Republicans.

□ 1545

Another way that we can adjust, address spending, is the earmark reform. I have been in strong support of earmark reform. I have stepped in and voted for 16 of the 17 that Congressman FLAKE brought to the floor of this Congress in the 109th Congress, but I don't think that really does the job. They are pieces that I agree with.

But I want to do some real reform here, Mr. Speaker, and I am prepared to introduce a bill. It is a bill that I introduced last year.

The problem is this, we talk about giving the President a line item veto, so that when there is spending that comes out, and maybe you want to talk about the Bridge to Nowhere, that is one of those issues that has been raised up as a earmark. Well, if the Bridge to Nowhere comes up, or the Cowgirl Hall of Fame comes up or some of these other earmarks that have been rather notorious in the media, we would ask the President, under a presidential line item veto to veto that, take it out of the budget, save that $273 million or whatever the number might be for any of those items, or $1 million line item veto to maybe study the nocturnal habits of the salamander, or whatever it might be. You know some of those, Mr. Speaker, they have been out in the news.

These are earmarks that get slipped in, generally at the committee level, as the bill is being drafted. It comes out here. No Member of Congress has an opportunity to evaluate those earmarks, nor an opportunity to bring an amendment that could strike those earmarks from the bill. They arrive in a compromised fashion often as a conference committee report that comes back in the negotiations between the House and the Senate.

It comes to the floor. We have got to vote on it to move to keep the government operating, and what happens is, there are line items in there that have been earmarked by people who are inside that conference committee, and these Members of Congress here, Democrats and Republicans, are held accountable for voting ''yes'' or ''no'' on pork projects that they didn't know was in the bill.

I would illustrate it this way, when I first came to this Congress, there was a 3,600 page omnibus spending bill. I was only here about 3 days, or maybe even two, and that bill came to the floor of this Congress, and 20 minutes after it was made available to my staff to evaluate, the final vote went up here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

That process meant that I was accountable for all of those earmarks that were in that omnibus spending bill, those 3,600 pages. It is one thing to try to evaluate a bill and read what's in it, it is not possible within the time we had, but it is at least possible to evaluate something that is in the bill.

Try and find, Mr. Speaker, something that is not in the bill. Try and look through 3,600 pages to determine that there are omissions as well as the issues, the earmarks that are in the bill.

This process does need to be more open, so I have drafted the CUT Act, and it is cut unnecessary tab, and the tab references, if you have a tab in an eating or drinking establishment, we want to cut this tab.

I believe this, that Members of Congress need to have a legitimate opportunity to have their own line item veto. I think every Member of this Congress should be able to offer an amendment to a bill that strikes out the line items of their choice under an open rule.

So the CUT Act does this, Mr. Speaker, it allows once a quarter, four times a year, for a bill to come to the floor under an open rule, and it may just be a shell bill, it may not have a single line item strike in it, but it allows under an open rule any and every Member to bring forth their list of objectionable spending, objectionable earmarks, and have them offer those earmark strikes.

All it would do is be a rescissions bill that reduces spending, and the reduction in that spending goes to address the deficit. When the deficit is addressed, then it goes back into the general fund, which ultimately reduces our national debt, gives every Member of this Congress an opportunity to have a line item veto of their own offered to all Members of Congress.

So let us say there is a crazy appropriation out here that got slipped into a bill. It will surely happen, Mr. Speaker, it will happen hundreds and perhaps thousands of times. Let us just say that the blogosphere out there is lit up, that people go to their Web pages, and they scrutinize the work that we do. We need to give them a lot of access to do that because they are the next watch dogs on this Congress.

It used to be that the watch dogs sat in this gallery, and many do, and I am glad they are here, but then as those watch dogs were also up here in the press corps, and then the press wrote, and it got into the newspapers, and sometimes, weeks later, had got out into the press in the corners of the United States of America.

Well, now we are real-time. We are real-time, and it has been press real-time for a long time, but it is even better now because we have an Internet, we have a blogosphere. Let us just say that there is a completely objectionable earmark that has been slipped in by a committee chairman, or maybe an agreement with a ranking member, that comes out of a conference committee, and it comes down to the floor of this Congress.

Let us just pick the nocturnal habits of salamanders for $10 million, to have a subject here that we can talk about and understand. Well, we don't really need to understand the nocturnal habits of salamanders, at least at that kind of experience to the taxpayers. But whatever the motivation was that put it in there, we will not see it. We will not have time to read the bill. But that bill then, once it passes a conference report, goes to the President, and he will sign that bill, because there are many things in there that we must have to keep the government operating, and now we have got $10 million wasted on the nocturnal habits of salamanders.

There is nothing Congress can do about it, we have done it. We have been complicit, our rules have been complicit in allowing these things to happen, not just with this earmark, Mr. Speaker, but hundreds and even thousands of them. My CUT Act allows this, it allows a Member to stand up on the first day of the quarter, hopefully it will be the leader and the leaders, and they will say, I have a bill at the desk made in order under the rule, and this bill is the CUT Act bill, then that allows the shell bill to come up like an appropriations bill, only this is a deappropriations bill, a rescissions bill, that every amendment that strikes spending by line item is in order, and the Members can flock over here to the Capitol, and being responsive to their constituents, being responsive to their constituency groups, being responsive to the bloggers out there, that have gone down through this legislation, have read every single line item, have read the details and the nuances of it, read every details and the nuances of it; and then, these Members of Congress can come here, offer their amendments to strike the $10 million that would be spent for the nocturnal habits of salamanders, and you can add line after item after line item, strike after strike to that.

When that happens, we will have an open process, a process that will allow for the people of the United States of America to weigh in on our appropriations that we are doing here.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a description of how the CUT Act works. A lot of us would like to see the President with a legitimate and effective line item veto. But I believe this Congress deserves a legitimate and an effective line item veto. It is why I put a lot of research into this, I have examined it, I have floated it out to the various constituency groups. I have asked them for their input because I don't want to have unintended consequences. I want to be able to provide a process here that is good for the future of America, an open process, a process that gives everybody in this Congress a line item veto, at least to offer the amendment.

When that bill passes off this floor, and I don't envision just eliminating $10 million on the nocturnal habits of salamanders, I envision there to be 25 or 50 or 100 or 300 or more line items that are accumulated into that bill that are struck. Because individually, they will not be able to withstand the scrutiny of the majority of the Members of Congress, because you, the people of America, and the American people, I should say, actually, Mr. Speaker, will insist that we be fiscally responsible and that we not waste money.

So let us just say that there are now 100 line items strikes, each one of them representing an amendment to the CUT Act bill that is in order, and that $10 million to the nocturnal habits of salamanders is the first one, and that saves the taxpayers $10 million. We go right down the list of those things that you know about, Mr. Speaker, those things that are in the media, strike after strike after strike, and we have now accumulated 100 different strikes, line item vetoes, and out of those 100, there is in there, perhaps, let us pick a round number, $1 billion. Now this bill, then, passes off this House of Representatives, and it goes over to the Senate, where we ask them to take it up.

We cannot write their rules, Mr. Speaker, but we can ask them to take up a bill that we pass here, a rescissions package that has the full support of the American people that cuts $1 billion out of our spending that reduces our deficit and when, successfully, we are at the balanced budget level, pays down the national debt.

That is the CUT Act, Mr. Speaker. That is a line item veto for Members of Congress. That is Congressional accountability. That is the kinds of things that we need to have an opportunity to debate here on the floor of this Congress when we kick off this 110th. That is the kind of amendment that has been shut out of this process, not just out of the process of subcommittee and committee, but shut out of even being presented at the Rules Committee so that there can be access to the media for the debate, the deliberation, and so that there will be people that can be held accountable for their vote when they decide they don't want this kind of an open process.

I submit that there is no desire for this open process on the part of the majority. I believe that I need to continue to beat this drum, and I will.

To package the PAYGO argument up and move on to the next component of this, PAYGO, for Republicans is, control and constrain spending to achieve a balanced you budget, no new taxes, less spending, balanced budget, fiscally responsible, PAYGO for Democrats is buy what you need to, spend what you need to pass by your Members, raise taxes, so that you can say that you balanced the budget.

That will work until you kill the goose that lays the golden egg, what you tax you will get less of. We will get less tax gas production in America as taxes increase. That means then that there will be less revenue coming in, coming off of the production in America, and eventually this economy will be constrained. It will shrink, and we will have, we will finally kill the goose that lays the golden egg. We will have to come back around, reduce tax again, stimulate again, do what we did in the aftermath of September 11 to reduce tax, do it in the Reagan way, do it in the John F. Kennedy way, the Reagan way, the George W. Bush way, those things, those tax reductions have always increased and stimulated our economy. That doesn't seem to be something that is within the scope of understanding on the other side, because there is a different agenda. It is a socialization agenda.

So, that is the description of PAYGO, Mr. Speaker. Now, the next component that I want to talk about within this rules package is the idea of ethics reform. Ethics reform, I agree, we needed to reform some ethics. We didn't do enough in the 109th Congress to reform ethics. We did things that were, I thought, window dressing.

My view on ethics is that, I mentioned the bloggers a little bit earlier. We need to give the American people sunlight. They have got to have sunlight on this process. That means that we should not have rules that are written and reports that are written in such a way that the information is difficult to access, or difficult to understand, or impossible to legitimately analyze and draw real black and white conclusions.

But in truth, that is the system that we have today, and it is the system that has been improved some over the years, but it has got a ways to go. The system that I would submit is under a package that I have offered called the Sunlight bill. That means that I want a light on the things that we do.

I think that we live in a fishbowl anyway, all 435 of us, we are scrutinized by the press whenever we show up in public, we are recognized, and that is great, it is flattering. It is a tremendous honor to be able to represent the people here in the United States House of Representatives. The trade-off for that is you don't get a lot of privacy. The requirement for that is that you report your finances, for example, and that we report our campaign finances, as well as our personal finances, and we report our financial dealings. That includes real estate transactions, purchases.

But we have a system that is not open. We have a system that is not accessible. We have a system that is not really sortable, and it is vague enough

that you can't draw clear conclusions from that reporting system that we have. I have offered the Sunlight Act to fix all of that and to make it more, and I am going to say far more, accessible to the American people.

First and the easiest one to deal with is the Federal Election Commission reporting. Now, all of us have to go out and raise money in order to get elected to this Congress. Money is a necessity for the people to express their freedom of speech. If we don't raise the money, eventually someone will spend a lot of money. No matter what our level of integrity is, you cannot sustain a seat in the House of Representatives if you are not willing to go out and raise some money and be able to advertise on a political campaign.

It is unfortunate. I don't know that it was envisioned by our Founding Fathers, but it is necessary. Mr. Speaker, if we concede the point that money has to be raised by Members of Congress, and it does, then we also need to discuss, and I believe, concede the point that we should have full reporting of our campaign finances, and we do have a law that requires full reporting, and I don't want to imply that that doesn't exist, it is just that the reporting isn't necessarily in real-time.

□ 1600

It isn't necessarily in a format that is accessible. So if it is not accessible, easily accessible, then it is not as full as the reporting should be. The Sunlight Act asks this, that the Federal Election Commission reporting, our campaign finances, be reported in real-time. And it sets up some parameters on how much time you have if you receive some revenue from an individual or from a PAC, the timing of that is a little looser until you get down to the last 30 days of a campaign. In the last 30 days the Sunlight Act requires that you file those campaign contributions every 24 hours, every single day, the last 30 days, you file those campaign revenues. Somebody hands you a check, that gets deposited, but it gets reported the same business day. That is not too much to ask when you have that kind of flurry going on. We have to do a lot of things on a real-time basis, and that is one of them.

But that is only, but to report that, to report it to the FEC and have the FEC bring that report out in their own good time, in a time that it is not possible for the public to understand where the monies come from, and we agree, I believe, that utilization of funds to advance a candidacy or to advance a cause are political speech, but free speech.

So if funds are speech, and the reporting of those funds is an open process, it needs to be in a timely fashion. So say if there were, what if there happened to be an entity out there that was one who was rejected by Democrats and Republicans but put a lot of money in a campaign and that didn't show up until after the election, Madam Speaker. But the public, had they known that, might have voted for the candidate who didn't receive those funds. That is my argument as to why we need to have real-time reporting.

But I want to take this back to the blogosphere. We have people out there that have their blogs and they are watching the mainstream news media. They are interacting with other blogs. They have their information conduits that come from whatever their access points are. Maybe they happen to be in politics, or maybe they are just a pundit that is well wired and well connected. And they might see information that the rest of the country doesn't see. That is how news is gathered. So the bloggers are gathering the news and they are writing their opinions and sometimes they are taking information and then sorting it in a fashion that people can use it and they can understand it.

I submit that we should submit ourselves, Madam Speaker, to the scrutiny of the blogosphere; that we should have FEC reporting, campaign finance reporting in real-time in a searchable, sortable, downloadable format that will allow anyone out there in America that has access to a computer or to the Internet to go click on that information, if they want to know where STEVE KING'S revenue stream came from, download that into a database that you can sort.

If you want to sort it alphabetically, sort it alphabetically. If you want to sort it by dollars, biggest contribution down to smallest, do that. If you want to sort it by date, do that. If you want to sort it by name, do that. But we should put that information out to the public so that you can scrutinize, in the public, where our campaign funds come from, so that you can evaluate sometimes the positions that we take. Because if they can be indexed to the influence of money, you need to hold us accountable. We owe you our best judgment.

We don't owe the public a vote that is a bought vote. And the public needs to have an opportunity to identify if there is someone who is influenced too much by money, and it needs to happen in real-time. It needs to happen every single day 30 days prior to an election. That is part of the Sunlight Act, to shed light on our Federal Election Commission reporting, real-time, Internet accessible, downloadable, searchable, sortable database so that the American public has access.

Now, Madam Speaker, that would take care of the reporting on our FEC documents. Essential open process, put me in the fish bowl, make it real-time. I am already in the fish bowl. Let's be honest and open about it and we will get these adjustments made, and they will be made by the people out there in the country, and that is where it should be.

The next part of this that needs reform even more, Madam Speaker, is our personal financial reporting from an ethics perspective. And I will reiterate that when a Member of Congress files a financial disclosure form and files it under the ethics rules that are there, they sign that document and pledge that it is true and accurate and done so within the rules and the guidelines of ethics. And to violate that, to willfully violate that and falsely report is a felony. It is a felony. It is worse to report wrong data on your ethics than it is to come into the United States illegally. It is a felony to report inaccurate information willfully on our financial disclosure forms.

But we have ranges of financial reporting, ranges that, not all of them committed to memory, and I didn't come down here prepared to go through them component by component. But I can just give some examples off the top of my head, Madam Speaker. And it works kind of this way. If you have liabilities, I am speaking again in general terms, not to the specific numbers within their financial reporting. If you have liabilities, perhaps between zero and $100,000, you put a little X in that column on this little kind of little spread sheet but it is a paper spread sheet. So you put an X in there and say, well, I owe somewhere between zero and $100,000. Or maybe you say I have no liabilities. And if you have assets that might be within $250,000 and $750,000, you put a little X in that box.

Well, then if you want to analyze what somebody is worth, you might have $100,000 worth of debt and they might have no more than $250,000 worth of assets, but you can't determine if they have no liability or $100,000 worth of liability and you can't determine whether they have $250,000 worth of assets or $750,000 worth of assets. And so as people go up the line in their reporting, the difference, the dollars in disparity get greater and greater and greater to the extent that, Madam Speaker, we have a Member seated in this Congress who reported low six digits in net worth assets 5 years earlier, and then 5 years later, showed up with somewhere between $6.4 million and $25 million in net worth. How does a person make $6 million in assets or, excuse me, in net worth value over a period of 5 years on the salary of a Member of Congress? How could a person expand that from $6.4 million on up to $25 million. Those questions cannot be legitimately answered without the Department of Justice and search warrants and Ryder trucks and filing cabinets loaded up to take into the investigation and computers being picked up and brought in and a massive financial analysis to figure out what really was going on. Were there taxpayer dollars that were pouring into this? Was there a Member of Congress that was enriching himself at the expense of the taxpayers? That is why we have the reporting of our finances.

But the ranges that are in there don't allow for the public to see that early enough to be able to call that question, get it into the media and bring that

Member into bay so that it doesn't get completely out of hand. This one, from my viewpoint, looks like it is completely out of hand, and I think it is going to take more than months yet for Justice to be able to do complete scrutiny of this and find out what really happened.

But if that Member that I am referencing, and if every Member, and I am speaking about every Member in this Congress, were required to put down exactly the dollar amount of their liabilities and exactly the dollar amounts of their assets so that you could look at their net worth, and understand that there is an amount of appreciation that might come with real estate investment. There might be an amount of appreciation that comes with stock options and investments. That needs to be reported. That should be traceable and trackable, and we should be required to put down exact dollar amounts, not ranges. Not a range of $5 to $25 million. If I were in that range, it is a lot of difference between being worth $5 million and $25 million. Where did the money come from is the reason that we have to report our finances.

The American people, Madam Speaker, do not have access to that information. That allows unethical Members of Congress to hide the worth that they may have been gathering in a fashion that is less than ethical. I believe we need to have sunlight on all of the financial proceedings, not just our Federal Election Commission reporting, not just our campaign side, but on our personal side as we are required today, but not in a range, not in a range of $5 to $25 million, not in a range of zero to $100 now, or $250,000 to $750,000, but in a range that is to the nearest dollar.

Exact reporting, and, Madam Speaker, do so in real-time. Do so in a downloadable, searchable, sortable database format, so that the bloggers out there, or anyone who has access to the Internet, be it a public library or their laptop on the bus or whether it is their hard-wired computer that sits in their basement, can sit down and say, I think I have been watching somebody here that is my Member of Congress. I don't know how they are doing so well. I am hearing rumors out here. Let's see what's really happened and go look and see, if we are going to be an open process, let's be an open process. Let's put sunlight on everything that we do in this Congress, Madam Speaker.

Let's put real-time reporting, downloadable, searchable, sortable formats on our FEC reporting for our campaign funds. Let's do that same thing for our personal finances. Let's open this up to the American people. Let them scrutinize our finances and the movement of our finances so that if some Member can be in here in the year 2000 with a net worth of perhaps $100,000, and in the year 2005 have a net worth of $6.4 million, or more, the American public can ask the question, why. Why did that take that kind of jump? It is not something that can be analyzed or justified unless there are special conditions. Those conditions, those circumstances have not been addressed at this point. I believe we need sunlight on everything that we do, sunlight on our campaign stream, sunlight on our personal finances.

And while we are shedding light on what is going on here in the Chamber, Madam Speaker, it is a bit of a surprise to many of us who come into this Congress to walk down here on the floor of Congress and hear a debate going on and it doesn't seem to be fitting with the debate we were watching on C–SPAN on the television in our office in the 5-minute walk over here. Things have changed. And you can walk on the floor of this Congress and thinking you are coming to weigh in on the debate of H. Res. 5 and find out you are debating H.R. 3495.

Now, neither one of those bills has a name in my mind. But we have names for these bills too that help describe what it is we are debating. And we are sitting in this technological era, where I have just called for real-time access for financial reporting of the Members of Congress, but the people that are sitting in the gallery here in this House of Representatives, Madam Speaker, unless they have got some kind of ear piece in them or some kind of a BlackBerry that they are allowed to have and I don't know that they are, that can tell them what is going on here on the floor of Congress they will not know when they walk in this Chamber what this debate is all about.

They will not know the bill that is before us. They will not know the amendment we are discussing. They will not know why some of the rhetoric doesn't match the language of the bill and the intent of the subject we are talking about. They can't know, Madam Speaker, because there isn't a single sign around this Chamber that tells the people that come into the gallery to witness the people's House what it is we are actually talking about. And if a Member of Congress walks in and they have been 1 minute or 5 minutes or 10 minutes out of the loop in their walk from their office and their watching their C–SPAN camera to come over here, the bill may have changed or a bill may have been temporarily deferred. It might be a different one that is taken up. And in that transfer of that subject matter, they can't know unless they walk over here and interrupt the person or the staff and ask what are we discussing, what are we debating. What is happening. I thought I came over here to talk on H.R. 6, and instead I am over here on H.R. 3094.

The reason that we don't know that is because we don't use the simplest of technology, a technology that at least when we vote puts the number of the bill up here on either end of the Chamber, illuminates it on the wooden panels so that you can see the vote that comes up. There is no technological reason, there is no procedural reason why we can't just ask for the sunlight bill on finances, why we can't just shine the light up on the wall, a subject matter that is being debated, the number of the bill that is being debated and the name and perhaps the number of the amendment that is also under discussion at the moment. That would allow anyone who comes in off the street to witness the debate and deliberation of the people's House to immediately sit down and understand what the debate is all about and understand what the amendment is and who has got the amendment up, and they will figure out then instantly who is the proponent, who is the opponent, and the process becomes more open.

The simplest thing that should be nonpartisan, this very simple idea is not just my idea but an idea that is supported and endorsed by many. I would ask if we could submit this idea to the freshmen that have come in. Those who have come out of State legislatures understand that the technology is there and has been there for years in State legislatures. When you walk into the chamber of a State House or a State Senate almost anywhere in the country, the subject of the bill is illuminated on the wall, the bill number is illuminated on the wall, the name of the person offering the amendment and the number of the amendment is offered on the wall with a short description of the bill, the amendment, so that the public can easily see what is going on, so that the members who are elected can walk in the room and instantaneously understand the process that they have walked into and be able to pick up immediately and engage in the process.

□ 1615

That is part of the light that needs to be shined on this process, Madam Speaker. And I raise this issue up with this particular discussion because it happens to be something that is almost without cost. It should be absolutely bipartisan. In fact, it should be nonpartisan in its nature. Everyone who serves here should be interested in being able to have easy access to the process and the procedure we happen to be under. And it is something that allows the people in the gallery to understand what is happening.

Right now, it could have ''Special Order by King'' on there. They could have a little clock on there to tell me how much time I have left before the gavel drops and my time has run and expired.

But at this point I would ask the Speaker how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). The gentleman has 30 seconds.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Oh, boy. The gentleman will then immediately conclude my discussion, and I really appreciate that I have been able to bring it to that conclusion in exactly the 60 minutes that have been allowed. I appreciate

also the privilege in speaking to you, Madam Speaker.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1845

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COOPER) at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, JANUARY 9, 2007

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday next for morning hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and January 4 after 3:30 p.m. on account of the death of his daughter.

Mr. BUYER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of medical reasons.

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. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SPRATT, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, January 9, 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:

24. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Fruits and Vegetables [Docket No. 03-086-3] (RIN: 0579-AC23) received December 19, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

25. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Labor Reimbursement on DoD Non-Commercial Time-and-Materials and Labor-Hour Contracts (DFARS Case 2006-D030) (RIN: 0750-AF44) received December 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

26. A letter from the Chief Counsel/FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-B-7474] received December 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

27. A letter from the Chief Counsel/FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received December 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

28. A letter from the Chief Counsel/FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determination — received December 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

29. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting the System's final rule — Electronic Fund Transfers [Regulation E; Docket No. R-1265] received December 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

30. A letter from the Attorney, Office of Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program; Test Procedures for Certain Consumer Products and Certain Commercial and Industrial Equipment; Technical Amendment to Energy Conservation Standards for Certain Consumer Products and Certain Commercial and Industrial Equipment [Docket No. EE-RM/TP-05-500] (RIN: 1904-AB53) received December 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

31. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Acquisition Regulations — received December 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

32. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Court Orders and Legal Processes Affecting Thrift Savings Plan Accounts — received September 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

33. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — North Dakota Regulatory Program [SATS No. ND-049-FOR, Amendment No. XXXVI] received December 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

34. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Trip Limit Reduction [Docket No. 001005281-0369-02; I.D. 112006D] received December 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

35. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeastern Multispecies Fishery; 2006 Georges Bank Cod Fixed Gear Sector Operations Plan and Agreement and Allocation of Georges Bank Cod Total Allowable Catch [Docket No. 060808213-6300-02; I.D. 073106C] (RIN: 0648-AU56) received December 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

36. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No. 051014263-6028-03; I.D. 112106B] received December 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

37. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplement to Justice Department Procedures and Council on Environmental Quality Regulations to Ensure Compliance With the National Environmental Policy Act [Docket No. USMS 101] (RIN: 1105-AB13) received December 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

38. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Air Tractor, Inc. Models AT-602, AT-802, and AT-802A Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24228; Directorate Identifier 2006-CE-22-AD; Amendment 39-14805; AD 2006-22-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

39. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400, 777-200, and 777-300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-360-AD; Amendment 39-14789; AD 2006-21-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

40. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D-1, -1A, -1B, -7, -7A, -7B, -9, -9A, -11, -15, -15A, -17, -17A, -17R, -17AR, -209, -217, -217A, -217C, and -219 Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2006-25809; Directorate Identifier 2001-NE-30-AD; Amendment 39-14791; AD 2006-17-

07R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

41. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A321 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25060; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-119-AD; Amendment 39-14792; AD 2006-21-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

42. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777-200 Series Airplanes Equipped with General Electric GE90-94B Engines [Docket No. FAA-2006-26085; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-142-AD; Amendment 39-14794; AD 2006-21-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

43. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca Turmo IV A and IV C Series Turboshaft Engines [Docket No. FAA-2006-25730; Directorate Identifier 2006-NE-31-AD; Amendment 39-14796; AD 2006-21-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

44. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200, A340-200, and A340-300 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-26083; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-185-AD; Amendment 39-14793; AD 2006-21-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

45. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; AeroSpace Technologies of Australia Pty Ltd. Models N22B, N22S, and N24A Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25928; Directorate Identifier 2006-CE-53-AD; Amendment 39-14797; AD 2006-21-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

46. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca Arriel 2B Series Turboshaft Engines [Docket No. FAA-2005-23809; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-52-AD; Amendment 39-14795; AD 2006-21-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

47. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Aircraft Equipped With Honeywell Primus II RNZ-850()/-851() Integrated Navigation Units [Docket No. FAA-2005-20080; Directorate Identifier 2003-NM-193-AD; Amendment 39-14802; AD 2006-22-05] received December 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

48. A letter from the Paralegal, FTA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Controlled Substances and Alcohol Misuse Testing [Docket No. FTA-2006-24592] (RIN: 2132-AA86) received December 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

49. A letter from the FHWA Regulations Officer, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Worker Visibility [FHWA Docket No. FHWA-2005-23200] (RIN: 2125-AF11) received December 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

50. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Additional Types on Child Restraint Systems That May Be Furnished and Used on Aircraft; Corrections [Docket No. FAA-2006-25334; Amendment Nos. 125-51 and 135-106] (RIN: 2120-AI76) received December 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

51. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reservation System for Unscheduled Arrivals at Chicago's O'Hare International Airport [Docket No. FAA-2005-19411; SFAR No. 105] (RIN: 2120-AI47) received December 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

52. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oil Pollution Prevention; Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan Requirements — Amendments [EPA-HQ-OPA-2005-0001; FRL-8258-3] (RIN: 2050-AG23) received December 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

53. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NASA FAR Supplement Administrative Changes (RIN: 2700-31) received December 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

54. A letter from the Director of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of the Presumptive Period for Compensation for Gulf War Veterans (RIN: 2900-AM47) received December 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

55. A letter from the Assistant to the Secretary for Reg Policy and Mgt, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Filipino Veterans' Benefits Improvements (RIN: 2900-AK65) received December 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

56. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States — Chile Free Trade Agreement (RIN: 1505-AB47) received December 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

57. A letter from the Director of Reg. Management, Office of Regulation Policy & Mgt, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Transfer of Montgomery GI Bill-Active Duty Entitlement to Dependents (RIN: 2900-AM12) received December 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

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:

[Filed on December 15, 2006]

Mr. HUNTER: Committee on Armed Services. Report of the Activities of the Committee on Armed Services for the 109th Congress (Rept. 109–731). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[The following actions occurred on December 19, 2006]

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. In the matter of Representative James McDermott (Rept. 109–732). Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Investigation of allegations related to improper conduct involving Members and current or former House pages (Rept. 109–733). Referred to the House Calendar.

[Filed on December 21, 2006]

Mr. LEWIS of California: Committee on Appropriations. Report on Activities of the Committee on Appropriations, 109th Congress (Rept. 109–734). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. Report on Legislative and Oversight Activities of the Committee on Resources During the 109th Congress (Rept. 109–735). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

[Filed on December 22, 2006]

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Ways and Means. Report on the Legislative and Oversight Activities of the Committee on Ways and Means During the 109th Congress (Rept. 109–736). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

[Filed on December 27, 2006]

Mr. BUYER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Activities Report of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 109th Congress (Rept. 109–737). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on December 29, 2006]

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Summary of Legislative and Oversight Activities of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for the 109th Congress (Rept. 109–738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on December 29, 2006]

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia: Committee on Government Reform. Activities of the House Committee on Government Reform for the 109th Congress (Rept. 109–739). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on January 2, 2007]

Mr. MANZULLO: Committee on Small Business. Summary of Activities of the Committee on Small Business for the 109th Congress (Rept. 109–740). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on Homeland Security. Report on Legislative and Oversight Activities of the House Committee on Homeland Security During the 109th Congress (Rept. 109–741). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. Report on the Activity of the Committee on Financial Services for the 109th Congress (Rept. 109–742). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. Survey of Activities of the House Committee on

Rules, 109th Congress (Rept. 109–743). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Summary of Activities of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for the 109th Congress (Rept. 109–744). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCKEON: Committee on Education and the Workforce. Report on the Activities of the Committee on Education and the Workforce During the 109th Congress (Rept. 109–745). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on Agriculture. Report of the Committee on Agriculture on Activities During the 109th Congress (Rept. 109–746). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on International Relations. Legislative Review Activities of the Committee on International Relations, 109th Congress (Rept. 109–747). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOEHLERT: Committee on Science. Summary of Activities of the Committee on Science for the 109th Congress (Rept. 109–748). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. Report on the Activities of the Committee on the Judiciary During the 109th Congress (Rept. 109–749). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. NUSSLE: Committee on the Budget. Activities and Summary Report of the Committee on the Budget, 109th Congress (Rept. 109–750). 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 of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

[Filed on January 5, 2007]

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SKELTON, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BACA, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HARE, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HODES, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SPACE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. SUTTON, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, Mr. WYNN, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 1. A bill to provide for the implementation of the recommendations of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States; to the Committees on Homeland Security Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, Intelligence (Permanent Select), Foreign Affairs, Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Government Reform, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BACA, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HARE, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HODES, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KIND, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SPACE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. SUTTON, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Ms.

WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 2. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DENT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. BONO, Mr. STARK, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BACA, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. CARSON, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GORDON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HARE, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HODES, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KIND, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SPACE, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. SUTTON, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. WASSERMAN Schultz, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, Mr. WYNN, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 3. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human embryonic stem cell research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BACA, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GORDON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HARE, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HODES, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MITCHELL, 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. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SPACE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. SUTTON, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, Mr. WYNN, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 4. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate lower covered part D drug prices on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

[Filed on January 4, 2007]

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. MACK):

H.R. 11. A bill to reiterate that chapters 119 and 121 of title 18, United States Code, and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 are the exclusive means by which domestic electronic surveillance may be conducted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. KIRK:

H.R. 12. A bill to permit certain school districts in Illinois to be reconstituted for purposes of determining assistance under the Impact Aid program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 13. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for water supply for Rialto, Fontana, and Colton, California; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 14. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to deny retirement benefits accrued by an individual as a Member of Congress if such individual is convicted of any of certain offenses; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on 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. DINGELL:

H.R. 15. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance, 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. GILCHREST (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WYNN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 16. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve and reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. BERRY, Mr. RADANOVICH, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. REHBERG, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. RENZI, Mrs MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 17. A bill to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. RUSH (for himself, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 18. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Rosa Parks; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BONO, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. DREIER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. GOODE):

H.R. 19. A bill to require employers to conduct employment eligibility verification; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on 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. RUSH:

H.R. 20. A bill to provide for research on, and services for individuals with, postpartum depression and psychosis; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FARR (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. SAXTON):

H.R. 21. A bill to establish a national policy for our oceans, to strengthen the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to establish a national and regional ocean governance structure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, 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. COLE of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. BOREN, Mr. SAXTON, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. TURNER, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.R. 22. A bill to make appropriations for military construction and family housing projects for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 23. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to provide benefits to certain individuals who served in the United States merchant marine (including the Army Transport Service and the Naval Transport Service) during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. RADANOVICH (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 24. A bill to authorize the implementation of the San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LINDER (for himself, Mr. BOREN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Ms. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. POE, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GOODE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. STEARNS):

H.R. 25. A bill to promote freedom, fairness, and economic opportunity by repealing the income tax and other taxes, abolishing the Internal Revenue Service, and enacting a national sales tax to be administered primarily by the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself and Mr. DREIER):

H.R. 26. A bill to amend section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to impose mandatory sentencing ranges with respect to aliens who reenter the United States after having been removed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 27. A bill to designate the exclusive economic zone of the United States as the ''Ronald Wilson Reagan Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 28. A bill to transfer certain land in Riverside County, California, and San Diego County, California, from the Bureau of Land Management to the United States to be held in trust for the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 29. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct facilities to provide water for irrigation, municipal, domestic, military, and other uses from the Santa Margarita River, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. ISSA:

H.R. 30. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Eastern Municipal Water District Recycled Water System Pressurization and Expansion Project; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, and Mrs. BONO):

H.R. 31. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District Wildomar Service Area Recycled Water Distribution Facilities and Alberhill Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility Projects; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 32. A bill to provide for a credit for certain health care benefits in determining the minimum wage; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 33. A bill to provide for a credit for employers of tipped employees in determining the minimum wage required in States that require employers to pay a minimum wage at a rate higher than the Federal rate; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 34. A bill to establish a pilot program in certain United States district courts to encourage enhancement of expertise in patent cases among district judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EHLERS:

H.R. 35. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require the use of science assessments in the calculation of adequate yearly progress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EHLERS:

H.R. 36. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage teachers to pursue teaching math and science subjects at elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EHLERS:

H.R. 37. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage businesses to improve math and science education at elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EHLERS:

H.R. 38. A bill to amend the Head Start Act to improve the math and science readiness of disadvantaged children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 39. A bill to preserve the Arctic coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, as wilderness in recognition of its extraordinary natural ecosystems and for the permanent good of present and future generations of Americans; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 40. A bill to acknowledge the fundamental injustice, cruelty, brutality, and inhumanity of slavery in the United States and the 13 American colonies between 1619

and 1865 and to establish a commission to examine the institution of slavery, subsequently de jure and de facto racial and economic discrimination against African-Americans, and the impact of these forces on living African-Americans, to make recommendations to the Congress on appropriate remedies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 41. A bill to repeal the prohibition on the payment of interest on demand deposits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 42. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to continue in effect and expand the Lifeline Assistance Program and the Link Up Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 43. A bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to provide financial assistance for the development and reuse of brownfields; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 44. A bill to preserve affordable housing opportunities for low-income families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 45. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants to community-based organizations and local redevelopment agencies operating in low-income communities to promote increased access to and consumption of fresh fruits, fresh vegetables, and other healthy foods among residents of such communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and 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 Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 46. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 47. A bill to direct the Architect of the Capitol to establish and display within the Capitol Visitor Center a suitable exhibit which depicts the Congressional careers, accomplishments, and contributions of the 22 African-American Members of Congress who served during the Reconstruction and Post-Reconstruction Eras, and a suitable exhibit which acknowledges the use of slave labor in the construction of the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WELCH of Vermont:

H.R. 48. A bill to redesignate the White Rocks National Recreation Area in the State of Vermont as the ''Robert T. Stafford White Rocks National Recreation Area''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 49. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 North Frontage Road West in Vail, Colorado, as the ''Gerald R. Ford, Jr. Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 50. A bill to reauthorize the African Elephant Conservation Act and the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 51. A bill to amend titles XI and XIX of the Social Security Act to remove the cap on Medicaid payments for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa and to adjust the Medicaid statutory matching rate for those territories; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 52. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the cap on the cover over of tax on distilled spirits to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 53. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a long-term lease with the Government of the United States Virgin Islands to provide land on the island of Saint John, Virgin Islands, for the establishment of a school, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 54. A bill to expand the eligibility of individuals to qualify for loan forgiveness for teachers in order to provide additional incentives for teachers currently employed or seeking employment in economically depressed rural areas, Territories, and Indian Reservations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 55. A bill to establish the District Court of the Virgin Islands as a court under article III of the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 56. A bill to extend the supplemental security income benefits program to Guam and the United States Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 57. A bill to repeal certain sections of the Act of May 26, 1936, pertaining to the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 58. A bill to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to authorize the legislature of the Virgin Islands to create municipal governments; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 59. A bill to convey certain submerged lands to the Government of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. COOPER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 60. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the deduction of State and local general sales taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 61. A bill to amend the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 to extend the deadline for the submission of the final report of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack, to provide for the appointment of additional members for the Commission, to ensure the availability of funds for the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 62. A bill to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 to extend the deadline for the submission of the final report of the Commission on the Implementation of the New Strategic Posture of the United States, to provide for the appointment of additional members for the Commission, to ensure the availability of funds for the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 63. A bill to provide that the approved application under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the drug commonly known as RU-486 is deemed to have been withdrawn, to provide for the review by the Comptroller General of the United States of the process by which the Food and Drug Administration approved such drug, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 64. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish an independent panel to assess the homeland security needs of the National Capital Region; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MCINTYRE (for himself, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. HAYES, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WATT, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 65. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCINTYRE (for himself and Mr. HAYES):

H.R. 66. A bill to establish the SouthEast Crescent Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 67. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the outreach activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 68. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 to allow the Secretary of the Army to extend the period during which the Secretary may provide beach nourishment for a water resources development project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 69. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 5-month waiting period for entitlement to disability benefits and to eliminate reconsideration as an intervening step between initial benefit entitlement decisions and subsequent hearings on the record on such decisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 70. A bill to authorize States to regulate the receipt and disposal of out-of-State municipal solid waste; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 71. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to repeal the requirement that persons making disbursements for electioneering communications file reports on such disbursements with the Federal Election Commission and the prohibition against the making of disbursements for electioneering communications by corporations and labor organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 72. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the use of public funds for political party conventions; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 73. A bill to protect the right to obtain firearms for security, and to use firearms in defense of self, family, or home, and

to provide for the enforcement of such right; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 74. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to authorize an additional category of national trail known as a national discovery trail, to provide special requirements for the establishment and administration of national discovery trails, and to designate the cross-country American Discovery Trail as the first national discovery trail; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 75. A bill to recognize the birthdays of Presidents George Washington and Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 76. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the number vehicles for which the alternative motor vehicle credit is allowed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 77. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to change the deadline for income tax returns for calendar year taxpayers from the 15th of April to the first Monday in November; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 78. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act and title IV of the Social Security Act to provide for the denial of family classification petitions filed by an individual who owes child support arrearages; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 79. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act with respect to penalties for powder cocaine and crack cocaine offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on 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. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 80. A bill to provide for Federal research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities to enable the development of farms that are net producers of both food and energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 81. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces and Selected Reserve may transfer certain educational assistance benefits to dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. BERMAN (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BACA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REYES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WOLF, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. MOLLOHAN):

H.R. 82. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 83. A bill to amend section 42 of title 18, United States Code, popularly known as the Lacey Act, to add certain species of carp to the list of injurious species that are prohibited from being imported or shipped; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BIGGERT:

H.R. 84. A bill to establish a program of demonstration and commercial application of advanced energy efficiency technologies and systems for buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mrs. BIGGERT:

H.R. 85. A bill to provide for the establishment of centers to encourage demonstration and commercial application of advanced energy methods and technologies; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mr. KIRK):

H.R. 86. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and extend the incentives for alternative fuel vehicles and refueling property and to repeal the oil and gas production incentives added by the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BIGGERT:

H.R. 87. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve and expand education savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BIGGERT:

H.R. 88. A bill to amend title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to raise awareness of eating disorders and to create educational programs concerning the same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on 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. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 89. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend eligibility for combat-related special compensation paid to certain uniformed services retirees who are retired under chapter 61 of such title with fewer than 20 years of creditable service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. FLAKE):

H.R. 90. A bill to amend the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 to require the disclosure of the original source of funds made payable to a lobbyist who is subcontracted to engage in lobbying activities on behalf of a third person or entity, and the disclosure of the identity of that third person or entity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (for herself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 91. A bill to establish a program to provide reinsurance for State natural catastrophe insurance programs to help the United States better prepare for and protect its citizens against the ravages of natural catastrophes, to encourage and promote mitigation and prevention for, and recovery and rebuilding from such catastrophes, and to better assist in the financial recovery from such catastrophes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida:

H.R. 92. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish standards of access to care for veterans seeking health care from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida:

H.R. 93. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to protect Social Security beneficiaries against any reduction in benefits; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. CARTER:

H.R. 94. A bill to make funds available for program integrity purposes, including the data mining project, under the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 95. A bill to make funds available for fiscal years 2007 and 2008 for program integrity purposes, including the data mining project, under the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. KIRK):

H.R. 96. A bill to require criminal background checks on all firearms transactions occurring at events that provide a venue for the sale, offer for sale, transfer, or exchange of firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 97. A bill to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to reform the ethics process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Rules, and Standards of Official Conduct, 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. DREIER (for himself, Mr. REYES, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 98. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to enforce restrictions on employment in the United States of unauthorized aliens through the use of improved Social Security cards and an Employment Eligibility Database, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Homeland Security, 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. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 99. A bill to provide for the establishment of a hazardous materials cooperative research program; to the Committee on Science and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 100. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prevent veterans' contributions to education benefits from reducing Federal student financial assistance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 101. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit certain State election administration officials from actively participating in electoral campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 102. A bill to strengthen and expand scientific and technological education capabilities of associate-degree-granting colleges through the establishment of partnership arrangements with bachelor-degree-granting institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 103. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to create a presumption that disability of a Federal employee in fire protection activities caused by certain conditions is presumed to result from the performance of such employee's duty; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 104. A bill to require assurances that certain family planning service projects and programs will provide pamphlets containing the contact information of adoption centers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 105. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the suitability and feasibility of establishing the Northern Neck National Heritage Area in Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 106. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Rappahannock Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 107. A bill to define marriage for all legal purposes in the District of Columbia to consist of the union of one man and one woman; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 108. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a program to provide regulatory compliance assistance to small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 109. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to make service-disabled veterans eligible under the 8(a) business development program; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 110. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to impose limitations on wetlands mitigation activities carried out through the condemnation of private property; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KANJORSKI (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BONNER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. RADANOVICH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. DOOLITTLE):

H.R. 111. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 and the Revised Statutes of the United States to prohibit financial holding companies and national banks from engaging, directly or indirectly, in real estate brokerage or real estate management activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 112. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of stipends to veterans who pursue doctoral degrees in science or technology; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 113. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require group health plans to provide coverage for reconstructive surgery following mastectomy, consistent with the Women's Health and Cancer Rights Act of 1998; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 114. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a double deduction for a portion of an individual's State and local property taxes that are in excess of the national average; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 115. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for expenses related to the collection and storage of umbilical cord blood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 116. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the income tax forgiveness for members of the Armed Forces who die as a result of wounds, disease, or injury incurred while serving in a combat zone to include forgiveness for the last taxable year ending before the wounds, disease, or injury are incurred; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 117. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a permanent hold harmless provision for sole community hospitals under the Medicare prospective payment system for covered outpatient department services; 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 Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 118. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate prices for part D covered drugs for Medicare beneficiaries; 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 Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 119. A bill to require that health plans provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for mastectomies, lumpectomies, and lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer and coverage for secondary consultations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and 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 Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 120. A bill to reform Federal procedures relating to intercountry adoption; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. DOYLE (for himself and Mrs. BONO):

H.R. 121. A bill to improve efficiency in the Federal Government through the use of high-performance green buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Science and Technology, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. DREIER (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 122. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Inland Empire regional recycling project and in the Cucamonga Valley Water District recycling project; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 123. A bill to authorize appropriations for the San Gabriel Basin Restoration Fund; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Ms. HERSETH):

H.R. 124. A bill to require the prompt issuance by the Secretary of Agriculture of

regulations to restore integrity to the payment limitation requirements applicable to commodity payments and benefits, to reduce waste, fraud, and abuse related to the receipt of commodity payments and benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 125. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the number of Iraqi and Afghan translators in the United States Armed Forces who may be provided status as special immigrants; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 126. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow loans from individual retirement plans for qualified small business capital assets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 127. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to increase the mortgage amount limits applicable to FHA mortgage insurance for multifamily housing located in high-cost areas; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 128. A bill to amend the Federal Education Right to Privacy Act to improve the access of the victims of crimes to information concerning the outcome of disciplinary proceedings by institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. ROTHMAN):

H.R. 129. A bill to direct the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to designate New Jersey Task Force 1 as part of the National Urban Search and Rescue System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. ROTHMAN):

H.R. 130. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to make grants to first responders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Judiciary, 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. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 131. A bill to impose a mandatory minimum sentence on a deportable alien who fails to depart or fails to attend a removal proceeding; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 132. A bill to impose a criminal penalty on an alien who fails voluntarily to depart the United States after securing permission to do so, or who unlawfully returns to the United States after voluntarily departing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 133. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to deny citizenship at birth to children born in the United States of parents who are not citizens or permanent resident aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 134. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to deny visas and admission to aliens who have been unlawfully present in the United States for more than 6 months; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDER (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 135. A bill to establish the Twenty-First Century Water Commission to study and develop recommendations for a comprehensive water strategy to address future water needs; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 136. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that individuals and appropriate authorities are notified by the Commissioner of Social Security of evidence of misuse of the Social Security account numbers of such individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland):

H.R. 137. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen prohibitions against animal fighting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 138. A bill to require an employer to take action after receiving official notice that an individual's Social Security account number does not match the individual's name, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 139. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit for the purchase of idling reduction systems for diesel-powered on-highways vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 140. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the amounts reimbursed to institutional providers of health care services under the TRICARE program to be the same as amounts reimbursed under Medicare, and to require the Secretary of Defense to contract for health care services with at least one teaching hospital in urban areas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 141. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to revise regulations concerning the recording and reporting of occupational injuries and illnesses under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 142. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to require the arbitration of initial contract negotiation disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 143. A bill to provide for the security of critical energy infrastructure; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 144. A bill to amend the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to allow States and localities to provide primary and preventive care to all individuals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 145. A bill to amend section 1369 of title 18, United States Code, to extend Federal jurisdiction over destruction of veterans' memorials on State or local government property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 146. A bill to provide Capitol-flown flags to the families of deceased law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 147. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt elementary and secondary schools from the fee imposed on employers filing petitions with respect to non-immigrant workers under the H-1B program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 148. A bill to require the Surface Transportation Board to consider certain issues when deciding whether to authorize the construction of a railroad line; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 149. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 150. A bill to prevent the nondisclosure of employer-owned life insurance coverage of employees as an unfair trade practice under the Federal Trade Commission Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on 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. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 151. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure that projects funded through the National Institutes of Health comply with wage rate requirements commonly referred to as the ''Davis-Bacon Act'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 152. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act and title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide comprehensive coverage for childhood immunization; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 153. A bill to provide that no more than 50 percent of funding made available under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 for any fiscal year be provided for home heating purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 154. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to phase out the 24-month waiting period for disabled individuals to become eligible for Medicare benefits, to eliminate the waiting period for individuals with life-threatening conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Ms. HERSETH:

H.R. 155. A bill to provide compensation to the Lower Brule and Crow Creek Sioux Tribes of South Dakota for damage to tribal land caused by Pick-Sloan projects along the Missouri River; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HOLDEN:

H.R. 156. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of dependency and indemnity compensation to the survivors of former prisoners of war who died on or before September 30, 1999, under the same eligibility conditions as apply to payment of dependency and indemnity compensation to the survivors of former prisoners of war who die after that date; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 157. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to conduct a study on the potential fuel savings from intelligent transportation systems that help businesses and consumers to plan their travel and avoid delays; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 158. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the battlefields of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 159. A bill to establish the American Veterans Congressional Internship Program; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 160. A bill to amend the American Battlefield Protection Act of 1996 to establish a battlefield acquisition grant program for the acquisition and protection of nationally significant battlefields and associated sites of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 161. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Minidoka Internment National Monument to include the Nidoto Nai Yoni Memorial in Bainbridge Island, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JINDAL:

H.R. 162. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Barataria Preserve Unit of the Jean Lafitte National Historical Park and Preserve in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JINDAL:

H.R. 163. A bill to make permanent marriage penalty relief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JINDAL:

H.R. 164. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the creation of disaster protection funds by property and casualty insurance companies for the payment of policyholders' claims arising from future catastrophic events; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JINDAL:

H.R. 165. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the depreciation recovery period for roof systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 166. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to reform funding for the Seniors Farmers' Market Nutrition Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 167. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide financial assistance for the construction, improvement, and rehabilitation of farmers markets; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 168. A bill to amend section 207 of title 18, United States Code, to further restrict Federal officers and employees from representing or advising foreign entities after leaving Government service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 169. A bill to require that, in cases in which the annual trade deficit between the United States and another country is $10,000,000,000 or more for 3 consecutive years, the President take the necessary steps to create a more balanced trading relationship with that country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 170. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 and the Rules of the House of Representatives to strengthen financial disclosures and to require precertification of privately-funded travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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 Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 171. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants to States for assistance in hiring additional school-based mental health and student service providers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 172. A bill to assist teachers and public safety officers in obtaining affordable housing; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 173. A bill to protect innocent elderly and disabled tenants in public housing and housing assisted under the rental assistance program under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 from eviction by reason of criminal activity; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 174. A bill to reauthorize the public and assisted housing drug elimination program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 175. A bill to provide assistance to combat HIV/AIDS in India, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 176. A bill to authorize assistance to the countries of the Caribbean to fund educational development and exchange programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 177. A bill to provide that no funds made available to the Department of the Treasury may be used to implement, administer, or enforce regulations to require specific licenses for travel-related transactions directly related to educational activities in Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 178. A bill to reduce the spread of sexually transmited infections in correctional facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 179. A bill to confirm the jurisdiction of the Consumer Product Safety Commission with respect to releasing systems on residential window bars and to establish a consumer product safety standard ensuring that all such bars include a quick-release mechanism; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, 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 Ms. LEE:

H.R. 180. A bill to require the identification of companies that conduct business operations in Sudan, to prohibit United States Government contracts with such companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Ms. LEE:

H.R. 181. A bill to provide for the issuance of a semipostal to benefit the Peace Corps; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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 Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California:

H.R. 182. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an excise tax on automobiles sold in the United States that are not alternative fueled automobiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on 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. MELANCON:

H.R. 183. A bill to authorize the project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Morganza to the Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MELANCON (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. MCCRERY):

H.R. 184. A bill to extend for 1 year the availability of supplemental social services block grant funding; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

H.R. 185. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to provide compensation for certain livestock losses; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

H.R. 186. A bill to authorize the construction of the Arkansas Valley Conduit in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H.R. 187. A bill 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''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. SIRES):

H.R. 188. A bill to provide a new effective date for the applicability of certain provisions of law to Public Law 105-331; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. SIRES):

H.R. 189. A bill to establish the Paterson Great Falls National Park in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. WAMP, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 190. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide prospectively that wages earned, and self-employment income derived, by individuals who are not citizens or nationals of the United States shall not be credited for coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under such title, and to provide the President with authority to enter into agreements with other nations taking into account such limitation on crediting of wages and self-employment income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. CANNON, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 191. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the inclusion in gross income of Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. FEENEY, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 192. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 1993 increase in taxes on Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 193. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make higher education more affordable by providing a full tax deduction for higher education expenses and interest on student loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 194. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the purchase of prescription drugs by individuals who have attained retirement age, and to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the importation of prescription drugs and the sale of such drugs through Internet sites; 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. PAUL (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. CULBERSON):

H.R. 195. A bill to provide greater health care freedom for seniors; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on 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. POMEROY (for himself and Mr. HULSHOF):

H.R. 196. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent certain tax incentives for ethanol and biodiesel used as a fuel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. WAMP):

H.R. 197. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 5-year extension of the credit for electricity produced from certain renewable resources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REGULA:

H.R. 198. A bill to provide for the retention of the name of Mount McKinley; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RENZI:

H.R. 199. A bill to designate segments of Fossil Creek, a tributary to the Verde River in the State of Arizona, as wild and scenic rivers; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROTHMAN:

H.R. 200. A bill to enable America's schools to use their computer hardware to increase student achievement and prepare students for the 21st century workplace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROTHMAN:

H.R. 201. A bill to authorize 150,000 incremental vouchers for tenant-based rental assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to help meet the housing needs of low-income families; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROTHMAN:

H.R. 202. A bill to authorize the renewal of tenant-based rental assistance vouchers under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROTHMAN:

H.R. 203. A bill to amend Federal crime grant programs relating to domestic violence to encourage States and localities to implement gun confiscation policies, reform stalking laws, create integrated domestic violence courts, and hire additional personnel for entering protection orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROTHMAN:

H.R. 204. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct a feasibility study for applying airport bubbles as a method of identifying, assessing, and reducing the adverse environmental impacts of airport ground and flight operations and improving the overall quality of the environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. SAXTON (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 205. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the annual enrollment periods of the Medicare prescription drug benefit program and under the Medicare Advantage program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on 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. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 206. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to provide greater access to the food stamp program by reducing duplicative and burdensome administrative requirements, authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to award grants to certain community-based nonprofit feeding and anti-hunger groups for the purpose of establishing and implementing a Beyond the Soup Kitchen Pilot Program for certain socially and economically disadvantaged populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 207. A bill to provide for identification of members of the Armed Forces exposed during military service to depleted uranium, to provide for health testing of such members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 208. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to expand the fruit and vegetable pilot program to 5 States, including New York, and to include Head Start programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 209. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to be used to recruit, hire, and train 100,000 new classroom paraprofessionals in order to improve educational achievement for children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 210. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to waive the requirement for proof of citizenship during first year of life for children born in the United States to a Medicaid-eligible mother; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. HOOLEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. LEE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. COOPER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. GERLACH):

H.R. 211. A bill to facilitate nationwide availability of 2-1-1 telephone service for information and referral on health and human services, including volunteer services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 212. A bill to permit members of the House of Representatives to donate used computer equipment to public elementary and secondary schools designated by the members; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 213. A bill to provide discretionary authority to an immigration judge to determine that an alien parent of a United States citizen child should not be ordered removed from the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 214. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating Oak Point and North Brother Island in the Bronx in the State of New York as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 215. A bill to amend the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the egg, meat, and poultry inspection laws to ensure that consumers receive notification regarding food products produced from crops, livestock, or poultry raised on land on which sewage sludge was applied; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. SERRANO:

H.R. 216. A bill to waive certain prohibitions with respect to nationals of Cuba coming to the United States to play organized professional baseball; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. SERRANO:

H.R. 217. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and Agriculture, 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. SERRANO:

H.R. 218. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow taxpayers to designate income tax overpayments as contributions to the United States Library Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on 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. PAUL (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. MICA):

H.R. 219. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to ensure the integrity of the Social Security trust funds by requiring the Managing Trustee to invest the annual surplus of such trust funds in marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States and certificates of deposit in depository institutions insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and to protect such trust funds from the public debt limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H.R. 220. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect the integrity and confidentiality of Social Security account numbers issued under such title, to prohibit the establishment in the Federal Government of any uniform national identifying number, and to prohibit Federal agencies from imposing standards for identification of individuals on other agencies or persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on 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. SIMPSON:

H.R. 221. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the appointment of additional Federal circuit judges, to divide the Ninth Judicial Circuit of the United States into two circuits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 222. A bill to promote the economic development and recreational use of National Forest System lands and other public lands in central Idaho, to designate the Boulder-White Cloud Management Area to ensure the continued management of certain National Forest System lands and Bureau of Land Management lands for recreational and grazing use and conservation and resource protection, to add certain National Forest System lands and Bureau of Land Management lands in central Idaho to the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Mr. RENZI):

H.R. 223. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make grants to nonprofit tax-exempt organizations for the purchase of ultrasound equipment to provide free examinations to pregnant women needing such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 224. A bill to provide that no Federal funds may be used for the design, renovation, construction, or rental of any headquarters for the United Nations in any location in the United States unless the President transmits to Congress a certification that the United Nations has adopted internationally-recognized best practices in contracting and procurement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Ms. WESTMORELAND, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 225. A bill to withhold United States funding from the United Nations Human Rights Council; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 226. 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 227. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for amounts paid for health insurance and prescription drug costs of individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 228. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income certain interest amounts received by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 229. A bill to provide that no automatic pay adjustment for Members of Congress shall be made in the year following a fiscal year in which there is a Federal budget deficit; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on 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. STEARNS:

H.R. 230. A bill to create a commission to develop a plan for establishing a Museum of Ideas; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. TERRY (for himself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 231. A bill to authorize an additional district judgeship for the district of Nebraska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 232. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to deny Federal retirement benefits to individuals convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 233. A bill to establish a grant and fee program through the Environmental Protection Agency to encourage and promote the recycling of used computers and to promote the development of a national infrastructure for the recycling of used computers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. FARR, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 234. A bill to make funds available for Pacific Salmon emergency disaster assistance; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 235. A bill to allow for the renegotiation of the payment schedule of contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and the Redwood Valley County Water District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 236. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to create a Bureau of Reclamation partnership with the North Bay Water Reuse Authority and other regional partners to achieve objectives relating to water supply, water quality, and environmental restoration; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 237. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to exempt airports in economically depressed communities from matching grant obligations under the airport improvement program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 238. A bill to repeal a prohibition on the use of certain funds for tunneling in certain areas with respect to the Los Angeles to San Fernando Valley Metro Rail project, California; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico:

H.R. 239. A bill to increase the Federal minimum wage and to provide an alternative

minimum wage as an incentive to an employer to provide health care and child care benefits; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. DRAKE, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MACK, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MICA, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SALI, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WAMP, Ms. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. EVERETT, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. UPTON, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. WELLER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, and Mr. BARTON of Texas):

H.J. Res. 1. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.J. Res. 2. A joint resolution proposing an amendment the Constitution of the United States regarding presidential election voting rights for residents of all United States territories and commonwealths; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 3. A joint resolution to acknowledge a long history of official depredations and ill-conceived policies by the United States Government regarding Indian tribes and offer an apology to all Native Peoples on behalf of the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.J. Res. 4. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college and to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.J. Res. 5. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to limitations on the amounts of contributions and expenditures that may be made in connection with campaigns for election to public office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 6. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the number of persons in each State who are citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

H.J. Res. 7. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.J. Res. 8. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal the twenty-second article of amendment, thereby removing the limitation on the number of terms an individual may serve as President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution regarding consent to assemble outside the seat of government; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that schools in the United States should honor the contributions of individuals from the territories of the United States by including such contributions in the teaching of United States history; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue commemorative postage stamps honoring Americans who have distinguished themselves by their service in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution urging increased Federal funding for juvenile (Type 1) diabetes research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina):

H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the designation and goals of ''Hire a Veteran Week'' and encouraging the President to issue a proclamation supporting those goals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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 Ms. KAPTUR:

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Supreme Court misinterpreted the First Amendment to the Constitution in the case of Buckley v. Valeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution calling on the League of Arab States to acknowledge the genocide in the Darfur region of Sudan and to step up their efforts to stop the genocide in Darfur; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE:

H. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring victims of HIV/AIDS and recognizing the struggle to prevent and treat HIV/AIDS in the United States and throughout the world; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. CARSON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. WEINER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. COOPER):

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring former Representative Shirley Chisholm, and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LEE:

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the tax give away since 2001 to the wealthiest 5 percent of Americans should be repealed and those monies instead invested in vital programs to relieve the growing burden on the working poor and to alleviate poverty in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution entitled the ''English Plus Resolution''; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Ms. WESTMORELAND):

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution requiring the display of the Ten Commandments in the United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H. Res. 1. A resolution electing officers of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 2. A resolution to inform the Senate that a quorum of the House has assembled and of the election of the Speaker and the Clerk; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 3. A resolution authorizing the Speaker to appoint a committee to notify the President of the assembly of the Congress; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Res. 4. A resolution authorizing the Clerk to inform the President of the election of the Speaker and the Clerk; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H. Res. 5. A resolution providing for the consideration of the resolution (H.Res. 6) adopting the Rules of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred Tenth Congress; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 6. A resolution adopting the Rules of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred Tenth Congress.

By Mr. EMANUEL:

H. Res. 7. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PUTNAM:

H. Res. 8. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PUTNAM:

H. Res. 9. A resolution providing for the designation of certain minority employees; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H. Res. 10. A resolution fixing the daily hour of meeting of the First Session of the One Hundred Tenth Congress; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 11. A resolution expressing profound sorrow on the occasion of the death of the Honorable Gerald R. Ford, thirty-eighth President of the United States of America; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland (for himself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H. Res. 12. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States, in collaboration with other international allies, should establish an energy project with the magnitude, creativity, and sense of urgency that was incorporated in the ''Man on the Moon'' project address the inevitable challenges of ''Peak Oil''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BIGGERT:

H. Res. 13. A resolution encouraging increased public awareness of eating disorders and expanded research for treatment and cures; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

H. Res. 14. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to curtail the growth of Government programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EHLERS (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. WALBERG):

H. Res. 15. A resolution mourning the passing of President Gerald Rudolph Ford and celebrating his leadership and service to the people of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H. Res. 16. A resolution recognizing Virginia's James River as ''America's Founding River''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H. Res. 17. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a National Inflammary Skin Disease Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GOODE (for himself, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. FEENEY, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia):

H. Res. 18. A resolution expressing disapproval by the House of Representatives of the totalization agreement between the United States and Mexico signed by the Commissioner of Social Security and the Director General of the Mexican Social Security Institute on June 29, 2004; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H. Res. 19. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning health promotion and disease prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H. Res. 20. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should issue a postage stamp commemorating Juan Nepomuceno Seguin; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JINDAL:

H. Res. 21. A resolution to honor and recognize the achievements of Craig Webre for his 15 years of dedicated service as Sheriff of Lafourche Parish, Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H. Res. 22. A resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives of the Social Security totalization agreement between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE:

H. Res. 23. A resolution disavowing the doctrine of preemption; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. DREIER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. REYES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. WATSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama):

H. Res. 24. A resolution establishing the House Democracy Assistance Commission for the One Hundred Tenth Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROTHMAN (for himself and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H. Res. 25. A resolution calling on the Board of Directors of the National High School Mock Trial Championship to accommodate students of all religious faiths; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H. Res. 26. A resolution commending the Boise State University Broncos football team for winning the 2007 Fiesta Bowl and completing an undefeated season; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H. Res. 27. A resolution to institute a Pay-As-You-Go rule in the House of Representatives for the 110th Congress; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. SPRATT:

H. Res. 28. A resolution to institute a reconciliation rule in the House of Representatives for the 110th Congress; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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.

[Filed on January 5, 2007]

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mrs. DRAKE):

H.R. 241. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve access and choice for entrepreneurs with small businesses with respect to medical care for their employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 242. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide each American child with a KidSave Account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 243. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the payment of Combat-Related Special Compensation to members of the Armed Forces retired for disability with less than 20 years of active military service who were awarded the Purple Heart; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 244. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income for certain education and training expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 245. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain amounts paid for exercise equipment and physical fitness programs as amounts paid for medical care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 246. A bill to conduct a study evaluating whether there are correlations between the commission of methamphetamine crimes and identity theft crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. WU, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon):

H.R. 247. A bill to designate a Forest Service trail at Waldo Lake in the Willamette National Forest in the State of Oregon as a national recreation trail in honor of Jim Weaver, a former Member of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SHAYS, and Mrs. DRAKE):

H.R. 248. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to revise the regulations regarding the Do-not-call registry to prohibit politically-oriented recorded message telephone calls to telephone numbers listed on that registry; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 249. A bill to restore the prohibition on the commercial sale and slaughter of wild free-roaming horses and burros; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. EHLERS (for himself and Mr. GILCHREST):

H.R. 250. A bill to provide for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. BARTON of Texas):

H.R. 251. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit manipulation of caller identification information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 252. A bill to create a separate DNA database for violent predators against children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 253. A bill to increase the evidentiary standard required to convict a person for a drug offense, to require screening of law enforcement officers or others acting under color of law participating in drug task forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 254. A bill to enhance Federal enforcement of hate crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EHLERS:

H.R. 255. A bill to establish an interagency committee to coordinate Federal manufacturing research and development efforts in

manufacturing, strengthen existing programs to assist manufacturing innovation and education, and expand outreach programs for small and medium-sized manufacturers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 256. A bill to prevent children's access to firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 257. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals reimbursed under the Medicare system to establish and implement security procedures to reduce the likelihood of infant patient abduction and baby switching, including procedures for identifying all infant patients in the hospital in a manner that ensures that it will be evident if infants are missing from the hospital; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, 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 Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 258. A bill to provide for the collection of data on traffic stops; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 259. A bill to provide for the establishment of a task force within the Bureau of Justice Statistics to gather information about, study, and report to the Congress regarding, incidents of abandonment of infant children; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on 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. EHLERS:

H.R. 260. A bill to establish marine and freshwater research, development, and demonstration programs to support efforts to prevent, control, and eradicate invasive species, as well as to educate citizens and stakeholders and restore ecosystems; to the Committee on Science and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Natural Resources, and House Administration, 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 Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 261. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an alternate release date for certain nonviolent offenders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 262. A bill to require the Secretary of Education to conduct a study and submit to Congress a report on methods for identifying and treating children with dyslexia in kindergarten through third grade; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 263. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a program to award grants to institutions of higher education for the establishment or expansion of cybersecurity professional development programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Homeland Security, 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 Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 264. A bill to prevent the President from encroaching upon the Congressional prerogative to make laws; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 265. A bill to provide for the establishment of an independent, Presidentially-appointed Commission to assess the circumstances related to the damage caused by Hurricane Katrina on or between Friday, August 26, 2005, and Tuesday, August 30, 2005; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 266. A bill to authorize the President to posthumously award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to the seven members of the crew of the space shuttle Columbia in recognition of their outstanding and enduring contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 267. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to repeal the restriction on the jurisdiction of courts, justices, and judges to hear or consider applications for writs of habeas corpus filed by or on behalf of certain aliens detained by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 268. A bill to amend the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the agencies and actors responsible for the administration of such compensation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on 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. BOREN (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 269. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Defense to prohibit the unauthorized use of names and images of members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 270. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2008 through 2010 for the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, 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 Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida:

H.R. 271. A bill to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act to extend the applicability of such Act to individuals determined to have a mental capacity of less than 18 years of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAMP of Michigan:

H.R. 272. A bill to require amounts remaining in Members' representational allowances at the end of a fiscal year to be used for deficit reduction or to reduce the Federal debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CAMP of Michigan (for himself and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H.R. 273. A bill to repeal the sunset of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 with respect to the expansion of the adoption credit and adoption assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 274. A bill to impose certain limitations on the receipt of out-of-State municipal solid waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 275. A bill to promote freedom of expression on the Internet, to protect United States businesses from coercion to participate in repression by authoritarian foreign governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on 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. CAPPS:

H.R. 276. A bill to designate the Piedras Blancas Light Station and the surrounding public land as an Outstanding Natural Area to be administered as a part of the National Landscape Conservation System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 277. A bill to prohibit the use of amounts in a Members' Representational Allowance to provide any vehicle which does not use alternative fuels; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. CUBIN (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. KIND, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H.R. 278. A bill to amend section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that funds received as universal service contributions and the universal service support programs established pursuant to that section are not subject to certain provisions of title 31, United States Code, commonly known as the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CUBIN:

H.R. 279. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for Congressional oversight and approval of totalization agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 280. A bill to establish a pilot program to encourage certification of teachers in low-income, low-performing public elementary and secondary schools by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 281. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to allow all eligible voters to vote by mail in Federal elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 282. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for second opinions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and 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 Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 283. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans permit enrollees direct access to services of obstetrical and gynecological physician services directly and without a referral; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and 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. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 284. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the issuance of a prisoner-of-war medal to civilian employees of the Federal Government who, during war or under wartime conditions, are taken captive by armed forces or agents of a foreign government hostile to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 285. A bill to establish the Steel Industry National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. EHLERS:

H.R. 286. A bill to amend the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 to require Federal agencies to impose certain requirements on recipients of awards for scientific and engineering research; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 287. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit to certain senior citizens for premiums paid for coverage under Medicare Part B; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 288. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for an improved benefit computation formula for workers affected by the changes in benefit computation rules enacted in the Social Security Amendments of 1977 who attain age 65 during the 10-year period after 1981 and before 1992 (and related beneficiaries) and to provide prospectively for increases in their benefits accordingly; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 289. A bill to protect the religious freedom of providers of adoption or foster care services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 290. A bill to prevent ineligibility for supplemental security income benefits by reason of an increase in the Federal minimum wage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLMOR:

H.R. 291. A bill to establish a National Sex Offender Risk Classification Task Force to create guidelines for the establishment of a risk-based sex offender classification system for use in sex offender registries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FARR, Ms. HOOLEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KIND, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 292. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to reform funding for the Seniors Farmers' Market Nutrition Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. FARR, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KIND, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 293. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide financial assistance for the construction, improvement, and rehabilitation of farmers markets; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 294. A bill to prohibit the entry into any bilateral or regional trade agreement, and to prohibit negotiations to enter into any such agreement, for a period of 2 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 295. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a national cemetery for veterans in the Pikes Peak region of Colorado; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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 Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 296. A bill to specify that the 100 most populous urban areas of the United States, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall be eligible for grants under the Urban Area Security Initiative of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 297. A bill to improve the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 298. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow amounts in a health flexible spending arrangement that are unused during a plan year to be carried over to the next plan year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 299. A bill to adjust the boundary of Lowell National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. POE, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.R. 300. A bill to limit the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 301. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to establish standards for the distribution of voter registration application forms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 302. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to prohibit a State receiving payments under such Act from using the payments for public communications which promote or oppose a candidate for public office or political party; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 303. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain additional retired members of the Armed Forces 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 and to eliminate the phase-in period under current law with respect to such concurrent receipt; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. PEARCE (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. DOOLITTLE):

H.R. 304. A bill to establish guidelines and incentives for States to establish criminal drug dealer registries and to require the Attorney General to establish a national criminal drug dealer registry and notification program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 305. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from paroling into the United States an alien who falls ill while seeking admission at a port of entry or seeks emergency medical assistance by approaching an agent or official of the Department of Homeland Security at or near a border; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 306. A bill to provide for an initial period of admission of 36 months for aliens employed as dairy workers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 307. A bill to impose limitations on the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to claim title or other rights to water absent specific direction of law or to abrogate, injure, or otherwise impair any right to the use of any quantity of water; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 308. A bill to clarify congressional intent with respect to the nature of rights-of-way granted and accepted under former section 2477 of the Revised Statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 309. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a demonstration program to facilitate landscape restoration programs within certain units of the National Park System established by law to preserve and interpret resources associated with American history, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 310. A bill to amend the National Park Service Concessions Management Improvement Act of 1998, to extend to additional small businesses the preferential right to renew a concessions contract entered into under such Act, to facilitate the renewal of a commercial use authorization granted under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 311. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for the original appointment of a retired member of the Armed Forces to a border patrol agent position, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself, Mr. NORWOOD, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 312. A bill to authorize the presentation of flags at the funerals of civilian Federal employees engaged in the support of military operations who have died in combat zones in the course of their duties; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 313. A bill to promote greater access to air transportation for all persons; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 314. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, relating to the assurance required of owners and operators of airports

with respect to long-term leases for construction of hangars; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 315. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with community health care providers to improve access to health care for veterans in highly rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 316. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the village of Santa Clara, the city of Bayard, or the county of Grant, in the State of New Mexico, in tracts of not less than 40 acres, at market price at its present state of use as agricultural grazing lands as determined by the Secretary, for business and community development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. SALAZAR:

H.R. 317. A bill to authorize the construction of the Arkansas Valley Conduit in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 318. A bill to amend the Impact Aid program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve the distribution of school construction payments to better meet the needs of military and Indian land school districts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. MCCRERY):

H.R. 319. A bill to establish the Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.J. Res. 9. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress and the States to prohibit the act of desecration of the flag of the United States and to set criminal penalties for that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.J. Res. 10. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for a balanced budget for the United States Government and for greater accountability in the enactment of tax legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.J. Res. 11. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to voluntary school prayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need to prevent the closure or consolidation of post offices; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution expressing that Congress has the sole and exclusive power to declare war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Government of Iraq should not grant blanket amnesty to persons known to have attacked, killed, or wounded members of the United States Armed Forces in Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution congratulating Prime Minister Portia Simpson-Miller for becoming the first democratically-elected female Prime Minister of Jamaica and the first female Jamaican head of state; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the people of the United States should grieve for the loss of life that defined the Third Reich and celebrate the continued education efforts for tolerance and justice, reaffirming the commitment of the United States to the fight against intolerance and prejudice in any form, and honoring the legacy of transparent procedure, government accountability, the rule of law, the pursuit of justice, and the struggle for universal freedom and human rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of George Thomas ''Mickey'' Leland; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. KELLER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H. Res. 29. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Mentoring Month 2007; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H. Res. 30. A resolution recognizing the historic steps India and Pakistan have taken toward achieving bilateral peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H. Res. 31. A resolution recognizing the Honorable Andrew L. Jefferson, Jr., on the occasion of the establishment of an endowment for trial advocacy called the ''Andrew L. Jefferson Endowment for Trial Advocacy'' at Texas Southern University's Thurgood Marshall School of Law in Houston, Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H. Res. 32. A resolution denouncing the practices of female genital mutilation, domestic violence, ''honor'' killings, acid burning, dowry deaths, and other gender-based persecutions and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that participation, protection, recognition, and independence of women is crucial to achieving a just, moral, and honorable society; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GILLMOR:

H. Res. 33. A resolution recognizing the thousands of Freemasons in every State in the Nation and honoring them for their many contributions to the Nation throughout its history; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H. Res. 34. A resolution recognizing the 75th birthday of Desmond Mpilo Tutu, South African Anglican Archbishop of Cape wn, and Nobel Peace Prize recipient; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OBEY:

H. Res. 35. A resolution to enhance intelligence oversight authority; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H. Res. 36. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should declare its support for the independence of Kosova; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SOLIS:

H. Res. 37. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that all workers deserve fair treatment and safe working conditions, and honoring Dolores Huerta for her commitment to the improvement of working conditions for farm worker families and the rights of women and children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTRODUCING THE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARY TAX REDUCTION ACT AND THE SENIOR CITIZENS' TAX ELIMINATION ACT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce two pieces of legislation to reduce taxes on senior citizens. The first bill, the Social Security Beneficiary Tax Reduction Act, repeals the 1993 tax increase on Social Security benefits. Repealing this increase on Social Security benefits is a good first step toward reducing the burden imposed by the federal government on senior citizens. However, imposing any tax on Social Security benefits is unfair and illogical. This is why I am also introducing the Senior Citizens' Tax Elimination Act, which repeals all taxes on Social Security benefits.

Since Social Security benefits are financed with tax dollars, taxing these benefits is yet another example of double taxation. Furthermore, ''taxing'' benefits paid by the government is merely an accounting trick, a shell game which allows Members of Congress to reduce benefits by subterfuge. This allows Congress to continue using the Social Security trust fund as a means of financing other government programs, and masks the true size of the federal deficit.

Instead of imposing ridiculous taxes on senior citizens, Congress should ensure the integrity of the Social Security trust fund by ending the practice of using trust fund monies for other programs. This is why I am also introducing the Social Security Preservation Act, which ensures that all money in the Social Security trust fund is spent solely on Social Security. At a time when Congress' inability to control spending is once again threatening the Social Security trust fund, the need for this legislation has never been greater. When the government taxes Americans to fund Social Security, it promises the American people that the money will be there for them when they retire. Congress has a moral obligation to keep that promise.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to help free senior citizens from oppressive taxation by supporting my Senior Citizens' Tax Elimination Act and my Social Security Beneficiary Tax Reduction Act. I also urge my colleagues to ensure that moneys from the Social Security trust fund are used solely for Social Security benefits and not wasted on frivolous government programs.

TRIBUTE TO WALTER THEOPHILUS LUNSFORD, SR.

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a great man and outstanding citizen who passed away on December 28, 2006.

Walter Theophilus Lunsford, Sr. passed away at the age of 90 years old in Columbus, Ga., the city where he was born, raised, and spent much of his life making an impact as a businessman, family man and positive contributor to the community.

Success came early in Mr. Lunsford's life and he never let it go. After graduating as valedictorian from Spencer High School in 1933, he furthered his academic pursuits at Fisk University where as a physics major, he pledged Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity. Later, he became a charter member of the Eta Theta Chapter at Columbus State University, as well as the Columbus Alumni Chapter.

Mr. Lunsford first developed his business acumen by working in the family grocery store. He learned entrepreneurship first-hand as his parents expanded their business into real-estate, building houses at a time when public housing did not exist. He later built on that knowledge at the University of Chicago, studying business administration and international relations.

In the early 1940's, Mr. Lunsford carried his initial business experience into his own ventures, first as the sole owner and proprietor of Fox Deluxe Wholesale Beer Distributing Company and later, as the first black owner of a Georgia taxicab company. At the peak of its operation, he employed over 100 blacks between the Checker, Blue Bird and Red Bird Taxicab Companies. Since much of his clientele was comprised of black soldiers stationed at Fort Benning, his business filled both a social and economic void for members of the local community.

Mr. Lunsford did not stop there—as an offshoot to his taxicab business, he opened a Shell Service Station. Eventually, he closed his taxi business and opened a full auto station and grocery store, a forerunner to the modem convenience store. Along the way, he found a way to integrate his love of entertainment by opening the Pierce Amusement Company, leasing coin-operated vending and game machines to other establishments.

Above all, Mr. Walter Lunsford was a successful, well-respected entrepreneur who placed God and family first. For 62 years, he accomplished it all with his wife, Sally Bryant Lunsford, at his side. Together they raised their ten college-educated children, an accomplishment in itself.

Today, we thank and honor Mr. Lunsford, not only for his contributions to Columbus, but also for the example he set for others. He will be remembered as an inspirational figure to not only those in Columbus, but to all who have the opportunity to learn about his life.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO HAROLD LEE MEYER

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Harold Lee Meyer who passed away on December 14, 2006.

Born in Paullina, Iowa on January 1, 1927, Harold settled in Littleton, Colorado with his wife of 55 years, Natalie Meyer. After spending his career in the savings and loan industry, Harold used his retirement to give back to his community. Harold was active in both local and state pursuits, having served as a member of the Denver General Hospital Board and as director of Good Shepherd Lutheran Home of the West. As a member of the Littleton City Council and as mayor of the City of Littleton, Harold enriched and improved countless lives. His other philanthropic pursuits included being a member of DRCOG, a volunteer at the Denver Museum of Nature and Science, a driver for the Red Cross, and being an active member of the Bethlehem Lutheran Church community.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to honor the life and legacy of Harold Lee Meyer. His professional success and dedication to community should serve as an example to us all. Harold dedicated his life to enriching the lives of those around him. I applaud all his efforts; he was truly a distinguished humanitarian and will be profoundly missed.

MONTGOMERY GI BILL

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address an inequity facing America's men and women in uniform who seek an education in return for their military service.

For years, the Montgomery GI Bill (MGIB) has allowed thousands of men and women in uniform attend college or to receive vocational training to prepare for a new career after the military.

It is an excellent program and one we must preserve.

However, Madam Speaker, I would like to remedy an inequity that exists in this program with legislation I am introducing today.

To receive the benefits of the Montgomery GI Bill, our service members must pay into the program at the beginning of their military service.

A $100 is deducted each month from their military pay for the first 12 months.

With the legislation I offer today, our service members would still make the initial contribution. However, this contribution would no longer count against them later on when they apply for federal student aid.

In many cases, Madam Speaker, the Montgomery GI Bill alone does not cover the cost for college or job training. Our service members must also apply for federal student aid to cover tuition and other expenses.

The Department of Education considers their benefits from the Montgomery GI Bill as ''income''— thereby reducing the amount they are eligible to receive from federal student aid programs.

This legislation goes back to the $1,200 out-of-pocket contribution that a service member made to become eligible for the Montgomery GI Bill.

It is not fair to ask our service members to pay the original amount out of their own pocket and then penalize them for it later on.

This bill would simply exempt the original contribution that came from their own pocket from the Department of Education's income consideration.

This legislation does not present significant cost to the federal government but would go a long way to help America's individual service members afford college.

During the last Congress, I offered the provisions contained in this legislation as part of the College Access and Opportunity Act (H.R. 609) when it was on the House floor.

Unfortunately, the amendment was not accepted, but I plan to pursue the issue until we correct this inequity.

Madam Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to offer legislation benefiting America's military service members and helping them to attend college or receive job training.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ANIMAL PROHIBITION ACT OF 2007

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. GALLEGLY. Madam Speaker, today I reintroduce the Animal Fighting Prohibition Act to address the brutal, inhumane practice of animal fighting, something I have been trying to federally criminalize for the past several Congresses.

A few years ago, Congress enacted legislation to tighten federal law and close some loopholes that were allowing the barbaric practices of animal fighting to thrive nationwide, in spite of bans in virtually every state.

But Congress didn't finish the job. We left in place weak penalties that have proven ineffective. Misdemeanor penalties simply don't provide a meaningful deterrent. Those involved in animal fighting ventures—where thousands of dollars typically change hands in the associated gambling activity—consider misdemeanor penalties a ''slap on the wrist'' or merely a ''cost of doing business.'' Moreover, we've heard from U.S. Attorneys that they are reluctant to pursue animal fighting cases with just a misdemeanor penalty.

In recent years, we've seen a marked rise in the frequency of animal fighting busts in communities across the country. Local police and sheriffs are increasingly concerned about animal fighting, not only because of the animal cruelty involved, but also because of the other crimes that often go hand-in-hand, including illegal gambling, drug trafficking, and acts of human violence. Furthermore, there is an inherent danger for the children of animal fighters to be close to these animals.

There is the additional concern that cockfighters spread diseases that jeopardize poultry flocks and even public health. We in California experienced this first-hand, when cockfighters spread exotic Newcastle disease, which was so devastating to many of our poultry producers in 2002 and 2003. That outbreak cost U.S. taxpayers ''nearly $200 million to eradicate, and cost the U.S. poultry industry many millions more in lost export markets,'' according to former Agriculture Secretary Ann Veneman. Cockfighting has been identified as the major contributor of the spread of avian flu throughout Thailand and other parts of Asia, where the strain originated. Many of the humans who contracted avian flu and died from it contracted it from fighting birds. Experts say it's just a matter of time before it reaches our shores.

It is time Congress finishes the job and helps state and local law enforcement officials who have requested a strengthening of federal laws to rid animal fighting from communities that do not want it.

This legislation makes violations of federal animal fighting law a felony punishable by up to three years in prison, makes it a felony to transport an animal across state or international borders for the purpose of animal fighting, and prohibits the interstate and foreign commerce in knives and gaffs designed for use in cockfighting.

In the past, this legislation has been endorsed by nearly 400 law enforcement organizations, 110 animal control and humane organizations, and a number of industry organizations as well, and I expect to have their support again. The Animal Fighting Prohibition Act of 2006 had 324 cosponsors and was passed through the Senate by unanimous consent. I ask my colleagues to support this legislation so we can end the deplorable practice of animal fighting and all of the destructive behavior associated with it.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SENIOR'S HEALTH CARE FREEDOM ACT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise to introduce the Seniors' Health Care Freedom Act. This act protects seniors' fundamental right to make their own health care decisions by repeal federal laws that interfere with seniors' ability to form private contracts for medical services. This bill also repeals laws which force seniors into the Medicare program against their will. When Medicare was first established, seniors were promised that the program would be voluntary. In fact, the original Medicare legislation explicitly protected a senior's right to seek out other forms of medical insurance. However, the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 prohibits any physician who forms a private contract with a senior from filing any Medicare reimbursement claims for two years. As a practical matter, this means that seniors cannot form private contracts for health care services.

Seniors may wish to use their own resources to pay for procedures or treatments not covered by Medicare, or to simply avoid the bureaucracy and uncertainly that comes when seniors must wait for the judgment of a Center from Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) bureaucrat before finding out if a desired treatment is covered.

Seniors' right to control their own health care is also being denied due to the Social Security Administration's refusal to give seniors who object to enrolling Medicare Part A Social Security benefits. This not only distorts the intent of the creators of the Medicare system; it also violates the promise represented by Social Security. Americans pay taxes into the Social Security Trust Fund their whole working lives and are promised that Social Security will be there for them when they retire. Yet, today, seniors are told that they cannot receive these benefits unless they agree to join an additional government program!

At a time when the fiscal solvency of Medicare is questionable, to say the least, it seems foolish to waste scarce Medicare funds on those who would prefer to do without Medicare. Allowing seniors who neither want nor need to participate in the program to refrain from doing so will also strengthen the Medicare program for those seniors who do wish to participate in it. Of course, my bill does not take away Medicare benefits from any senior. It simply allows each senior to choose voluntarily whether or not to accept Medicare benefits or to use his own resources to obtain health care.

Forcing seniors into government programs and restricting their ability to seek medical care free from government interference infringes on the freedom of seniors to control their own resources and make their own health care decisions. A woman who was forced into Medicare against her wishes summed it up best in a letter to my office, ''. . . I should be able to choose the medical arrangements I prefer without suffering the penalty that is being imposed.'' I urge my colleagues to protect the right of seniors to make the medical arrangements that best suit their own needs by cosponsoring the Seniors' Health Care Freedom Act.

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR BOB POYDASHEFF

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today I have the distinct privilege of recognizing a man of remarkable vision and unyielding commitment to the community, which he has so faithfully served. Through the leadership of Mayor Bob Poydasheff, the city of Columbus has experienced extraordinary growth and prosperity. During his tenure as mayor, the area has gained in excess of seven thousand new jobs and under his leadership the Columbus Consolidated Government has exercised fiscal responsibility resulting in balanced budgets and a surplus.

Bob Poydasheff has always exhibited exceptional character throughout his professional

careers. He served in the U.S. Army for twenty four years and retired at the rank of Colonel. During his military career, Mayor Poydasheff served as Legislative Counsel to Secretary of the Army Howard (Bo) Calloway, Staff Judge Advocate at Ft. Belvoir, VA, Legal Counsel to Secretary of the Army and Secretary of Defense on Labor Relations (1955–1979). In recognition of his exemplary service to our country he has received the Vietnam Ribbon, Legion of Merit, Commendation Medal, and 2 Oak Leaf Clusters.

Mayor Poydasheffs determination to excel is apparent in virtually every aspect of his life—and in none, more evident than in his pursuit of education. After receiving a B.A. in Political Science from the Citadel in 1954, he went on to earn his Juris Doctorate from Tulane University. Mayor Poydasheff later received a M.A. in International Relations from Boston College. He has also attended The Academy of International Law and the Army War College.

Perhaps, his greatest accomplishment is the bond that he unwaveringly nurtures with his family. Mr. Bob Poydasheff and his wife, Stacy, are enjoying a wonderful and fulfilling marriage of forty-two years. Of this union, they were blessed with two children, through whom they have two lovely grandchildren.

His affiliation with many civic organizations outside of the political arena demonstrates the genuineness of his nature. These organizations include: Chattahoochee Valley Citadel Club (President); Chattahoochee Boy Scout Council (Past President); Association of U.S. Army (Past President); Anne Elizabeth Shepherd Home (Past President); Fort Benning Sojourners (Past President); Board of Directors American Red Cross (Past Chairman); Military Affairs Committee, Columbus Chamber of Commerce (Past Chairman); Civilian-Military Council (Past Chairman); Military Order of World Wars (Past Commander); Minority Business Development Council; Black History Month Steering Committee; Urban League (Director); Columbus Lawyer's Club; Georgia Council of the Humanities; Kiwanis Club of Columbus; Leadership Columbus Alumni; Shriner; Scottish Rite; and Masons.

Today, we thank and honor Mayor Bob Poydasheff for his selfless dedication and steadfast commitment to the welfare of others and his community. His commendable service to the citizens of Columbus serves as an attribute which we should all strive to emulate as we attempt to make the world a better place to live for humankind. As he leaves the Mayor's office we extend our best wishes for joy and happiness in the weeks, months and years ahead.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO TOM STONE

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Tom Stone for his many years as a dedicated public servant.

For the past eight years Tom has represented the citizens of Eagle County, Colorado as County Commissioner. Tom has proved to be a champion for the environment through his appointments to the Colorado River Water Conservation District, the Wildland Urban Interface Fire Committee, the National Association of Counties Public Lands Steering Committee, the Colorado State Forest Advisory Board, and Colorado Counties, Inc. Committees for Public Lands, Agriculture & Wildlife, and Land Use & Natural Resources. Most notably, Commissioner Stone created and implemented the Eagle County Youth Conservation Corps, a program of education, funding and service projects in our National Forests by Eagle County youth.

Tom worked tirelessly to develop the infrastructure necessary for the future health, safety, welfare, economy, housing and care of the citizens of Eagle County. Tom created the first of its kind public/private partnership to construct 282 affordable homes for the local workforce at Miller Ranch. He also spearheaded the building of a joint Veterans and Emergency Service Personnel Memorial on the banks of the pond to honor those who have given the greatest measure of devotion to their community and their country.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to honor Eagle County Commissioner Tom Stone. His amalgamation of professional success and community activism is exemplary. I applaud his efforts and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION INTEGRITY ACT

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Federal Election Integrity Act of 2007. This legislation would take the long-overdue step of prohibiting chief state election officials from taking part in the political campaigns of federal candidates in elections over which the officials have supervisory authority.

As a former President of the League of Women Voters in San Diego and an American voter myself, I know that election officials are entrusted with a crucial responsibility for our democracy. Their only allegiance must be to the will of-the voters, not to partisan political agendas.

I think we can all agree that an inherent conflict of interest exists when a state's chief election official is responsible for monitoring and certifying the results of a federal election while actively participating in the campaign of one of the candidates in that election.

In the last several years, multiple Secretaries of State have captured national attention and incited great controversy because of their political involvement in elections they were responsible for overseeing.

Although such individuals may be honorable public servants with no improper intentions, it is of the utmost importance for the integrity of our democracy that we provide legal safeguards to ensure the public trust is never violated.

This is not a partisan issue. The record shows that officials of both parties have in the past held these two types of positions simultaneously. Rather, this is an issue of preserving the American people's faith in the integrity of our democracy.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to offer this important legislation to protect the public's trust in the electoral process.

INTRODUCTION OF ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION AND IDENTITY THEFT LEGISLATION

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. GALLEGLY. Madam Speaker, today I introduced six bills that focus on the problems of illegal immigration and identity theft.

The first priority for this new Congress and any Congress, for that matter, should be to reduce the high levels of illegal immigrants entering this nation. This is a problem that goes directly to our responsibilities as a sovereign nation to secure our borders and enforce our laws.

Two of my bills address the crux of the illegal immigration problem in the United States. We know that most illegal immigrants come here looking for work. If we stop illegal workers from gaining employment, they would be less likely to enter our country illegally in the first place

To get a job, a person must provide his employer with a social security number. In many cases, an illegal immigrant simply provides a name and a fictitious social security number. Too often, an illegal immigrant has adopted the identity of a hard working American who is unaware that his identity has been stolen until he is refused a loan or contacted by an irate creditor.

The federal government currently has the capability to deter identity theft. Every year, employers have to file W–2 forms with the Social Security Administration that include the names, social security numbers and addresses of their workers.

Today, when the Social Security Administration receives multiple W–2 forms with the same social security number and different names and/or addresses, it simply ignores it, even when it is obvious that more than one person is using a Social Security number!

In other cases, when an employer files a W–2 with a name and Social Security number that does not match, the government simply mails the worker a letter explaining the discrepancy. That's it. The Social Security Administration does little to no follow-up. This has led to many discrepancies that the Social Security Administration has yet to resolve. In fact, a GAO report found that as of November 2004, there were 246 million unresolved discrepancies—involving $463 billion—dating back to 1937, the beginning of the Social Security program.

My legislation would change that.

The Employment Eligibility Verification and Anti-Identity Theft Act would require workers to resolve discrepancies if their names and Social Security numbers do not match. Employers would have to terminate workers who do not resolve discrepancies. The Social Security Administration would also be required to notify the Department of Homeland Security so it can investigate whether a crime has been committed.

The Identity Theft Notification Act of 2007 would require the Social Security Administration to investigate if it receives more than eight (8) separate W -2 forms with the same Social Security number if the number corresponds with four (4) different addresses in a single year. If the Social Security Administration finds

evidence of fraudulent activity, it is required to notify not only the Department of Homeland Security, but also the legal possessor of that Social Security number. This will enable innocent people to take steps to protect their credit, identity, and good name.

Although jobs are the primary magnets that bring illegal immigrants to this country, I have also introduced another bill that will remove a major incentive for people to come to this country illegally.

The Citizenship Reform Act of 2007 would simply bring our laws into line with virtually every other nation on earth by requiring that at least one parent be a citizen or permanent resident in order for a child to become automatically a citizen.

Additionally, I have also introduced a bill that will make our current immigration law more fair. Under current law, an illegal immigrant who leaves the country faces a bar of up to three years if he has been in the country illegally for more than 6 months, and a ten year bar if he has been here illegally for more than a year. However, if an illegal immigrant never leaves the country but applies to adjust his status, he faces no reentry prohibitions. This is fundamentally unfair. My legislation provides that all illegal immigrants face the same penalty—even if they are eligible for a change in status.

Finally, I have introduced two bills that would criminalize actions common among illegal immigrants.

Unfortunately, many illegal immigrants who are apprehended and agree to voluntarily depart either fail to leave or leave only to return. My bill would make it a felony, with a mandatory one year jail sentence, for illegal immigrants agree to leave and then either fail to leave or return illegally.

I have also found that too many illegal immigrants have figured out that they are given a ''get out of jail free card'' when they are given a notice to appear. Another bill I have introduced would make it a felony, with a mandatory one-year jail sentence, when illegal immigrants ignore the law and refuse to appear in court when ordered.

I know that these bills, if passed, will dramatically reduce illegal immigration and identity theft. I ask my colleagues for their support to protect our nation's sovereignty and our citizens' identities.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY PRESERVATION ACT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise to protect the integrity of the Social Security trust fund by introducing the Social Security Preservation Act. The Social Security Preservation Act is a rather simple bill which states that all monies raised by the Social Security trust fund will be spent in payments to beneficiaries, with excess receipts invested in interest-bearing certificates of deposit. This will help keep Social Security trust fund monies from being diverted to other programs, as well as allow the fund to grow by providing for investment in interest-bearing instruments.

The Social Security Preservation Act ensures that the government will keep its promises to America's seniors that taxes collected for Social Security will be used for Social Security. When the government taxes Americans to fund Social Security, it promises the American people that the money will be there for them when they retire. Congress has a moral obligation to keep that promise.

With federal deficits reaching historic levels the pressure from special interests for massive new raids on the trust fund is greater than ever. Thus it is vital that Congress act now to protect the trust fund from big spending, pork-barrel politics. Social Security reform will be one of the major issues discussed in this Congress and many of my colleagues have different ideas regarding how to best preserve the long-term solvency of the program. However, as a medical doctor, I know the first step in treatment is to stop the bleeding, and the Social Security Preservation Act stops the bleeding of the Social Security trust fund. I therefore call upon all my colleagues, regardless of which proposal for long-term Social Security reform they support, to stand up for America's seniors by cosponsoring the Social Security Preservation Act.

TRIBUTE TO MR. NATHAN SUBER

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding citizen of Columbus, Georgia who has distinguished himself as a dedicated and exemplary public servant. Mr. Nathan Suber joined the Columbus City Council in 1994 and for the past 12 years has served as City Councilman of Post 1.

Mr. Suber was born just across the waters of the Chattahoochee River in nearby Phenix City, Alabama. Being the oldest of three children in a military family, Mr. Suber learned at an early age the true meaning of ''service before self.'' As his father responded to the call of duty, Nathan Suber and his family relocated several times throughout his father's military career. It was not until the mid-sixties that the Suber family's roots were once again firmly planted in the Columbus, Georgia area. In 1968, Mr. Suber graduated from South Girard High School and later went on to earn an A.A. in Criminology at the City College of San Francisco and a B.A. in Criminal Justice at Columbus State University.

During his tenure as a Columbus Councilman, Mr. Suber served as Budget Review Committee Chairman for 1999–2000. In this appointed position, he was instrumental in changing policy to allow the citizens of Columbus access to budget sessions, which had previously been kept closed to the public. As Chairman of this committee, Mr. Suber exhibited steadfast dedication when he fought tirelessly to keep the Fluellen Recreational Center's doors open and, in the process, secured $462,000 in additional funding for the facility.

Mr. Suber also served on the Public Safety Committee and had a major role in ensuring the security of our neighborhoods by implementing measures to monitor the use of community resources. Among the many notable and worthy projects to which he has contributed vital energy and leadership were his efforts in designating the Midtown area of Columbus as a historic district. This vital rezoning measure provided a protective ordinance to the surrounding area, which prohibits development that would otherwise degrade the historic quality of the neighborhood.

Nathan Suber is known as a devout Christian and is a faithful member of Fourth Street Missionary Baptist Church, where he currently serves as Chairman of Trustees. His faith in God is shared with the younger generation through the Sunday school lessons he provides. His goodwill is further evident in his devotion to his family—his wife of twenty-nine years, Charlene B. Suber; two daughters, Kelly Suber Jones and Cynthia Suber; and one lovely grandchild, Morgan L. Jones.

Mr. Suber currently serves as Chairman of the Board of the Metro Columbus Urban League, which further attests to his unwavering commitment to community.

Today we honor Mr. Nathan Suber and thank him for all he has done for the benefit of Columbus, Georgia—as an elected official and as a private citizen driven by the compassion for others. His exemplary service to his community has set a standard of dedication and leadership that we are all compelled to emulate.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO CREATE A COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM FOR HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TRANSPORTATION

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, today, I am pleased to introduce legislation to establish a cooperative research program for hazardous materials transportation capable of meeting our Nation's urgent need for applied research that examines hazardous materials transportation from a comprehensive, multimodal perspective.

During the 109th Congress, I introduced similar legislation and, although it failed to pass as introduced, provisions from that bill were included in the most recent federal transportation authorization, SAFETEA–LU. Those provisions provided a total of $1.25 million in federal funding per year from fiscal year 2006 through fiscal year 2009 to support the conduct of multi-modal studies of hazardous materials transportation.

While the first of these 9 studies are now being planned for implementation and will cover such topics as technologies to improve safety and security and methods for improving the utility of data collected from hazardous materials incidents, I believe it is crucial that we create a permanent research program for hazardous materials transportation.

Madam Speaker, it is estimated that one million hazardous materials shipments move through thousands of local communities across the United States every single day—usually without the knowledge of residents or even of local officials. Between 1994 and 2003, unintentional releases of hazardous materials resulted in 210 fatalities and more than 3,400 injuries.

Unfortunately, it is our tendency to focus on mitigating the risks that these shipments pose

only after an accident occurs. In 2001, such an accident occurred in my district in Baltimore when a train derailed in a tunnel, puncturing a tank car and releasing a hazardous material that subsequently ignited.

This incident in the heart of Baltimore demonstrated to me and to my constituents in the most dramatic possible way the risks of hazardous materials transportation. Having seen first-hand these risks, I will never forget them—and it is for this reason that I am again introducing legislation to create a permanent hazardous materials cooperative research program.

Under our Nation's current regime for regulating the shipment of hazardous materials, more than a dozen federal agencies—as well as literally thousands of state and local agencies—regulate some aspect of hazardous materials transportation.

While each of these entities is critical and necessary to ensuring the safety of hazardous materials transportation, each entity is typically looking at hazardous materials from the perspective of a single mode, a single type of material, or a single travel route.

What we now lack is a comprehensive, multi-modal perspective that can examine risks and develop mitigation strategies that are applicable across modes, material types, and travel routes.

To fill this gap, the legislation I am introducing today will bring together representatives of federal agencies, private sector shippers and carriers, and state and local governments in a formal program to study cross-cutting topics in hazardous materials transportation that are not adequately addressed by existing mode-specific research programs.

The study program will be particularly focused on completing research projects that yield practical results immediately applicable to transportation issues.

Without the ability to adequately research and respond to issues in hazardous materials transportation that are multi-modal in scope and national in application, our ability to make informed legislative, regulatory, and operational decisions regarding hazardous materials transportation is unacceptably limited.

Therefore, I urge you to join with me in supporting the formulation of a cooperative research program for hazardous materials transportation by co-sponsoring this critical legislation.

INTRODUCING THE IDENTITY THEFT PREVENTION ACT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, today I introduce the Identity Theft Prevention Act. This act protects the American people from government-mandated uniform identifiers that facilitate private crime as well as the abuse of liberty. The major provision of the Identity Theft Prevention Act halts the practice of using the Social Security number as an identifier by requiring the Social Security Administration to issue all Americans new Social Security numbers within 5 years after the enactment of the bill. These new numbers will be the sole legal property of the recipient, and the Social Security Administration shall be forbidden to divulge the numbers for any purposes not related to Social Security administration. Social Security numbers issued before implementation of this bill shall no longer be considered valid federal identifiers. Of course, the Social Security Administration shall be able to use an individual's original Social Security number to ensure efficient administration of the Social Security system.

Madame Speaker, Congress has a moral responsibility to address this problem because it was Congress that transformed the Social Security number into a national identifier. Thanks to Congress, today no American can get a job, open a bank account, get a professional license, or even get a driver's license without presenting his Social Security number. So widespread has the use of the Social Security number become that a member of my staff had to produce a Social Security number in order to get a fishing license!

One of the most disturbing abuses of the Social Security number is the congressionally-authorized rule forcing parents to get a Social Security number for their newborn children in order to claim the children as dependents. Forcing parents to register their children with the State is more like something out of the nightmares of George Orwell than the dreams of a free republic that inspired this nation's founders.

Congressionally-mandated use of the Social Security number as an identifier facilitates the horrendous crime of identity theft. Thanks to Congress, an unscrupulous person may simply obtain someone's Social Security number in order to access that person's bank accounts, credit cards, and other financial assets. Many Americans have lost their life savings and had their credit destroyed as a result of identity theft. Yet the Federal Government continues to encourage such crimes by mandating use of the Social Security number as a uniform ID!

This act also forbids the Federal Government from creating national ID cards or establishing any identifiers for the purpose of investigating, monitoring, overseeing, or regulating private transactions among American citizens. In 2005, this body established a de facto national ID card with provisions buried in the "intelligence" reform bill mandating Federal standards for drivers" licenses, and mandating that Federal agents only accept a license that conforms to these standards as a valid ID.

Nationalizing standards for drivers' licenses and birth certificates creates a national ID system pure and simple. Proponents of this scheme claim they are merely creating new standards for existing State IDs. However, imposing Federal standards in a Federal bill creates a federalized ID regardless of whether the ID itself is still stamped with the name of your State.

The national ID will be used to track the movements of American citizens, not just terrorists. Subjecting every citizen to surveillance diverts resources away from tracking and apprehending terrorists in favor of needless snooping on innocent Americans. This is what happened with "suspicious activity reports" required by the Bank Secrecy Act. Thanks to BSA mandates, Federal officials are forced to waste countless hours snooping through the private financial transactions of innocent Americans merely because those transactions exceeded $10,000.

Turning State-issued drivers licenses into federally controlled national ID cards is yet another Federal usurpation of State authority and another costly unfunded mandate imposed on the States. According to a report issued by the National Conference of State Legislators, turning drivers licenses into national ID cards will cost the States more than $11 billion.

Madam Speaker, no wonder there is a groundswell of opposition to this mandate. There is even a movement in several State legislatures to refuse to comply with this mandate! The Identity Theft Prevention Act not only repeals those sections of the Federal law creating a national UD, it forbids the Federal Government from using Federal funds to blackmail States into adopting uniform Federal identifiers. Passing the Identity Theft Prevention Act is thus an excellent way for this Congress to show renewed commitment to federalism and opposition to imposing unfunded mandates on the States.

This legislation not only repeals those sections of Federal law creating the national ID, it also repeals those sections of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 that require the Department of Health and Human Services to establish a uniform standard health identifier—an identifier which could be used to create a national database containing the medical history of all Americans. As an OB/GYN with more than 30 years in private practice, I know the importance of preserving the sanctity of the physician-patient relationship. Oftentimes, effective treatment depends on a patient's ability to place absolute trust in his or her doctor. What will happen to that trust when patients know that any and all information given to their doctors will be placed in a government accessible database?

By putting an end to government-mandated uniform IDs, the Identity Theft Prevention Act will prevent millions of Americans from having their liberty, property, and privacy violated by private and public sector criminals.

Some members of Congress will claim that the Federal Government needs the power to monitor Americans in order to allow the government to operate more efficiently. I would remind my colleagues that, in a constitutional republic, the people are never asked to sacrifice their liberties to make the jobs of government officials easier. We are here to protect the freedom of the American people, not to make privacy invasion more efficient.

Madam Speaker, while I do not question the sincerity of those members who suggest that Congress can ensure that citizens' rights are protected through legislation restricting access to personal information, the only effective privacy protection is to forbid the Federal Government from mandating national identifiers. Legislative "privacy protections" are inadequate to protect the liberty of Americans for a couple of reasons.

First, it is simply common sense that repealing those Federal laws that promote identity theft is more effective in protecting the public than expanding the power of the Federal police force. Federal punishment of identity thieves provides cold comfort to those who have suffered financial losses and the destruction of their good reputations as a result of identity theft.

Federal laws are not only ineffective in stopping private criminals, but these laws have not even stopped unscrupulous government officials from accessing personal information.

After all, laws purporting to restrict the use of personal information did not stop the well-publicized violations of privacy by IRS officials or the FBI abuses of the Clinton and Nixon administrations.

In one of the most infamous cases of identity theft, thousands of active-duty soldiers and veterans had their personal information stolen, putting them at risk of identity theft. Imagine the dangers if thieves are able to obtain the universal identifier, and other personal information, of millions of Americans simply by breaking, or hacking, into one government facility or one government database?

Second, the Federal Government has been creating proprietary interests in private information for certain State-favored special interests. Perhaps the most outrageous example of phony privacy protection is the ''medical privacy'' regulation, that allows medical researchers, certain business interests, and law enforcement officials access to health care information, in complete disregard of the Fifth Amendment and the wishes of individual patients! Obviously, ''privacy protection'' laws have proven greatly inadequate to protect personal information when the government is the one seeking the information.

Any action short of repealing laws authorizing privacy violations is insufficient primarily because the Federal Government lacks constitutional authority to force citizens to adopt a universal identifier for health care, employment, or any other reason. Any Federal action that oversteps constitutional limitations violates liberty because it ratifies the principle that the Federal Government, not the Constitution, is the ultimate judge of its own jurisdiction over the people. The only effective protection of the rights of citizens is for Congress to follow Thomas Jefferson's advice and ''bind (the Federal Government) down with the chains of the Constitution.''

Madam Speaker, those members who are not persuaded by the moral and constitutional reasons for embracing the Identity Theft Prevention Act should consider the American people's opposition to national identifiers. The numerous complaints over the evergrowing uses of the Social Security number show that Americans want Congress to stop invading their privacy. Furthermore, according to a survey by the Gallup company, 91 percent of the American people oppose forcing Americans to obtain a universal health ID.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I once again call on my colleagues to join me in putting an end to the Federal Government's unconstitutional use of national identifiers to monitor the actions of private citizens. National identifiers threaten all Americans by exposing them to the threat of identity theft by private criminals and abuse of their liberties by public criminals, while diverting valuable law enforcement resources away from addressing real threats to public safety. In addition, national identifiers are incompatible with a limited, constitutional government. I, therefore, hope my colleagues will join my efforts to protect the freedom of their constituents by supporting the Identity Theft Prevention Act.

RECOGNIZING J. CHRIS KOLLMAN, III, MAYOR, CITY OF COLONIAL HEIGHTS, VIRGINIA FOR HIS SERVICE AND DEDICATION

HON. J. RANDY FORBES

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. FORBES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend Mayor J. Chris Kollman. After serving 28 distinguished years in public service, Mayor Kollman has decided not to pursue another term in order to devote more time to his family.

Mayor Kollman began his tenure with the City of Colonial Heights nearly three decades ago when he was elected to City Council. During his time on the Council he has served two terms as Mayor and two terms as Vice-Mayor. He has been a part of many accomplishments of the city, including the building of the vocational school, the development of Southpark Mall, the building of the Colonial Heights Public Library, the building of the Government Center, the revitalization of the old City Hall Building into a Public Safety Building, the development of the Memorandum of Understanding between the City and the Schools, and his many efforts to help beautify the city.

In addition to his public service, Mr. Kollman served in the United States Army where he received an Honorable Discharge. He is also retired, after 30 years of service, from Bell Atlantic and currently owns and operates C & C Lawn Service, Inc. He is a lifelong resident of Colonial Heights and is a graduate of the Colonial Heights school system.

Mr. Kollman is a former volunteer fireman, a member of the Colonial Heights Optimist Club, served as co-chairman of the Colonial Heights After Prom Committee, and is a member of Highland United Methodist Church where he serves in various leadership positions.

Madam Speaker, please join me in honoring Mr. J. Chris Kollman.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND REAUTHORIZATION ACT

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today the Multinational Species Conservation Fund Reauthorization Act. This legislation will extend the authorization of appropriations for the African Elephant Conservation Act of 1988 and the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994. These acts have been two of the most effective conservation laws ever approved by the United States Congress.

First enacted nearly two decades ago, the African Elephant Conservation Act was designed to assist range countries who were fighting a losing battle against heavily armed poachers who were systematically annihilating the flagship species of the African continent. By the mid-1980's, the population of African Elephants had fallen from 1.3 million to less than 500,000 animals. In fact, only in Botswana, South African and Zimbabwe were elephant populations stable.

In response to this growing wildlife crisis and the real likelihood that this species could face extinction throughout most of its historic range, Congress passed the African Elephant Conservation Act. This landmark law was used to ban the importation of carved ivory into the United States and its established the African Elephant Conservation Fund. Under the terms of P. L. 100–478, the Secretary of the Interior was directed to review conservation projects submitted by government entities and non governmental organizations and to approve those that significantly advanced the conservation needs of this important species.

Since its inception, the Secretary has approved 280 conservation grants in 23 African range countries. These grants have received nearly $17 million in U.S. tax dollars and nearly $72 million in private matching funds. This favorable ratio of more than 4 to 1 in private donations has been truly remarkable.

The types of conservation projects approved include the training of wildlife personnel; determining the population status, characteristics and habitat needs of elephants in various range countries; providing uniforms, tents and security equipment to wildlife rangers; monitoring the impact of elephants on agriculture; research the seasonal migration patterns of elephants; train local residents in the collection of baseline elephant data and provide local communities with viable economic alternatives to poaching elephants and other species.

One of the more interesting conservation projects has been the partnership between local communities in Zambia and The Mcihenny Company of Avery Island, Louisiana. What has transpired is that local farmers are growing chilli peppers which are sold to be used in various tabasco products. These peppers have produced badly needed income for local African communities and they assisted in the conservation of elephants who find the scent of growing and burning peppers unacceptable to their sensory glands. The net effect is that not only are pepper plants not trampled but adjoining agricultural crops are protected by their cultivation. This innovative idea has been a real conservation achievement.

While one of these projects would not by itself save the African elephant, together, they have stopped the precipitous slide towards extinction. Sadly, there is no question that elephants are still being poached and that illegally obtained ivory remains a serious international problem. This is why this law must be extended. This small investment of taxpayer dollars is making a significant positive difference is saving this species.

Section III of this legislation will extend the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act. This act was designed to assist these two highly imperiled species. In fact, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has noted that: ''rhinos and tigers remain among the most charismatic and some of the most endangered species on earth''.

At the time of its initial enactment in 1994, the number of rhinoceros living in the wild had fallen from 65,000 in 1970 to fewer than 16,000 animals. The five subspecies of tigers were facing an ever more perilous future. At the turn of the 20th century, there were more than 100,000 tigers living in the wild. By 1994, there were fewer than 6,000 tigers which represented a decline of roughly 95 percent. By

comparison, there are more than 25,000 tigers currently living in captivity.

While there are many factors causing the decline of these species, there is no question that poaching and loss of habitat are the two primary reasons rhinos and tigers are facing extinction. A 1994 Newsweek cover shouted that the tiger was "doomed" unless the international community took some concrete steps to save them. The Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act was one of those positive steps. It was a lifeline to two species on the brink of disappearing and this fund remains the only dedicated annual source of money for rhinos and tigers in the world.

In the last 12 years, the Fish and Wildlife Service has received 744 conservation grant proposals to assist rhinos and tigers. The service has approved 321 projects in range countries throughout Africa and Asia. These proposals have received $7.8 million in federal funds with nearly $20 million in private matching funds.

This money has been used to finance a host of projects including the training of wildlife mangers; facilitating the reintroduction of white rhinos; a database on tiger poaching; a tiger community education program in Indonesia; monitoring tigers, prey and their habitat in India's tiger reserves; providing emergency veterinary services to treat injured black rhinos in Zimbabwe and investigating the poaching and trade of wild tiger parts in India. The sponsors of these projects include the International Rhino Foundation, The Wildlife Conservation Society and the World Wildlife Fund.

According to the World Wildlife Fund: "there is no question that these programs have been instrumental in the conservation progress that we have seen in the last decade". In fact, The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has indicated that: "it has been expressed by field experts that both the Javan and Sumatran rhinos might now be extinct were it not for the multinational species conservation funds".

The purpose of my legislation is to extend the authorization of appropriations for the African Elephant Conservation Act and The Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act for an additional five years until September 30, 2012. While I extend the existing annual authorization levels of $5 million for elephants and $10 million for rhinos and tigers, the stark reality is that it is highly unlikely that these species will receive $15 million in funding each year. In fact, sadly, the more likely outcome is about $2 million per year.

Nevertheless, $2 million is a huge amount of money in many local African communities who do not have the funds to equip their wildlife rangers with such basic equipment as tents, uniforms or weapons to battle heavily financed and armed poachers.

This small investment of U.S. tax dollars has made a tremendous difference in the fight to save these species from extinction. However, the battle has not been won and it is essential that we reauthorize these two highly effective conservation funds. In the words of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: "continued funding is critical in order to help support efforts for these critically endangered species". It will be a monumental tragedy if we allow these flagship species to disappear forever.

I urge my colleagues to support the Multinational Species Conservation Reauthorization Act of 2007.

INTRODUCING THE SOCIAL SECURITY FOR AMERICAN CITIZENS ONLY ACT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, today I introduce the Social Security for American Citizens Only Act. This act forbids the federal government from providing Social Security benefits to non-citizens. It also ends the practice of totalization. Totalization is where the Social Security Administration takes into account the number of year's an individual worked abroad, and thus was not paying payroll taxes, in determining that individual's eligibility for Social Security benefits!

Hard as it may be to believe, the United States Government already provides Social Security benefits to citizens of 17 other countries. Under current law, citizens of those countries covered by these agreements may have an easier time getting Social Security benefits than public school teachers or policemen!

Obviously, this program provides a threat to the already fragile Social Security system, and the threat is looming larger. The administration's totalization proposal, a version of which passed the other body in the 109th Congress, actually allows thousands of foreigners who would qualify for U.S. Social Security benefits actually came to the United States and worked here illegally. Adding insult to injury, the federal government may even give Social Security benefits to non-citizens who worked here for as little as 18 months.

That's right: the federal government may actually allow someone who came to the United States illegally, worked for less than the required number of years to qualify for Social Security, and then returned to Mexico for the rest of his working years, to collect full U.S. Social Security benefits while living in Mexico. That is an insult to the millions of Americans who pay their entire working lives into the system and now face the possibility that there may be nothing left when it is their turn to retire.

The proposed agreement is nothing more than a financial reward to those who have willingly and knowingly violated our own immigration laws. Talk about an incentive for illegal immigration! How many more would break the law to come to this country if promised U.S. government paychecks for life? Is creating a global welfare state on the back of the American taxpayer a good idea? The program also establishes a very disturbing precedent of U.S. foreign aid to individual citizens rather than to states.

Estimates of what this latest totalization proposal would cost top one billion dollars per year. As the system braces for a steep increase in those who will be drawing from the Social Security trust fund while policy makers seriously consider cutting Social Security benefits to American seniors and raising payroll taxes on American workers, it makes no sense to expand Social Security into a global welfare system. Social Security was designed to provide support for retired American citizens who worked in the United States. We should be shoring up the system for those Americans who have paid in for decades, not expanding it to cover foreigners who have not.

It is long past time for Congress to stand up to the internationalist bureaucrats and start looking out for the American worker. I therefore call upon my colleagues to stop the use of the Social Security Trust Fund as yet another vehicle for foreign aid by cosponsoring the Social Security for American Citizens Only Act.

TRIBUTE TO BEN STONE

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I, along with my colleague Congressman MIKE THOMPSON, rise today to honor Ben Stone, who recently completed 20 years of service as head of the Sonoma County Economic Development Board. Under Ben's quiet but dynamic leadership, the Economic Development Board (EDB) has successfully implemented programs that have more than met the mandate of the County Board of Supervisors to enhance economic development by concentrating on new and innovative programs that enable businesses to remain competitive in a changing economy.

Ben came to Sonoma County from the Seattle area where he had been a county administrator in Port Angeles, Washington, a consultant with Arthur Andersen & Co. and a Special Projects Director with Scafco Corporation. He graduated from Whitman College in Walla Walla and received his masters of Public Administration from the University of Washington in Seattle.

Ben tells the story that, after coming to Sonoma County, he was informed that a decision had been made to close the EDB. However, he commenced creating programs atypical of economic development, which bolstered the local economy, and, 20 years later, the EDB is thriving under his leadership.

With the help of a small staff and interns, Ben has developed a number of award-winning programs in concert with local private and public sectors. Many of these programs have been successfully transitioned to community-based organizations.

Among them are the Sonoma County Tourism Program, which served to increase tourism 31 percent; two technology groups (SofTech, a trade group, and the North Bay Techonology Roundtable, a policy group); Youth Business Week; the Business Environmental Alliance; the North Bay World Trade Association; the Small Business Center now operated by Santa Rosa Junior College; a home-based business project; and a business crime prevention program. Ben's office still operates the Sonoma County Film Commission.

Ben also initiated a broad-based strategic planning process resulting in the formation of bachelors and master's degree programs in Engineering Science at Sonoma State University, a new cooperative agricultural marketing program, and an economic research program. An EDB forum, the Business Regulatory Roundtable, involving elected officials, regulatory agencies, and business executives to improve local regulatory processes, resulted in Northern California's first multi-agency Permit Assistance Center.

By creating the Economic Development Board Foundation, the EDB is able to support

research projects, bring expert speakers to discuss aspects of the economy at local presentations twice annually, present an annual State of the County program, and recognize local business men and women at the annual Spirit of Sonoma County Awards program.

Ben developed one of the most visited websites in the County. The EDB pages contain all the research reports, information on upcoming events, the latest initiatives sponsored by his office, and the first live web cast of the State of the County event. In addition, Ben helped establish the California-Swiss Foundation, the World Affairs Council, and has been on the boards of the Sonoma County Museum, the Sonoma County YMCA, and presently is a member of the President's Council at Santa Rosa Junior College.

Some form of the Economic Development Board has been a part of Sonoma County since the late 1950s. If you wanted assistance from Ben in the early days of his 20-year tenure, your first task would be to find his office, which moved four times in the first 10 years before finding a home on College Avenue in Santa Rosa. His long-time friends particularly recall his small office on Cleveland Avenue piled with filing boxes that a visitor clambered over to reach his desk.

A wall of certificates and plaques now greets visitors to his office, including a Grand Prize for Excellence from the California Association of Economic Development; four Achievement Awards from the National Association of Counties; and six Innovation Awards from the National Association of Development Organizations.

Madam Speaker, we want to honor Ben Stone today for his 20 years of service to Sonoma County and the Economic Development Board. He has made many friends in the many communities he serves and is always willing to give a boost to new arrivals or make that important contact for someone who needs assistance. As Ben always says to others, we wish him many more "Onward and Upward" years at the Sonoma County Economic Development Board.

INTRODUCTION OF LOWER BRULE AND CROW CREEK TRIBAL COMPENSATION ACT

HON. STEPHANIE HERSETH

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Ms. HERSETH. Madam Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the Lower Brule and Crow Creek Tribal Compensation Act. This bill would fully compensate the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe and the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe in South Dakota for the lands that they lost in the last century as a result of the federal government's construction of the massive dams on the main stem of the Missouri River.

The 1944 Flood Control Act cost these tribes much in terms of lost land. It also took an enormous toll on the people of both tribes and their economies. It is critically important that we seek to fully reimburse these tribes for the lands they lost.

The Lower Brule Sioux Tribe and the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe are both constituent bands of the Great Sioux Nation. Both border on the Missouri River in central South Dakota and are connected by the Big Bend Dam.

Congress created a trust fund for the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe in 1996, and a separate trust fund for the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe in 1997. These trust funds sought to compensate the tribes for the value of their land that is now permanently inundated as a result of the construction of the Big Bend Dam. Unfortunately, the compensation amounts between different but similarly situated tribes varied greatly along the Missouri River. The result was unfair and inadequate compensation trust funds for these tribes. This act is designed to create consistency among the affected tribes and to bring some long-overdue closure to two tribes whose best lands were inundated decades ago.

This legislation already has a history that spans multiple Congresses. An earlier version of this bill was reported by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs in the 108th Congress and ultimately passed the Senate. In the 109th Congress it was amended in the Senate after further hearings and then reported. I am hopeful that the House will move quickly in the 110th to Congress to advance this important legislation.

Compensation for these tribes would mean an ability to actively work for the betterment of their communities. It would mean adequate roads and improved community facilities. It would mean better health care and newer schools. It would mean attracting commercial business and improving the local economy. Most importantly, it would mean a real chance for these tribes to provide future generations with the tools that so many of us take for granted.

I would ask all of my distinguished colleagues to support the Lower Brule and Crow Creek Tribal Compensation Act and work with me to enact legislation that would fairly and appropriately compensate members of the Lower Brule and Crow Creek Sioux Tribes. I ask you to do it because of the tremendous positive difference it would make in the lives of those affected—and because it is the right and fair thing to do.

HONORING BEN STONE OF SONOMA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I, along with my colleague Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY, rise today to honor Ben Stone, who recently completed 20 years of service as head of the Sonoma County Economic Development Board. Under Ben's quiet but dynamic leadership, the Economic Development Board (EDB) has successfully implemented programs that have more than met the mandate of the County Board of Supervisors to enhance economic development by concentrating on new and innovative programs that enable businesses to remain competitive in a changing economy.

Ben came to Sonoma County from the Seattle area where he had been a county administrator in Port Angeles, Washington, a consultant with Arthur Andersen & Co. and a Special Projects Director with Scafco Corporation. He graduated from Whitman College in Walla Walla and received his Masters of Public Administration from the University of Washington in Seattle.

Ben tells the story that, after coming to Sonoma County, he was informed that a decision had been made to close the EDB. However, he commenced creating programs atypical of economic development, which bolstered the local economy, and, 20 years later, the EDB is thriving under his leadership.

With the help of a small staff and interns, Ben has developed a number of award-winning programs in concert with local private and public sectors. Many of these programs have been successfully transitioned to community-based organizations.

Among them are the Sonoma County Tourism Program, which served to increase tourism 31 percent; two technology groups (SofTech, a trade group, and the North Bay Technology Roundtable, a policy group); Youth Business Week; the Business Environmental Alliance; the North Bay World Trade Association; the Small Business Center now operated by Santa Rosa Junior College; a home-based business project; and a business crime prevention program. Ben's office still operates the Sonoma County Film Commission.

Ben also initiated a broad-based strategic planning process resulting in the formation of bachelors and master's degree programs in Engineering Science at Sonoma State University, a new cooperative agricultural marketing program, and an economic research program. An EDB forum, the Business Regulatory Roundtable, involving elected officials, regulatory agencies, and business executives to improve local regulatory processes, resulted in Northern California's first multi-agency Permit Assistance Center.

By creating the Economic Development Board Foundation, the EDB is able to support research projects, bring expert speakers to discuss aspects of the economy at local presentations twice annually, present an annual State of the County program, and recognize local business men and women at the annual Spirit of Sonoma County Awards program.

Ben developed one of the most visited websites in the County. The EDB pages contain all the research reports, information on upcoming events, the latest initiatives sponsored by his office, and the first live web cast of the State of the County event In addition, Ben helped establish the California-Swiss Foundation, the World Affairs Council, and has been on the boards of the Sonoma County Museum, the Sonoma County YMCA, and presently is a member of the President's Council at Santa Rosa Junior College.

Some form of the Economic Development Board has, been a part of Sonoma County since the late 1950s. If you wanted assistance from Ben in the early days of his 20-year tenure, your first task would be to find his office, which moved four times in the first 10 years before finding a home on College Avenue in Santa Rosa. His long-time friends particularly recall his small office on Cleveland Avenue piled with filing boxes that a visitor clambered over to reach his desk.

A wall of certificates and plaques now greets visitors to his office, including a Grand Prize for Excellence from the California Association of Economic Development; four Achievement Awards from the National Association of Counties; and six Innovation Awards, from the National Association of Development Organizations.

Madam Speaker, we want to honor Ben Stone today for his 20 years of service to Sonoma County and the Economic Development Board. He has made many friends in the many communities he serves and is always willing to give a boost to new arrivals or make that important contact for someone who needs assistance. As Ben always says to others, we wish him many more ''Onward and Upward'' years at the Sonoma County Economic Development Board.

INTRODUCING THE PRESCRIPTION DRUG AFFORDABILITY ACT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise to introduce the Prescription Drug Affordability Act. This legislation ensures that millions of Americans, including seniors, have access to affordable pharmaceutical products. My bill makes pharmaceuticals more affordable to seniors by reducing their taxes. It also removes needless government barriers to importing pharmaceuticals and it protects Internet pharmacies, which are making affordable prescription drugs available to millions of Americans, from being strangled by federal regulation.

The first provision of my legislation provides seniors a tax credit equal to 80 percent of their prescription drug costs. While Congress did add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare in 2003, many seniors still have difficulty affording the prescription drugs they need in order to maintain an active and healthy lifestyle. One reason is because the new program creates a ''doughnut hole,'' where seniors lose coverage once their prescription expenses reach a certain amount and must pay for their prescriptions above a certain amount out of their own pockets until their expenses reach a level where Medicare coverage resumes. This tax credit will help seniors cover the expenses provided by the doughnut hole. This bill will also help seniors obtain prescription medicines that may not be covered by the Medicare prescription drug program.

In addition to making prescription medications more affordable for seniors, my bill lowers the price for prescription medicines by reducing barriers to the importation of FDA-approved pharmaceuticals. Under my bill, anyone wishing to import a drug simply submits an application to the FDA, which then must approve the drug unless the FDA finds the drug is either not approved for use in the U.S. or is adulterated or misbranded. This process will make safe and affordable imported medicines affordable to millions of Americans. Madam Speaker, letting the free market work is the best means of lowering the cost of prescription drugs.

I need not remind my colleagues that many senior citizens and other Americans impacted by the high costs of prescription medicine have demanded Congress reduce the barriers which prevent American consumers from purchasing imported pharmaceuticals. Congress has responded to these demands by repeatedly passing legislation liberalizing the rules governing the importation of pharmaceuticals. However, implementation of this provision has been blocked by the federal bureaucracy. It is time Congress stood up for the American consumer and removed all unnecessary regulations on importing pharmaceuticals.

The Prescription Drug Affordability Act also protects consumers' access to affordable medicine by forbidding the Federal Government from regulating any Internet sales of FDA-approved pharmaceuticals by state-licensed pharmacists.

As I am sure my colleagues are aware, the Internet makes pharmaceuticals and other products more affordable and accessible for millions of Americans. However, the federal government has threatened to destroy this option by imposing unnecessary and unconstitutional regulations on web sites that sell pharmaceuticals. Any federal regulations would inevitably drive up prices of pharmaceuticals, thus depriving many consumers of access to affordable prescription medications.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to make pharmaceuticals more affordable and accessible by lowering taxes on senior citizens, removing barriers to the importation of pharmaceuticals and protecting legitimate Internet pharmacies from needless regulation by cosponsoring the Prescription Drug Affordability Act.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS HOSPITAL DESIGNATED AS MAGNET HOSPITAL BY THE AMERICAN NURSES CREDENTIALING CENTER

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, December 20, 2006, the University of Kansas Hospital became the first hospital in Kansas to attain the coveted Magnet™ designation. The Department of Nursing began working toward this goal in 2002.

Since the American Nurses Credentialing Center developed the Magnet Recognition Program® in 1990, approximately 225 facilities—less than 3 percent of all hospitals—have attained Magnet designation. To join this exclusive group, both the nursing staff and hospital have demonstrated their ability to meet and exceed more than 150 professional standards of excellence.

Magnet designation recognizes the quality and importance of our nursing department. It also emphasizes the important role our nurses play in the hospital's success. Magnet hospitals exemplify the very best in patient care and outcomes. Just 3.5 percent of health care organizations are Magnet hospitals.

This designation proves the commitment of the University of Kansas Hospital to excellent patient care outcomes. Magnet designation means a hospital outperforms others and is statistically proven to have: higher quality care; better patient outcomes; lower mortality rate; significantly higher levels of patient satisfaction; salaries typically above average; excellent nursing recruitment; higher nursing retention; and greater consumer confidence. Madam Speaker, I am proud to have the opportunity to bring this noteworthy designation to your attention, and to the attention of the House of Representatives as a whole.

PROTECTING IMPACT AID FOR NORTH SUBURBAN SCHOOLS

HON. MARK STEVEN KIRK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to ensure the federal government fulfills an important obligation to the families of servicemen and women in my district. In 1950, President Harry Truman established the Impact Aid program to assist school districts and communities that lose their property tax base because of the presence of the federal government. Without this federal money, the burden would fall to the remaining residents whose property taxes would continue to rise while impacting the quality of education which can be provided. The Impact Aid program helps to alleviate this problem by directly reimbursing public school districts for the loss of traditional revenue sources.

For years Impact Aid was fully funded and offered some of the strongest direct assistance to military families across the nation. Unfortunately, over the last decade we have fallen behind on this commitment, and it is time to reverse this trend.

While I support fully funding the Impact Aid program, I believe the situation in my district warrants special attention. In order to ensure that our students most in need continue to receive necessary resources, I have introduced this bill to help North Chicago to continue to qualify for heavily impacted payments, and Glenview and Highland Park receive fair compensation.

Due to a unique housing situation for the Great Lakes Naval Training Facility, Impact Aid funding should be higher in five of my school districts. This Naval base is located in North Chicago, one of the poorest school districts in my state. However, some service members and their families live in Navy housing obtained when Ft. Sheridan and Naval Air Station Glenview, located in other suburbs, were closed in the 1990's. These former bases are located within the boundaries of other school districts that now must bear the economic cost of educating children from a base, but receive none of the economic benefits a base provides. Thus, it is vitally important that we both ensure North Chicago continues to receive heavily impacted payments for the benefit of students living there, and that the surrounding communities are more fairly compensated for their loss of property taxes.

By passing this bill, the federal government will be fulfilling its responsibility to these communities, and giving our military families the support they deserve.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND RETIREMENT OF CHARLES E. COOKE

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of a valued staff member—Charles E. Cooke—who retired this month from the

House Science Committee. As a professional staffer on the Energy Subcommittee, Charlie's expertise on the issues of energy production, energy research and development, and energy conservation have been unmatched.

Charlie has been working on energy issues since the 1960s, when he was a staffer for the Texas State Legislature. In the 1970s he moved to Washington to work with the Federal Power Commission. He represented Southern California Edison in its Washington office in the late seventies. From 1979 to 1985 he was a principal in a consulting firm that represented Texas interests in Washington and Austin.

Charlie came to Capitol Hill in 1985, first as a legislative assistant to Rep. RALPH HALL (TX) and then as staff of the Committee on Science. In 1990, Charlie went back to work for Southern California Edison on energy restructuring, telecommunications, electric transportation, and tax issues. After leaving Edison, he joined the EOP Group, an energy and environmental consulting firm, and then returned to the Hill in 1998 to serve as Special Assistant to Congressman HALL, working on utility restructuring. Finally, in 2000 Charlie returned to the Science Committee as a professional staff member with responsibility for energy issues.

Before switching to the political science field, Charlie began his early studies in electrical engineering, and his engineering training comes through, both in his approach to problems and in his passions: home improvement and landscape architecture. He has been an active volunteer in planning the House botanical gardens and on the Advisory Board of the Landscape Architecture Department at the University of Texas.

Charlie's easy going personality, issue expertise, and his talent for making great barbeque will be long remembered on this Committee. The Science Committee's Members and staff wish him well as he moves on to new endeavors and a relaxing retirement. Thank you, Charlie, for your many years of dedicated and loyal service.

TRIBUTE TO THE FIRST GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH OF SPRINGFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to pay my respects to the First Greek Orthodox Church in Springfield, Massachusetts upon the occasion of its 100th anniversary

In 1907 an old house was acquired on Auburn Street, converted into a place of worship and it was here that the rapidly growing Greek community held their first church services.

By 1920 the Greek population had grown so large that the Auburn Street building no longer could accommodate the members of St. George's Greek Orthodox Church. A building fund campaign was soon inaugurated to raise the funds to buy a new church. A building was purchased on Patton Street which provided adequate facilities for church services, a Greek School and administrative offices.

By 1940 the Greek population had again increased greatly. It was at this time that the Congregational Memorial Church at Main and Plainfield Streets became available. The Greek Community took advantage of this opportunity and purchased the Memorial Church and its spacious parish house on October 7, 1940. This magnificent Gothic Church, built in 1866, was designed by the noted architect, Richard Upjohn, with a high vaulted ceiling and priceless stained glass windows.

By 1975 the Church began looking at new sites for a community center and by June 1977 it was decided that St. George would expand and stay in Springfield. A General Assembly approved plans for a parish center by purchasing the old Memorial Square Library Building. The St. George Greek Orthodox Church Cultural Center was opened in 1978 and to the present time it houses administrative offices, classrooms for Sunday and Greek Schools, a gymnasium and facilities for social functions. A Chapel was added to the building in 1986.

The first Greek immigrants in Springfield brought with them their history, their philosophies, their democratic ideals, their courage, their culture and traditions, their Greek language and customs, their festive celebrations, their foods, music and dance and most of all their Greek Orthodox faith which they have handed down from one generation to the next all of which we celebrate this Centennial Year.

INTRODUCTION OF THE GERALD R. FORD, JR. POST OFFICE ACT

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I rise to introduce legislation to name the post office in Vail, Colorado, after our Nation's 39th President, Gerald R. Ford, Jr.

I believe this legislation is appropriate as another means of honoring the legacy of President Ford, in large part because of his special connection to Colorado and the Vail Valley.

In 1968 then-Congressman Ford and wife, Betty, first came to Colorado with their children to celebrate Christmas and to ski in the mountains at Vail. Like many other visitors, President Ford was inspired by the beauty of the area and found a connection to the land and to the surrounding community.

The Fords later owned a home and continued to vacation in Vail. When he became President, his vacations in Colorado helped introduce the world to the Town of Vail, and in fact, the family home was dubbed "the Western White House."

Vail residents knew President Ford and his family as neighbors and friends and are proud of their long association with them. Gerald Ford was beloved in Vail, where he was known to be a good neighbor, an avid golfer and a lover of the outdoors.

President Ford will rightly be remembered for his personal warmth, his decency, his interest in bridging the many divisions in America during the 1970s. My father, Mo Udall, served in Congress with Gerald Ford, and while they were often on different sides in political matters—so much so that my father hoped to run against President Ford in the famous election of 1976—they were united by a common view that politics should unite people. They both were firm believers that in public life one could disagree without being disagreeable.

This is a credo I continue to believe in, and I commend the memory of both good men to this House, an institution they loved.

Coloradans, especially those in the Vail Valley, have come to think of him as the first President from Colorado because he was a great ambassador for the State, who established long ties to the people of Colorado.

As a dedicated public servant, President Ford served honorably in his years in Congress and in the White House. Most important, when America needed someone to reassure their trust in government after Watergate, he filled that leadership role with authenticity.

I believe President Ford's special relationship and legacy in Colorado should be appropriately recognized by naming the postal facilities in Vail, Colorado, in his honor.

IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT AND SOCIAL SECURITY PROTECTION ACT

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, in the last two Congresses we have spent considerable time on the extremely important issue of immigration and homeland security. In the 108th Congress, we passed the National Intelligence Reform Act, a landmark piece of legislation to overhaul our intelligence agencies. But, as I noted at that time, the bill unfortunately did not go far enough in addressing the major security vulnerability presented by the porous nature of our borders.

Seeing that need, in the 109th Congress we debated immigration extensively and even passed H.R. 4437, the Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005. Regrettably, the Senate failed to act on this important piece of legislation. That is why I rise to ask for the support of my colleagues for an illegal immigration control plan that I am pleased to introduce today. This proposal, the Immigration Enforcement and Social Security Protection Act, is designed to eliminate up to 98 percent of the illegal border crossings into the United States.

I believe that in order for any proposal to stop illegal immigration to be successful, it must get at the root cause of what attracts illegal immigrants to our country—and that is the lure of economic opportunity and the ease with which illegal workers can find jobs. Under the Immigration Enforcement and Social Security Protection Act, we will dramatically increase the enforcement of laws which prohibit American businesses from employing illegal immigrants. Regrettably, too many employers have been unwilling to comply with the law. The growing availability of counterfeit identity documents has also undermined the current system because employers are increasingly unable to establish the authenticity of documents presented by job applicants.

Our legislation adds new features to the Social Security card to deter counterfeiting and make it easier for employers to determine whether a card is genuine by including a digitized photo of the cardholder on the card.

The improved Social Security card will also be encoded with a unique electronic encryption code to allow employers to verify each prospective applicant's work eligibility status prior to hiring, through either an electronic card-reader or a toll-free telephone number. The Department of Homeland Security will be required to establish and maintain an Employment Eligibility Database with information on a person's proof of citizenship data, work, and residency eligibility information, including expiration dates for non-citizens. This database will also include information from the Social Security Administration that the Commissioner determines necessary and appropriate for the purpose of verifying an individual's work eligibility status. Employers who hire an illegal immigrant or choose not to verify a prospective employee's work eligibility will face stiff federal fines of $50,000 and up to 5 years in prison. The employer would also be required to reimburse the government for the cost of deporting the illegal immigrant. Moreover, this bill provides that no officer or employee of the Department of Homeland Security shall have access to any information contained in the Employment Eligibility Database for any purpose other than the establishment of a system of records necessary for the effective administration of this act, and will imposes penalties of $10,000 in fines and mandatory-minimum sentence of 5 years in prison on anyone who misuses information on the database.

With the improved Social Security card and national verification system, employers will have no excuse for hiring illegal immigrants. By eliminating the supply of jobs for illegal workers, we will end the incentive for illegal immigrants to enter the United States because they will know that they will be unable to make a living here. Legal workers will only need to update their Social Security card once to have their photo placed on the card and for other long-overdue anti-fraud measures to be applied. Moreover, a worker would only need the updated Social Security card when applying for a new job. I want to make it very, very clear that this proposal does not represent the creation of a national identification card. This bill strictly prohibits the use of the Social Security card as a national ID card, and stipulates that the card not be required to be routinely carried on one's person. Social Security cards are often already required to be provided to new employers; the changes we are proposing to the Social Security card take us no further down the road of creating a national ID card. It should be noted that the government already has the information that would be contained in the Employment Eligibility Database. an individual's eligibility to work under the law is dependent on whether they are a U.S. citizen, and if not, their immigration status. Finally, the Immigration Enforcement and Social Security Protection Act also puts teeth into the new enforcement procedures by calling for the addition of 10,000 new Homeland Security officers whose sole responsibility will be to enforce employer compliance with the law. These new agents will free up the rest of the Border Patrol to exclusively focus on border enforcement and terrorism prevention.

Madam Speaker, I do not stand here today to tell the rest of the world that we intend to limit opportunities for the American dream to be fulfilled. As my good friend Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor of my home state of California and an immigrant himself has said, many arrive in America "owning nothing but a dream." However, the Governor has also noted that the first order of our government must be to provide security for our borders. If foreign nationals wish to come to the United States, they must, as Governor Schwarzenegger said, "play by the rules," and we must make clear that there will be no economic opportunity for anyone who enters this country illegally. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues in this effort, and hope they will consider joining me as we take action on this vital national security priority.

I would like to thank my original co-sponsors for this legislation, including, Mr. REYES of Texas, who began his career in public service with the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service in the U.S. Border Patrol, where he worked for 26½ years, as well as my colleagues from California, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. BILBRAY.

THE PATERSON GREAT FALLS NATIONAL PARK ACT OF 2007

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce the Paterson Great Falls National Park Act of 2007. This bipartisan legislation is cosponsored by every Member of the New Jersey Congressional delegation, and would designate a National Park at the majestic Great Falls in Paterson, New Jersey. I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation as soon as possible.

Fifteen miles west of New York City, the Great Falls was the second largest waterfall in colonial America. No other natural wonder in America has played such an important role in our Nation's historic quest for freedom and prosperity. At the Great Falls, Alexander Hamilton conceived and implemented a plan to harness the force of water to power the new industries that would secure our economic independence.

Hamilton told Congress and the American people that at the Great Falls he would begin implementation of his ambitious strategy to transform a rural agrarian society dependent upon slavery into a modem economy based on freedom. True to Hamilton's vision, Paterson became a great manufacturing city, producing the Colt revolver, the first submarine, the aircraft engine for the first trans-Atlantic flight, more locomotives than any city in the Nation, and more silk than any city in the world.

New Jersey's Great Falls is the only National Historic District that includes both a National Natural Resource and a National Historic Landmark. In a special Bicentennial speech in Paterson with the spectacular natural beauty of the Great Falls in the background, the late President Gerald R. Ford said, "We can see the Great Falls as a symbol of the industrial might which helps to make America the most powerful nation in the world."

Preeminent Hamilton biographers; an esteemed former Smithsonian Institution curator, the former chief of the National Park Service Historic American Engineering Record, and distinguished professors at Yale, Princeton, Harvard, NYU, Brown and other universities have filed letters with the National Park Service strongly recommending a National Historical Park for the Great Falls Historic District. Editorial boards, federal, state, and local officials and community groups have also endorsed the campaign to award a National Park Service designation to the Falls.

Scholars have concluded that Pierre L'Enfant's innovative water power system in Paterson, and many factories built later, constitute the finest remaining collection of engineering and architectural structures representing each stage of America's progress from a weak agrarian society to a leader in the global economy. It is a little known fact that L'Enfant was hired by Hamilton to create Paterson as the sister city to Washington, DC, having completed his plan of Washington only months before arriving in Paterson.

This proposed National Park would also encompass historic Hinchliffe Stadium, which was added to the National Register of Historic Places by the National Park Service in 2004. This stadium, built in 1932, is adjacent to the Great Falls and was home to the New York Black Yankees. Baseball legend Larry Doby played in Hinchliffe Stadium both as a star high school athlete and again as a Negro League player, shortly before becoming the first African-American to play in the American League.

Madam Speaker, Congress must act now to pass this vital piece of legislation, so that we may fully recognize these cultural and historic landmarks that have played such a seminal role in America's history.

STATEMENT OF INTRODUCTION OF THE COMMISSION TO STUDY REPARATION PROPOSALS FOR AFRICAN-AMERICANS ACT

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, today I come before this body to reintroduce the Commission to Study Reparation Proposals for African-Americans Act. I have advanced the Commission bill for over 15 years to direct attention to a historical wrong that warrants substantial consideration and discussion. Since introduction in 1989, I have never intended to spark controversy or promote division. Rather, I have worked to further a national dialogue on the plight of African Americans in the context of slavery, Jim Crow, and other legally sanctioned discrimination.

As a result, our dialogue has become more substantive and afforded us invaluable knowledge over the years. This Congress I intend to continue such discourse. I will also work to ensure that more people understand the benefit and the promise of a Commission. Unfortunately, there are too many that do not understand its purpose. This means that we must dispel the myths and correct the mistruths surrounding the Commission bill.

Each Congress, the conversations and efforts surrounding the Commission bill become more mature and sophisticated. Today we have a better understanding of slavery and its implications than we did 16 years ago. Since

1989, over forty states and cities have passed legislation in support of the Commission bill. In 2002, lawsuits were filed against U.S. corporations for their role in perpetuating slavery. The following year, in 2003, Brown University created the Committee on Slavery and Justice to assess the University's role in slavery and determine a response. And in 2004, a federal appeals court ruled that statute of limitations prevented redress in the case of the 1921 Tulsa Race Riot, but opened the door for legislative recourse.

Most recently, on December 13, 2006, a federal appeals court ruled that U.S. corporations can be found guilty of consumer fraud for failing to disclose their roles in slavery. Just a few weeks earlier, on November 27th, Prime Minister Tony Blair condemned the African slave trade and Britain's participation. As Brown University prepares to act on Committee recommendations in February, and on the eve of the 200th anniversary of Britain's prohibition of slavery in March, productive discussions on both the national and global levels seem promised.

However, as this dialogue continues to grow, one entity is noticeably absent—the federal government. The Commission would ensure proper participation in this conversation, in addition to taking us giant steps towards closure on this matter. The truth is that the institution of slavery will continue to tarnish the American national story until we confront this part of our history. While a Commission will not erase the past, it can bring us closer to racial reconciliation and advancement.

A Commission would not only examine the institution of slavery, but the legacy of slavery that weighs heavily on this country. Just last Congress, a bipartisan collective reauthorized the Voting Rights Act because racial inequities and injustices are a reality. This reality is the result of the social, economic, and political disenfranchisement African Americans have endured throughout our experience in this country. For a majority of this nation's history, this disenfranchisement was mandated by law. Disparities in education, housing, healthcare and other critical aspects of society have resulted.

After examining the issues, the Commission would recommend appropriate remedies to Congress. There is this common misperception that "remedies" means monetary compensation. Let me be clear, the Commission bill does not mandate financial payments of any kind. Recommendations would be at the sole discretion of the Commission. It is unfair to dismiss the idea of a Commission based on a fear that monetary reparations will be warranted. We need to understand that a reparations discussion goes beyond money.

We must also recognize that understanding slavery and its modern day implications is in the best interest of our society. This nation should serve as an example for corporations, universities, and other countries. In the 110th Congress, I look forward to open and constructive discourse about the Commission bill.

TRIBUTE TO HARVEY CHRISTIE

HON. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Harvey Christie, better known to people across West Virginia as Chef Harv. Chef Harv was tragically killed at age 42 in a car accident near Romney, West Virginia on December 1, 2006. He is survived by his wife Christy and two children.

Chef Harv traveled across West Virginia, as a caterer, as the host of "West Virginia Cooks", a Public Broadcasting cooking show, and as a champion for local agriculture products in our state.

Chef Harv never stopped promoting West Virginia's small farmers and food products. Whether it was catering a community dinner or visiting 4–H camp, he inspired a love for our state's agriculture goods to countless people.

Each year Chef Harv made the trip to Washington to remind members of Congress of the importance of supporting our local farmers. On each trip he cooked for "A Taste of the Virginias" held in a House office building—providing a meal made entirely from items grown in West Virginia or Virginia.

The amazing food Chef Harv prepared, like his award winning "Harv's Hot Pepper Jelly" was matched only by his outgoing, engaging personality that was an inspiration to those around him. West Virginia's agriculture community has suffered a tremendous loss with his passing, and he will be missed by countless friends across our state.

On January 13, Chef Harv's family and friends will gather to remember a life that ended much too soon. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, children, and all of his friends and family during this difficult time.

NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS WITH VIETNAM

HON. TRENT FRANKS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, on December 8, 2006, the House considered H.R. 6406, which, among other things, authorized the permanent extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations) to the products of Vietnam. While I am a strong proponent of free trade and I am committed to helping broaden the United States' relationship with Vietnam, I could not, in good conscience, vote for this legislation.

I continue to hold serious concerns about Vietnam's human rights record, as well as their handling of cases regarding U.S. Armed Forces personnel missing and killed in action during the Vietnam War.

Madam Speaker, I truly believe that the overall benefits of free trade are numerous for our country and that of our trading partners. These positive aspects include a higher economic standard of living, a wider range of higher quality products at lower costs, and a migration of workers from less competitive markets to more competitive and productive markets. As a former small business owner, I am and will remain a strong advocate for free trade.

However I also believe that religious liberty and respect for human rights should be requirements for achieving the broadest possible economic success.

INTRODUCTION OF FEDERAL JUDGESHIP FOR U.S. DISTRICT COURT, DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. TERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a looming judicial crisis in my state of Nebraska. Today, with my Nebraska colleagues Congressman JEFF FORTENBERRY and Congressman ADRIAN SMITH, I am introducing legislation to create an additional federal judgeship for the United States District Court, District of Nebraska.

Nebraska has three permanent judgeships and three senior judges. An additional temporary judgeship was created in 1990 and lapsed in May 2004 when a judge took senior status, despite recommendations by the Judicial Conference of the United States to convert the temporary status to a permanent position. After the lapse, the Judicial Conference has continued to recommend an additional permanent judgeship. To further burden the district, two of the court's three senior judges are in their early eighties and do not take full caseloads. The third senior judge also cannot handle a full caseload due to health reasons, and as a result, the senior judges provided the equivalent of less than one active judge in 2005.

Our delegation has introduced this important legislation on the very first day of the 110th Congress because the need for immediate Congressional action has never been greater. Nebraska's federal district courts handle a heavy caseload, not unlike many federal district courts nationwide. However, the number of Nebraska federal district court judges' criminal felony filings ranks them 5th nationwide and is more than twice the national average. Furthermore, the Nebraska judges have increased their overall number of completed trials by 41 percent since 2001 and now rank 2nd nationwide on a per-judgeship basis.

Weighted filings currently total 590 per judgeship, the 7th highest total in the Nation. Based on the current total of three authorized judgeships, the court's weighted filings are well above the standards of 500 per judgeship for small courts.

These numbers mean nothing unless they are put into a real life context. Nebraska is a rural state and the judges must travel long distances in order to try cases. For example, judges in Omaha must travel almost 600 miles four times per year to conduct two-week jury sessions. Additionally, magistrates are sent out one month prior to the judge's arrival to conduct pretrial conferences on all cases pending trial. All this travel takes its toll on these judges and forces them at times to use the services of judges from other districts.

The strain on assistance from senior judges, the high number of felony criminal cases and the heavy weighted caseload demonstrate clearly that the district of Nebraska requires four permanent judgeships. I call on all of my colleagues to recognize the pressing need for immediate Congressional action to create an additional federal judgeship in Nebraska.

TRIBUTE TO MARE ISLAND ORIGINAL 21ERS

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to invite my colleagues to join me in honoring the Mare Island Original 21ers for their efforts to end racial discrimination at Mare Island Naval Shipyard.

On Nov. 17, 1962, twenty-one African American workers at Mare Island Naval Shipyard in Vallejo, CA, took a historic step by filing a racial discrimination complaint with President Kennedy's newly created Committee on Equal Job Opportunities. The complaint quickly helped lead to sweeping changes locally at the shipyard and nationally at military installations, including early Affirmative Action-type programs. All the men wanted was a wage comparable to their white co-workers and to be treated equally. What they started was a chain reaction that reverberated around the country. The group would become known as the Mare Island Original 21ers, and would forever change the base's social landscape.

Despite these pioneering steps, their early civil rights efforts remain in obscurity. The group's surviving members still talk about the movement, but the full story was buried in the 1960s and only recently came to light as a result of a series of newspaper articles by Vallejo Times Herald reporter Matthias Gafni.

Their story is typical of the time. Vallejo was a Navy town, and a separated one. With its naval shipyard, Vallejo has always had a population reflecting a wide range of ethnic backgrounds; but it was not always harmonious. In the late 1950s minorities were mostly working in unskilled positions at Mare Island as sandblasters, laborers and cleaners, with efforts to keep them out of certain positions. The discrimination was not restricted to withholding promotions and unfair hiring practices, according to one of the workers. At every phase of each work day they faced discrimination.

By 1960 the Civil Rights Movement was in its infancy and the African American workers were losing patience. In March 1961, President Kennedy issued an executive order establishing a sweeping, government-wide Equal Employment Opportunity Policy. Twenty-one workers began organizing under the leadership of Willie Long, meeting in complete secrecy to protect their safety and their jobs. A complaint was drafted and twenty-five workers ultimately signed it. The complaint covered deplorable conditions for black workers, involving promotions, the apprenticeship program, and general unfair treatment. The shipyard commander found no pattern of discrimination, but President Kennedy's committee was inundated with similar complaints from around the country and changes were finally made after several years. Almost everyone who signed the original complaint was promoted to supervisor and fortunately escaped any of the serious reprisals they feared.

Their quiet but risky fight for equal treatment helped change our Nation. These heroic men included Willie Long, Boston Banks, Jr., Matthew Barnes, Louis Greer, Jake Sloan, Charles Fluker, Clarence Williams, James Davis, Thomas King, Robert E. Borden, James O. Hall, Matthew Luke, Herman Moore, Jimmie James, John L. McGhee, James J. Colbert, Virgil N. Herndon, Eddie Brady, Brodie Taylor, W.J. Price, Levi Jones, Herbert H. Lane, Kermit Day, and Charles Scales.

Madam Speaker, in tribute to these men and their fight for equal rights, it is proper for us, and it is indeed my honor, to formally recognize the Mare Island Original 21ers, and thank them for their heroic actions.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE UDALL-EISENHOWER ARCTIC WILDERNESS ACT

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, the Udall-Eisenhower Arctic Wilderness Act honors two great American visionaries by designating the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as wilderness in their names and giving permanent protection to this great unspoiled wild place. Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower began the bipartisan legacy of fighting to protect this majestic area for future generations of Americans when he set aside the core of the Refuge in 1960. Twenty years later, in 1980, Democratic Representative Morris Udall succeeded in doubling the size of the Refuge, protecting even more of this untrammeled wilderness from oil drilling.

President Eisenhower and Morris Udall had the vision to protect a remote but very special piece of pristine wilderness. I am proud to introduce legislation today along with Representative JIM RAMSTAD of Minnesota that would complete the job they began by giving permanent protection to the coastal plain of the Refuge.

I am also proud to introduce this legislation under the bill number H.R. 39, a bill number with important historical significance in the effort to preserve the land within the Arctic Refuge. H.R. 39 was the bill number given to Mo Udall's Alaska Natural Interest Lands Conservation Act that became law in 1980, expanding the area President Eisenhower had set aside and renaming it as the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Representative Udall later began introducing his legislation to designate the coastal plain of the Refuge as wilderness under that same bill number. This bill number offers an important reminder of the history of this special place.

The coastal plain is the biological heart of the Refuge and is central to the survival of many unique species of animals including caribou, polar bears, musk oxen, wolves, and over 160 species of birds. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service calls the coastal plain the "center for wildlife activity" in the Refuge. If we were to allow drilling in the Refuge it would irreparably disrupt this important ecosystem and one of our last great wild places will be forever scared and destroyed.

In this last year, we have seen so-called "environmentally-gentle" oil drilling exposed once and for all as the myth that it is. On March 2, 2006, BP workers discovered a quarter-inch hole in a pipeline on Alaska's North Slope that had leaked 267,000 gallons of oil onto the arctic tundra. That recent spill was the largest in the history of the North Slope. Subsequent spills led to the discovery that BP had grossly mismanaged and severely neglected its pipelines and North Slope oil drilling operations, which had previously been touted by drilling proponents as the best and most technologically advanced in the world. The reality is that drilling for oil is a dirty business and opening the Arctic Refuge to drilling would forever ruin this untouched special place.

Moreover, if we were to allow drilling in the Arctic Refuge, the crown jewel of the Wildlife Refuge System, it would represent a colossal shift in the policy and precedent governing our wildlife refuges. Prying open the Arctic Refuge for drilling would set a dangerous precedent that would allow the oil companies to select any of the other 544 as the next target for oil drilling.

The Bush administration has argued that we have no choice—that we are so dependent on oil that we must start defiling our wildlife refuge system to keep feeding our oil addiction. That is wrong. We have a choice, a better choice, and it is about time that we enact real changes in our energy policy by focusing on conservation rather than seeking to drill for a few short months worth of oil in this pristine refuge.

The United States consumes 25 percent of the world's oil but controls only 3 percent of the world's oil reserves. We cannot drill our way out of our dependence on foreign oil but we can choose to harness our technologic genius to do something real about our dependence on oil.

Two-thirds of the oil we consume everyday in the U.S. goes into the gas tanks of our cars, trucks and SUVs. From an energy standpoint, drilling in the Refuge is completely unnecessary. If our cars, trucks and SUVs traveled just 3 miles more per gallon today, we would save more oil than drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge would produce at its peak levels of production. But more than that, if we increased fuel economy standards to 40 miles per gallon over 10 years, we would save more oil within 15 years than we would be able to get out of the Arctic Refuge over its entire 40–50 year production life.

The oil fields on the North Slope already annually produce more air pollution and greenhouse gases than the municipality of Washington, D.C. and the Arctic is showing the strains of global warming.

Just this last month, the Bush Interior Department proposed listing the Polar Bear as an "endangered species" because global warming appears to be so drastically affecting its habitat—particularly the summer ice floes needed to hunt—that the bears are drowning far from shore when the floating ice melts. Last week scientists confirmed that a giant ice shelf—the Ayles Ice Shelf—snapped off of its land anchor just 500 miles south of the North Pole in the Canadian Arctic. This is a feature of the Arctic landscape that is thousands of years old. The remaining ice shelves are 90 percent smaller than when they were first discovered in 1906.

Our addiction to oil is real and enduring and still largely untreated. Drilling in the refuge would amount to a declaration that we remain in denial about this addiction, its impact on our planet and our obligation to future generations.

If Congress were to ever turn the coastal plain of the Arctic Refuge into an industrial footprint by allowing oil drilling, the impact on

the land and the wildlife would be permanent but the hoped-for energy benefits only temporary. There are some places in our world that are so rare and so special, that we have a responsibility to protect them. The Arctic Refuge is one of those places. As Mo Udall said, ''In our lifetime, we have few opportunities to shape the very Earth on which our descendants will live their lives. In each generation, we have carved up more and more of our once-great natural heritage. There ought to be a few places left in the world the way the Almighty made them.'' The Udall-Eisenhower Arctic Wilderness Act would ensure that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is never carved up by the big oil companies but is instead forever protected for future Americans.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CALLING FOR 2–1–1 ACT OF 2007

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. TERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Calling for 2–1–1 Act of 2007. I am proud to lend my support as an original cosponsor of this bill, which was introduced today by my colleague, Ms. ESHOO of California. I would also like to note a concern I have with the bill as introduced, which I hope will be resolved prior to a vote in the full House of Representatives.

2–1–1 is the number designated by the Federal Communications Commission to provide citizens with information and referral about important community services and volunteer opportunities. United Way and its affiliates operate more than 200 call centers in 41 states nationwide, including my home state of Nebraska. About two-thirds of American citizens currently have access to 2–1–1 referrals. The Calling for 2–1–1 Act will help achieve nationwide coverage for all citizens.

More than 50 percent of the calls made to 2–1–1 call centers are placed to meet basic needs such as food, heat, clothing and shelter for citizens facing difficulty. 2–1–1 helps to keep citizens off long-term government financial aid such as welfare and food stamps by meeting immediate needs before they become crises. 2–1–1 also enhances homeland security by serving as an emergency backup to 9–1–1 during natural disasters and other crises.

In my Congressional District alone, almost 40,000 Nebraskans sought information through 2–1–1 between November 2005 and October 2006. The top needs were for assistance with utilities, rent, food, housing, health and dental care, furniture and tax preparation. Thousands of Nebraskans were able to obtain assistance from federal and non-profit community service agencies because of the existence of 2–1–1.

2–1–1 was crucial during the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. When 9–1–1 emergency lines were inoperational, 2–1–1 stepped up to link citizens in dire need with critical services, including emergency medical care, food and housing, and crisis recovery and relocation services nationwide. Volunteer organizations such as the Red Cross also benefit from people who call 2–1–1 seeking opportunities to give back to their communities. 2–1–1 meets critical needs and merits federal aid, provided that additional protections are put in place before this legislation is brought to a vote.

It was my privilege to work last year with Ms. ESHOO and Mrs. CLINTON in the Senate, as well as Mr. PICKERING and Mr. BILIRAKIS in the House of Representatives, to address important concerns for ''socially sensitive'' referrals before bringing the Calling for 2–1–1 Act to a vote. As Members of Congress with deep convictions for the protection of human life, we drafted language to refer callers seeking pregnancy-related services to public health departments.

This reasonable compromise was designed to ensure the 2–1–1 legislation does not become a vehicle for taxpayer funding of controversial referrals such as abortion. Unfortunately, this important language, which had been agreed upon by all parties, was not included in the legislation introduced today. I look forward to working with my Ms. ESHOO and my other colleagues to correct this situation.

If my concerns are not addressed, I would be forced to vote against and actively fight against the legislation I have cosponsored and worked to enact into law, despite my strong support for increasing access to 2–1–1 for more American citizens. The fact that I have again cosponsored this legislation despite my concern is testament to the good working relationship I have enjoyed with Ms. ESHOO and Ms. CLINTON, and which I trust will continue during this new Congress.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I look forward to working with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to help this legislation become law while ensuring it protects and upholds the sanctity of human life.

IN HONOR OF UNIVERSITY PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate University Park Elementary School upon its receipt of the Department of Education's prestigious Blue Ribbon School Award.

University Park Elementary School is among the first selected in the 2006 No Child Left Behind—Blue Ribbon Schools Program. It is among only 250 schools nationwide honored for either superior academic achievement or dramatic gains in student achievement.

The Blue Ribbon Award is a testament to the hard work and dedication demonstrated by the students, parents, teachers, and administrators of University Park Elementary. This Award also recognizes the values that make the Highland Park Independent School District a beacon of academic excellence.

It is my honor and privilege to recognize University Park Elementary School for its outstanding achievement in preparing our children for the challenges of tomorrow. May University Park Elementary School continue to be a shining example of superior leadership and commitment to excellence in education.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION FOR SWEARING IN CEREMONY

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Speaker, please excuse my absence from the formal House of Representatives swearing in ceremony today as I was unavoidably detained while paying my respects to a fallen soldier from my district at his funeral in Arlington National Cemetery. I appreciate the opportunity to take my oath of office on my return to the U.S. Capitol.

RECOGNIZING MATTHEW A. PILCH FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Matthew A. Pilch, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 374, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Matthew has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Matthew has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Matthew A. Pilch for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout. I am honored to represent Matthew in the United States House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO THE PEOPLES BANK

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, it is with pleasure that I stand before you today to recognize the many accomplishments of Peoples Bank and offer my congratulations on their 97th Anniversary in the Northwest Indiana community. To commemorate this special occasion, Peoples Bank will hold an anniversary celebration on Saturday, January 6, 2007, at the Center for Visual and Performing Arts in Munster, Indiana.

Peoples Bank was established in 1910 and was organized with a focus to meet the many needs of its consumers. Peoples Bank was originally known as the First Polish National Building and Loan Association. During that time, it was the main hub for church and social activities in East Chicago, Indiana. Over several decades, the association's name changed numerous times, and in 1989, it was renamed Peoples Bank.

Peoples Bank was the first savings and loan association to receive a federal charter in East

Chicago after the Great Depression. In the 1950s, the bank played an integral role in assisting former servicemen to build or purchase homes through G.I. Loans. At this time, Peoples Bank expanded its access to the Northwest Indiana community by moving into a multi-office operation. The Woodmar section of Hammond was chosen as the second office location for Peoples Bank.

It was during the 1960s that Peoples Bank added another branch location in Merrillville. Due to the success of these initial offices, additional branches were eventually established in the area, including branches in Dyer, Munster, Schererville, and a second branch in Merrillville. In the year 2000, Peoples Bank opened its eighth branch location in Hobart.

With all of this expansion taking place, Peoples Bank introduced a new corporate headquarters in 2003. Located on two acres, this four-story building houses the many departments and offices necessary to operate such a professional organization, where the customers always come first.

Peoples Bank's Chief Executive Officer and Chairman, Mr. David Bochnowski, has served as the leader of the organization since 1981, after serving on the board since 1977. With his guidance, along with all the hard work of the staff, Peoples Bank has continued to be an active force in providing superior customer service and assistance to all of Northwest Indiana.

Madam Speaker, at this time, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in honoring and congratulating Peoples Bank on their 97th Anniversary. Their dedication to the people of Northwest Indiana and their constant efforts throughout the years are worthy of the highest commendation.

TRIBUTE TO YVONNE SCARLETT-GOLDEN

HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to the late Honorable Yvonne Scarlett-Golden, Mayor of Daytona Beach, Florida.

On Tuesday, December 5, this great pioneering lady succumbed to cancer at the age of 80, even as she continued performing her duties as the first female and African-American Mayor of that city. She was buried with full honors in her native Daytona Beach on Wednesday, December 13, surrounded by her six grandchildren, two brothers and a bereaved constituency. Her untimely passing will truly leave a deep void in our midst, especially in our state's African-American leadership and among the august membership of the National League of Cities, which looked up to Mayor Scarlett-Golden as one of Florida's truly great mayors.

Affectionately called ''The Mayor,'' by her constituents and friends, Mrs. Scarlett-Golden was one of the best and noblest of Florida's leaders. She dedicated 38 years of her life toward championing the education and academic achievements of Florida students and those who came under her tutelage at the San Francisco (California) Unified School District. She advocated comprehensive academics for her students, along with scholastic projects designed to help students at the junior and senior college levels. Mrs. Scarlett-Golden believed that education was the best way for children of the poor to achieve and serve as responsible and productive citizens.

A native of Daytona Beach, Mayor Scarlett-Golden obtained her early education at Daytona Beach's Campbell and Kaiser Laboratory School. She went on to get her Bachelor's degree, graduating with Honors from Bethune-Cookman College (B–CC), and later on obtained her Master's Degree in Education from Boston University. In 1999, her alma mater (B–CC) conferred upon her the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws.

Former Congresswoman Carrie P. Meek, a longtime friend, said of her, ''Yvonne was an incredible woman who achieved a tremendous amount in her life. She took on challenges and she was a real fighter. I never would've guessed the end was so near for my dear friend.'' ''She lived everyday as though her incredible life was never going to end.''

This public servant was a multi-dimensional leader, an indefatigable community-builder, and a loving mother and grandmother. Her leadership was truly admirable. Mrs. Scarlett-Golden was a faithful steward of Daytona Beach. She was God's faithful servant, bringing hope and optimism to thousands of ordinary folks whose lives she touched so deeply, never holding anyone at arm's length. This remarkable lady was a friend of the family. She was my confidante, and I was blessed to have her as my god-mother. Indeed, for me, she will serve as an indelible reminder of the noble commitment and awesome power of public service on behalf of the less fortunate. Her faith was deep and resolute and she was blessed with a sunny disposition and enviable optimism. She will be truly missed.

She taught us the virtues of hope, optimism and faith during her earthly sojourn. This is the wonderful legacy Mayor Yvonne Scarlett-Golden left behind. And this is the gift with which she blesses us now.

INLAND EMPIRE REGIONAL WATER RECYCLING INITIATIVE

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to re-introduce the Inland Empire Regional Water Recycling Initiative, to authorize water recycling projects under the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's Title XVI program. This legislation, which passed the House in the 109th Congress, is an important component of southern California's regional water management.

The Inland Empire Water Recycling Initiative authorizes $30 million for the Inland Empire Utilities Agency and the Cucamonga Valley Water District to assist in constructing two water recycling projects. The projects will produce nearly 100,000 acre-feet of new water annually to the area's water supply. This initiative has the support of all member agencies of the Inland Empire Utilities Agency, which encompasses 240 square miles in southern California. It also serves a number of cities I represent, including the cities of Rancho Cucamonga, Upland and Montclair.

These water agencies are using high quality recycled water in many water intensive applications, like landscape and agricultural irrigation, construction, and industrial cooling. This allows fresh water to be conserved or used for drinking, which reduces our dependence on expensive imported water. In addition, by recycling water which would otherwise be wasted and unavailable, these agencies ensure that we ring the last drop of use out of water before it is ultimately returned to the environment.

It is imperative that we continue to approve measures preventing water supply shortages in the Western United States. This recycling initiative will help meet the water needs of the Inland Empire and begin a strategic federal-local partnership to bring a significant amount of new water supply to the region. In fact, the Bureau of Reclamation has already recognized the Inland Empire Water Recycling Initiative as one of the most cost effective water reuse projects.

The Inland Empire Regional Water Recycling Initiative has the support of all member agencies of IEUA, as well as the water agencies downstream in Orange County. IEUA serves the cities of Chino, Chino Hills, Fontana (through the Fontana Water Company), Ontario, Upland, Montclair, Rancho Cucamonga (through the Cucamonga Valley Water District), and the Monte Vista Water District.

I look forward to working closely with the House Resources Committee, and with the new Water and Power Subcommittee Chairwoman GRACE NAPOLITANO, who is a cosponsor of this bill and has been a champion of regional water solutions. I am also pleased to have the continued support of my colleagues, KEN CALVERT and GARY MILLER.

RECOGNIZING NICHOLAS J. PILCH FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Nicolas J. Pilch, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 374, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Nicolas has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Nicolas has been involved with Scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Nicolas J. Pilch for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout. I am honored to represent Nicolas in the United States House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO THE VERY REVEREND FATHER JOVAN TODOROVICH

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure and admiration that I congratulate the Very Reverend Father Jovan Todorovich upon his retirement as parish priest at Saint Sava Serbian Orthodox Church in Merrillville, Indiana. I can truly say throughout his more than 36 years of service at Saint Sava, Father Todorovich has been one of the most dedicated, distinguished, and committed citizens of Indiana's First Congressional District. Northwest Indiana and Saint Sava have certainly been rewarded by the true service and uncompromising loyalty he has displayed to the parish and the entire community.

Father Todorovich was born in Vratare, Serbia on July 5, 1940. From a very young age, he was inspired by his faith and realized that a life of service in the priesthood was his calling. In pursuit of his dream, Father Todorovich eventually went on to complete his courses, earning a Bachelor's Degree in Theological Studies at Saints Cyril and Methodius Seminarian College in Prizen. Following the completion of his studies, Father Todorovich emigrated to the United States of America in 1964. In 1965, due to his perseverance and dedication, Father Todorovich's efforts came to fruition with his ordination into the priesthood.

Prior to joining the congregation at Saint Sava Serbian Orthodox Church, while serving as parish priest for Saint George Church, Father Todorovich served as the director of the Saint Sava Mission Summer Camp program in California. Shortly thereafter, in 1970, he arrived at Saint Sava Church, which was located in Gary, Indiana at the time. Early on during his tenure as parish priest at Saint Sava, Father Todorovich's abilities as a teacher and community leader began to emerge. It was through his efforts at this time that many new members joined the congregation, a new donation campaign was initiated, new church bylaws were introduced, and the need for social gatherings and activities for youth was realized.

When a fire destroyed the church in Gary, Father Todorovich led the parishioners of Saint Sava to a new chapel in Hobart, Indiana, where services were held until the construction of the current church, located in Merrillville, Indiana, was completed. Subsequently, the new church was consecrated in May 1991. Once again, with Father Todorovich's leadership and committed efforts, as well as the vast efforts of many parishioners, the people of Saint Sava were once again able to come together with their spiritual leader and each other to worship.

The new church's consecration, however, was not the only momentous occasion at this time, as Father Todorovich was awarded the highest honor, the Pectoral Cross with the title of Protojerej Stavrofor. To further illustrate the high esteem in which Father Todorovich is held by his parish and his community, in April 1993, he was appointed to the distinguished position of Deputy to the Metropolitan.

Another of the many ways Father Todorovich has touched the lives of so many people is through his writing. Father Todorovich is quite the accomplished writer, having produced several literary works, including: Patron Saint-Krsna Slava, Our Slava: A Manual on Confession and Communion, and A Visitor's Guide to Saint Sava Church. He has also penned various articles for the Diocesan Observer, as well as for Saint Sava's church bulletin.

Although his pastoral duties and many additional responsibilities have required a vast amount of his time, what is most impressive is the fact that Father Todorovich has never let his busy schedule keep him from his greatest love, his family. Father Todorovich and his wife, Protinica Mirijana, are the proud parents of three daughters, and they have also been blessed with one grandchild.

Madam Speaker, America is a better place because of the tireless and unselfish service of its citizens. Very Reverend Father Jovan Todorovich is a man who has dedicated his entire life to serving others, and he has been the truest example of morality and wisdom. In so doing, he has strengthened his community and the whole of our society. I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in commending Very Reverend Father Jovan Todorovich for his lifetime of enduring service and the unforgettable effect he has had on the people of Saint Sava Serbian Orthodox Church and Northwest Indiana. I wish Father Todorovich and his family well upon his retirement.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MARTY R. PINKSTON

HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Dr. Marty R. Pinkston, a longtime and dear friend of my family and one of our community's unsung heroines.

On Friday, December 15, 2006, her peers, friends and supporters will honor her at a farewell dinner as she retires from her position as Director of Governmental and Public Affairs at Florida Memorial University.

A preeminent educator, Dr. Pinkston is affectionately known as "Marty" to her countless admirers and is truly one of the most indomitable community activists of South Florida. Having dedicated a major portion of her life to making the public educational system work on behalf of Florida's minority and poor students, she has been relentless in developing innovative educational programs that succinctly responded to the needs of our community's underserved college student population. Responsible for developing strategies to secure additional resources for the university from local, state and federal sources, Dr. Pinkston was unrelenting in her dedication to providing quality education for all those willing to walk the extra mile in pursuing their college degree.

Having received her bachelor's degree from Florida A&M University, she went on to obtain her MA in Business Education from New York Institute of Technology and her Doctorate in Education from Nova Southeastern University. She complimented her educational achievements with her chairmanship of the Metro-Miami Action Plan Trust and service on the United Way of Miami-Dade County and the Miami-Dade Chamber of Commerce, as well as on the Metro-Dade County Safe Neighborhoods Parks Oversight Committee.

Dr. Pinkston epitomizes an admirable spirit of compassion and her concern for the less fortunate in our society will forever be lauded. But she is more than that. Dr. Marty Pinkston is remarkable not just for her energy, achievements and leadership, but because of the kind of person that she is. People are naturally attracted to her. The day just goes better if you get the chance to spend some time with Marty Pinkston.

As one of those hardy spirits who conscientiously chose to reach out to the less fortunate, Dr. Pinkston thoroughly understood how leadership could truly change people's lives. She wisely exercised her leadership and politic skills, alongside the mandate of her conviction and the wisdom of her knowledge. The crucial role she played all these years in developing the winning strategy for many a successful candidate for elective office evokes a genuine insight borne out of experience and expertise. She would often say that the accolades are not that important at all. Instead, she would note that what is important is that our community receives the recognition of its strength and promise amidst the tremendous challenges it has had to undertake all through the years.

It is an honor to have the the privilege of knowing this gentle and caring leader. I salute Dr. Marty R. Pinkston, a very dear friend, on behalf of a grateful community that she truly loves and cares for. Now, in retirement, she embarks upon new challenges in life and I am certain her legacy of greatness will only grow and develop as she enters this new phase of life. I wish her every happiness and success.

SAN GABRIEL BASIN RESTORATION FUND

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that will continue to provide safe drinking water to Southern California. In 2000, Congress created the San Gabriel Basin Restoration Fund after the discovery of perchlorate and other harmful contaminants in the basin's groundwater. The fund initially authorized $85 million in federal funding to assist the state and local government agencies as well as the private companies found responsible for the contamination to effectively implement a comprehensive clean up plan that would protect the safety of our region's drinking water supply. After evaluation, it is evident that an increase in this authorization is necessary. Therefore, I am introducing legislation to amend the original authorization by increasing the total amount by $50 million.

The San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority (WQA) has done a tremendous job in administering the clean up program. In 1999, the WQA projected the cost of cleaning up the San Gabriel Basin at a total of $320 million based on the level of contamination of the five original Operable Units of Baldwin Park, El

Monte, South El Monte, Whittier Narrows and Puente Valley. Since the San Gabriel Basin Restoration Fund was authorized by Congress in 2000, dramatically increased contamination levels have been identified in the South El Monte and Puente Valley Operable Units. This discovery has significantly increased both the capitol and operation and maintenance costs of the projects. With the cost of inflation, increased energy costs and the higher contamination levels found, the total cost is now estimated at $1 billion. Significantly, the WQA has a number of treatment plants that are already operating at full capacity with more coming on line in the near future.

The San Gabriel Groundwater Basin covers more than 160 square miles in Los Angeles County and is the primary source of drinking water for over 1.2 million people. Furthermore, natural groundwater flows from the San Gabriel Basin are allowing the contamination to spread into the Central Groundwater Basin, a vast 277 square-mile underground aquifer that provides drinking water to over half of Los Angeles County.

In working with the WQA and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation over the past decade on this regional solution, there is no doubt that this increase is warranted and will be utilized in the most effective way to continue to provide safe drinking water.

I look forward to working closely with the House Resources Committee, and with the new Water and Power Subcommittee Chairwoman GRACE NAPOLITANO, who is a cosponsor of this bill and has been a champion of regional water solutions. I am also pleased to have the support of my colleagues ADAM SCHIFF, HILDA SOLIS and GARY MILLER, who are cosponsors of this legislation.

RECOGNIZING ZACHARY R. BODE FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Zachary R. Bode, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 395, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Zachary has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Zachary has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Zachary R. Bode for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout. I am honored to represent Zachary in the United States House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO MR. DALE ENGQUIST

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, it is with great honor and pleasure that I stand before you today to recognize the many years of dedicated service of Mr. Dale Engquist. Having known Dale for many years, I can truly say that he is one of the most committed, knowledgeable, and honorable citizens in Northwest Indiana. Nowhere has his knowledge and commitment been more evident than in his faithful service to the National Park Service (NPS), and more specifically, to the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. Dale has served the Northwest Indiana community for the past 28 years, and his service to the NPS has spanned an astonishing 42 years. For many years, Dale has been a constant fixture at the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for his efforts, he will be honored at a retirement party on Tuesday, January 9, 2007, at the Lubeznik Center for the Arts in Michigan City, Indiana.

Following a summer position at Wind Cave National Park in South Dakota, Dale Engquist began his professional career with the NPS in 1964 at the National Capital Parks in Washington, DC. From there, Dale went on to serve as Chief Park Naturalist at Hot Springs National Park in Arkansas and then Assistant Chief Park Naturalist at Everglades National Park in Florida. Following his departure from Everglades National Park in 1971, Dale accepted his first Superintendent position at the Biscayne National Monument in Florida. After moving on to other managerial positions in New Jersey and Washington, DC, Dale settled in Northwest Indiana in 1978, where he served as Assistant Superintendent of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore until January 1983. At that time, Dale was named to the distinguished position of Superintendent of the National Lakeshore, a position he has held for the past 24 years. Over the years, Dale has maintained this post, and he has done so with a selfless commitment to nature and to the community. Dale's education, knowledge, and experience with the NPS have made him successful and respected in all of the positions he has held.

Indisputably, Dale Engquist has been extremely successful throughout his career with the NPS. To attest to this fact, Dale has been the recipient of numerous accolades and awards for merit and dedication. In 1987, he was awarded the Park Planning and Design Award for excellence in park design, as well as the Richard G. Lugar Award for recognition as an outstanding federal employee in the state of Indiana. In addition, Dale has also been honored with the 1991 Superintendent of the Year & Resource Stewardship Award, the National Park Service's 75th Anniversary Director's Award, the Sagamore of the Wabash, the Meritorious Service Award by then-Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt, the Polish Cavalry Cross of Merit, and the Chicago Wilderness Excellence in Conservation Award.

Though it may be difficult to imagine where he finds the time, Dale has always been involved in several associations and organizations, including: the Association of National Park Rangers, the Eastern National Parks & Monument Association, the National Park & Recreation Association, the Indiana Park & Recreation Association, the Indiana Historical Society, the National Audubon Society, and Rotary International.

Madam Speaker, Dale Engquist has devoted himself to improving and preserving the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore and serving the people of Northwest Indiana throughout his many years of service. At this time, I ask that you and all of my distinguished colleagues join me in commending him for his lifetime of service and dedication.

TRIBUTE TO MIAMI-DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, today I rise in solidarity with the Miami-Dade County Public Schools on the occasion of National World AIDS Day. Miami-Dade County Public Schools are working hard within my community to provide much-needed prevention information, as well as assistance to those afflicted with the HIV/AIDS virus.

Indeed, the National World AIDS Day evokes once again a special opportunity for the Miami-Dade County Public Schools, my North Dade constituents and the larger Miami-Dade County and South Florida communities to renew our collective and individual commitment to find a cure for this treatable and preventable disease. As we remember in our prayers those who passed on, as well as reach out to those who need our help, we are reminded of the urgency to fight against the spread of this virus. Despite the best efforts of our AIDS-support community organizations, in concert with the Miami-Dade County Public Schools, HIV/AIDS continues to be a devastating disease. I commend our health care professionals, the volunteers from our community organizations, and our schools, who together exemplify a symbol of strength and resilience in a way that combines true professionalism and utmost compassion along the tradition of our stewardship for one another.

The leadership of the Miami-Dade County Public Schools is readily focused on providing the opportunities of outreach information and ongoing education in a way that advances the common good of our fellow human beings, especially those who are suffering from the effects of the AIDS disease.

Despite the strategies and activities that organizations of good-will have utilized to combat this virus, we are still saddled with the fact that the pace of the AIDS infection is staggering. According to recent statistics from the World Health Organization, the past year alone has seen more infection and death from HIV/AIDS than ever before.

Of the estimated 18,371 AIDS-related deaths in the United States in 2006, approximately 52 percent were from the Black community. According to the Centers for Disease Control, Blacks accounted for 54 percent of all new diagnoses of HIV/AIDS. In Florida, HIV/AIDS is the leading cause of death among Black males and females, aged 25 to 44 years old. According to the Florida Department of Health, over half of all people living with HIV/

AIDS in Miami-Dade and Broward Counties are Black.

As we celebrate National World AIDS Day in light of these agonizing facts, we must put forth a much more aggressive and concerted effort to reach out to our communities, teaching our residents about this disease, insure proper treatment for AIDS victims and continue the research needed to bring this epidemic under control. This infectious disease should not be a partisan issue, but should be a commitment for all Americans. We can and we must address the HIV/AIDS epidemic aggressively, both at home and abroad.

I encourage everyone in Miami-Dade and Broward Counties and beyond to get tested; get informed about prevention and get treatment if you need it. Let's all renew our efforts to stop the spread of this dreaded disease and, as a caring community, reach out to those of our fellow residents who are already living with HIV/AIDS. I commend the Miami-Dade County Public Schools for their leadership role in raising the awareness level about HIV/AIDS and encourage school administrators, faculty, staff and students to continue with this most laudable effort.

RECOGNIZING CHARLES C. CROWE, IV FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Charles C. Crowe, IV, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 395, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Charles has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Charles has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Charles C. Crowe, IV for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout. I am honored to represent Charles in the United States House of Representatives.

COMMENDING LEE BANDY

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, last month, the dean of South Carolina political reporters, Lee Bandy, announced his retirement from The State newspaper. Bandy joined The State in 1966, serving as Washington correspondent and bureau chief before relocating to Columbia. I well remember him giving me a tour of Congressional offices when I was a Senate intern in 1967.

I have known and worked with Lee extensively during my years in South Carolina politics. While his departure marks the end of an era, I know Lee will continue to exert tremendous influence on the South Carolina political scene.

At a recent meeting of Midlands First Tuesday Club, I presented Lee a Certificate of Achievement on behalf of Congress.

On December 14, 2006, The State's Aaron Gould Sheinin penned the following article marking Bandy's retirement:

AFTER 40 YEARS AND 3,000 COLUMNS, THE STATE'S LEE BANDY IS RETIRING

Hailed as a legend by colleagues and a mover and shaker by sources, reporter has kept finger on pulse of S.C. politics

Legendary political reporter and columnist Lee Bandy will retire at the end of the year after 40 years with The State newspaper.

Bandy, 71, has been with the newspaper since 1966. He started as Washington correspondent, then served as Washington bureau chief. He moved to Columbia in January 1992.

While Bandy will retire from day-to-day reporting, he will continue writing his weekly Sunday column at least through 2007.

During a luncheon in his honor Wednesday at the newspaper, Bandy told his colleagues, ''I've met a lot of fascinating people, and I might add I've worked with some wonderful people. You've been a source of inspiration to me.''

As the top political reporter in South Carolina, Bandy often is sought out by politicians looking for a positive mention in his Sunday column. During Wednesday's lunch, in fact, potential 2008 presidential candidate John Edwards left a phone message for Bandy congratulating him on his coming retirement.

During 40 years of writing his column, Bandy never missed a week. He said he estimates he's written 3,000 columns. Each column is about 800 words. That's more than 2 million words, ''and that's more than enough for anybody,'' Bandy said.

David Broder, longtime political reporter for The Washington Post, said Bandy was a legend in the Senate Press Gallery in Washington. Broder still occasionally calls Bandy to get the pulse of South Carolina politics.

''He's enormously generous and helpful and tells you stories you would never hear from any other source,'' Broder said.

Former S.C. Gov. David Beasley, a Republican, called Bandy his friend and said, ''No one has become president of the United States without crossing his path in 40 years, and no one has had an impact on South Carolina government that hasn't dealt with Lee Bandy.''

A native of Asheville, Bandy is a graduate of Bob Jones University. He is a member of the exclusive Gridiron Club of Washington journalists. He and his wife, Mary, have two sons, Ryan and Michael, a daughter, Alexa, and two grandchildren, Sophia and Nathaniel. They are members of First Presbyterian Church in Columbia and live in Forest Acres.

INTRODUCTION OF THE BALANCED BUDGET CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I rise to introduce legislation that will amend the United States Constitution to force Congress to rein in spending by balancing the federal budget.

It is common sense to American families that they cannot spend more than they have—yet far too frequently, this fundamental principle has been lost on a Congress that is too busy spending to pay attention to the bottom line.

Our federal government must be lean, efficient and responsible with the dollars that our nation's citizens worked so hard to earn. We must work to both eliminate every cent of waste and squeeze every cent of value out of each dollar our citizens entrust to us. Families all across our nation understand what it means to make tough decisions each day about what they can and cannot afford, corporate officers are required to act in the best interests of their shareholders when using company resources, and government officials should be held to similar standards when spending the hard-earned dollars of our nation's citizens.

Congress took a dramatic step forward last year when it passed the Deficit Reduction Act. This new law found savings of approximately $40 billion over the next five years by eliminating wasteful spending and programs. This legislation was an important first step, but it was just that—a first step. Furthermore, the legislation was passed by the Senate by a margin of just one vote and was passed by the House by a margin of two votes, which shows exactly how difficult the task of balancing the budget is—and how important it is to force Congress to do so.

In the 109th Congress, we were fortunate to have a majority in the House and Senate that had an appetite for reining in spending but we stil have to make considerable strides to achieve a balanced budget. Only time will tell whether future Congresses will have this appetite as well. However, one thing is certain—if we pass an amendment to the U.S. Constitution that requires a balanced budget, Congress will have to act accordingly regardless of which party is in control in Washington, D.C. This is exactly why I am introducing this legislation today.

My legislation would amend the Constitution to require that total spending for any fiscal year not exceed total receipts and require the president to propose budgets to Congress that are balanced each year. It would also provide an exception in times of military conflicts that pose imminent and serious military threats to national security.

Furthermore, the legislation would make it harder to increase taxes by requiring that legislation to increase revenue must be passed by a true majority of each chamber and not just a majority of those present and voting. Finally, the bill requires a 3/5 majority vote for any increases in the debt limit.

This concept is not new. Forty-nine out of fifty States have a balanced budget requirement.

It has become clear that it is extremely difficult for Congress to agree on a budget that is fiscally responsible. By amending the Constitution to require a balanced budget, we can force Congress to control spending, paving the way for a return to surpluses and ultimately paying down the national debt, rather than allow big spenders to lead us further down the road of chronic deficits and in doing so leave our children and grandchildren saddled with debt that is not their own.

Yesterday, President Bush also highlighted the importance of a balanced federal budget

by announcing his plan to present Congress with a budget proposal that will balance the budget by 2012. I applaud the President for his announcement and look forward to working with him to bring fiscal responsibility back to the federal government.

Our nation faces many difficult decisions in the coming years, and Congress will face great pressure to spend beyond its means rather than to make difficult decisions about spending priorities. Unless Congress is forced to make the decisions necessary to create a balanced budget, it will always have the all-too-tempting option of shirking this responsibility. The Balanced Budget Constitutional amendment is a common sense approach to ensure that Congress is bound by the same fiscal principles that America's families face each day.

I urge support of this important legislation.

RECOGNIZING CHARLES T. ORTMAN FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Charles T. Ortman, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 395, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Charles has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Charles has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Charles T. Ortman for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout. I am honored to represent Charles in the United States House of Representatives.

THE TEAM (TO ENCOURAGE ALTERNATIVELY-FUELED VEHICLE MANUFACTURING) UP FOR ENERGY INDEPENDENCE ACT

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Madam Speaker, climate change threatens the security and stability of our planet. The temperature of the earth is increasing at a rate unseen in modern times and is starting to melt the polar ice caps and disrupt weather patterns. Unprecedented levels of carbon dioxide pumped into the atmosphere by automobiles and industries, with about one-fourth of the world's carbon dioxide emissions being produced by the United States, have led to current rates of warming.

Historically high gas prices and political instability in oil producing regions reinforce the need for the United States to secure our energy independence. We can make real progress by developing and distributing alternatively fueled vehicles. Through innovation and existing technology, we can reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and promote energy efficiency and conservation to secure a safe future for our country and the environment.

Alternatively fueled vehicles, such as those that use E85 ethanol fuel, could reduce our use of petroleum fuels by up to 40%, helping our country move towards sustainable energy independence. E85 ethanol fuel can be produced from agricultural products grown here in the United States, so that money spent on fuel supports farmers in the Midwest, not countries in the Middle East. Corn may not be the only answer to biofuels, as other sources of energy such as switchgrass or other renewable starch re-sources are also on the horizon.

Congress must do more to make alternative fueled vehicles practical and accessible to every American. There are currently only six million E85–capable vehicles on U.S. roads, compared to approximately 230 million gasoline- and diesel-fueled vehicles, according to the National Ethanol Vehicle Coalition. Only 993 fuel stations in the entire country currently provide E85 fuel, and only four of these are located in California.

That is why I am again introducing this bill to encourage consumers and manufacturers to develop the infrastructure necessary for a cleaner energy future. We must do more to make alternatively fueled vehicles practical and accessible to everyone. The cost of producing flex fuel capable vehicles is minimal at the time of manufacture, but there are currently few incentives for the production of flex fuel vehicles and a lack of infrastructure to service them.

My bill will encourage the production of more alternatively fueled vehicles by phasing in a tax penalty on the manufacture or import of new, non-flex fuel vehicles. However, since the cost to convert fleets to flex fuel is nearly nil, it will be easy for manufacturers or importers to avoid these costs completely. Any revenues generated would be used to help independent gas station owners install alternative fuel equipment.

I would like to thank Speaker PELOSI for her hard work and dedication to increase investment in renewable energy and ultimately achieving energy independence. I hope this bill can be a part of the crucial national dialogue towards securing our energy independence and helping America move towards a more secure and sustainable future.

COMMENDING JOAN COUNTRYMAN

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend Joan Countryman, who recently became the head of the Oprah Winfrey Leadership Academy for Girls in South Africa. In 2005, Ms. Countryman stepped down as head of the prestigious Lincoln School for girls in Providence, Rhode Island.

Ms. Countryman, a Quaker, began her career first as a math teacher and then as an administrator at the Germantown Friends School in Philadelphia, which she attended as a student. She received a bachelor's degree from Sarah Lawrence College in 1962, and after taking part in the civil rights movement, she received a master's degree in urban studies from Yale. In 1966, Ms. Countryman received a Fulbright fellowship to the London School of Economics. She is also a former Columbia University Klingenstein Fellow and a Woodrow Wilson Fellow. Ms. Countryman is also the author of works such as her 1992 book, Writing to Learn Mathematics, in which she explained how she approached the teaching of math by using such tools as journals, learning logs, and formal papers.

Before asking Ms. Countryman to head her new academy, Oprah Winfrey first asked her to lend her experience and expertise as a consultant. Oprah Winfrey founded the Leadership Academy with the goal of targeting South African girls from poor families and giving them an educational opportunity that they would otherwise not have received. Beginning with 152 girls in the seventh and eighth grades, the academy has a goal of expanding through grade 12.

I know that Joan Countryman will institute a welcoming and challenging school environment at the Oprah Winfrey Leadership Academy. Rhode Island was honored to have Ms. Countryman as an educator for twelve years, and the girls in South Africa will be lucky to have her there now.

Madam Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join with me in wishing Joan Countryman well in her new endeavor, as well as success to the Oprah Winfrey Leadership Academy.

RECOGNIZING JONATHAN VERNICKAS FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jonathan Vernickas, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 214, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jonathan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jonathan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jonathan Vernickas for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout. I am honored to represent Jonathan in the United States House of Representatives.

HONORING JOHN CASE, CHAIRMAN OF THE PACE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

HON. JUDY BIGGERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to thank John Case for his eight years of service as Chairman of the Pace Board of Directors. Under John's leadership, numerous improvements were instituted to North America's 6th largest bus system, resulting in better service for millions of Americans living in the Chicagoland area.

It is no surprise that John was chosen to serve as Chairman of the Board—he has a long history of serving his community and nation. As a retired United States Air Force Major with twenty years of service, including in the third bomber wing during the Korean War, he brought many valuable skills to his role as Chairman. His experience is evident in the many improvements he instituted. These include developing Board Committees to handle specific decision areas, implementing use of biodiesel in the Pace bus fleet, doubling the size of Pace's vanpool program, ensuring that retirement funds are being adequately funded, and implementation of the Intelligent Bus System, which provides real-time information on bus locations, ridership and on-time performance.

John is a dedicated public servant. For more than forty years, he has served his community in many public roles. He began his public career in Lisle Township—located in the 13th District of Illinois, which I represent—and, since then, has held the position of Township Trustee and Supervisor for Lisle Township. In Dupage County, in which Lisle Township resides, he has served as a DuPage County Board Member, County Board Chairman, and Forest Preserve President.

Once again, I would like to congratulate and thank John Case on his eight successful years as Chairman of the Pace Board of Directors and for all he has done for his community.

INTRODUCTION OF THE GERALD W. HEANEY FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE AND CUSTOMHOUSE ACT

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of a bill to name the Federal building and United States Courthouse and Customhouse in Duluth, Minnesota, in honor of Judge Gerald W. Heaney. Judge Heaney was appointed Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the 8th Circuit on November 3, 1966. After 40 years of distinguished judicial service, Judge Heaney retired on August 31, 2006.

Judge Heaney was born on January 29, 1918, in Goodhue, a rural community in the southeastern part of Minnesota. As a child growing up in a farming community, Judge Heaney learned the value of a close family, honesty, and hard work. These qualities have marked not only his personal life but also his life as a public servant. He was educated at the College of St. Thomas in St. Paul, Minnesota, and received his law degree from the University of Minnesota in 1941.

Gerry Heaney is a decorated World War II veteran. He was a member of the distinguished Army Ranger Battalion and participated in the historic D-Day landing at Normandy. He was awarded the Silver Star for extraordinary bravery in the battle of La Pointe du Hoc in Normandy, France. He also received a Bronze Star and five battle stars.

At the end of the war, Judge Heaney returned home and entered private practice in Duluth. During that time he was instrumental in improving the state education system, and served on the Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota. He was instrumental in helping the Duluth school system develop a payroll system that equalized the pay for both men and women.

In 1966, President Johnson appointed Judge Heaney to the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals. In that capacity, Judge Heaney has been a champion of protecting the rights of the disadvantaged. He is devoted to making sure that every person has an equal opportunity for an education, a job, and a home. He firmly believes the poor, the less educated, and less advantaged deserve the protections provided by the United States Constitution.

As a hard working, well-prepared, and fair-minded jurist, Judge Heaney left his legal imprimatur on school desegregation cases, bankruptcy law, prisoner treatment, and social security law.

His public service is discerned by industry, brilliance, and scholarly excellence. His compassion and dedication to our most disadvantaged are unparalleled.

It is fitting and proper for Congress to designate the Duluth, Minnesota Federal Building and United States Courthouse and Customhouse in honor of Judge Gerald W. Heaney.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

RECOGNIZING ADAM ZELLER FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Adam Zeller, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 180, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Adam has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Adam has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Adam Zeller for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout. I am honored to represent Adam in the United States House of Representatives.

INTRODUCING THE MAKE COLLEGE AFFORDABLE ACT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise to help millions of Americans afford higher education by introducing the Make College Affordable Act of 2007, which makes college tuition tax deductible. Today the average cost of education at a state university is $12,796 per year, and the cost of education at a private university is $30,367 per year! These high costs have left many middle class American families struggling to afford college for their children, who are often ineligible for financial aid. Therefore, middle class students have no choice but to obtain student loans, and thus leave college saddled with massive debt.

Even families who plan and save well in advance for their children's education may have a difficult time because their savings are eroded by taxation and inflation. The Make College Affordable Act will help these middle class students by allowing them, or their parents or guardians who claim them as dependents, to deduct the cost of college tuition as well as the cost of student loan repayments.

The Make College Affordable Act will also help older or nontraditional students looking to improve their job skills or prepare for a career change, by pursuing higher education. In today's economy, the average American worker can expect to change jobs, and even careers, several times during his or her working life, making it more important than ever that working Americans be able to devote their resources to continuing their educations.

Helping the American people use their own money to ensure every qualified American can receive a college education is one of the best investments this Congress can make in the future. I therefore urge my colleagues to help strengthen America by ensuring more Americans can obtain college educations by cosponsoring the Make College Affordable Act.

TRIBUTE TO LT. COL. D.B. RICHWINE, JR.

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, we open the 110th Congress, I rise today to honor a fine American and a devoted public servant and to congratulate him on a significant achievement. Donald Bowen Richwine, Jr. serves our Nation as a Marine Corps Officer and served the Congress as a Congressional Fellow in my office from December 2003 to December 2004. Recently he served our Nation's ongoing efforts in the Global War on Terror by his exemplary conduct in Operation IRAQI FREEDOM from October 2005 to April 2006. As a result of his devotion to duty and excellence as an officer, Bowen was promoted to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel on January 3, 2007 in a ceremony at the National Museum of the Marine Corps. Additionally, Bowen was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for his meritorious achievement in connection

with combat operations against the enemy as Department of Border Enforcement Coordinator. The formal citation for this Medal follows below. I heartily congratulate Lt. Col. Richwine on his promotion and the recognition of his meritorious achievement. I share the pride felt by his wife Angela and their children, Owen and Charlie, at this time in Bowen's career.

For meritorious achievement in connection with combat operations against the enemy as Department of Border Enforcement Coordinator, II Marine Expeditionary Force (Forward) and I Marine Expeditionary Force (Forward), in support of Operation IRAQI FREEDOM 04–06 and 05–07 from October 2005 to April 2006. During this period, Major Richwine was directly responsible for the development of Iraqi border forces along over 1000 kilometers of Iraq's borders. Coordinating movements of border forces, border fort construction, and Border Transition Teams, his determined efforts led to the strategically significant restoration of Iraq's borders on 30 November 2005. Identifying a significant problem at the Ports of Entry, Major Richwine developed an innovative plan involving the creation of a multi-agency task force formed to train, advise, and mentor the forces at the Ports of Entry. Ultimately this solution was briefed to the Commanding General Multi National Forces-Iraq who decided to duplicate this idea at other locations throughout Iraq. Finally, displaying an unusually prescient grasp on the mechanisms needed to grow new units, Major Richwine on his own initiative and despite the absence of Military Occupational Specialty Schools for the border police, sought out school seats at Ministry of Defense schools across Iraq. His vigorous efforts have led to the very first school trained Iraqi Border Police, giving them critical life support capabilities which will permit them to develop logistics systems that will support their force long after the Coalition Forces depart Iraq. Major Richwine's total effectiveness, forceful leadership, and loyal devotion to duty reflected great credit upon him and upheld the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and the United States Naval Service.

RECOGNIZING MR. TED NELSON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Mr. Ted Nelson of Liberty, Missouri. Ted served in the United States Navy. He fought for our country during the Korean War.

Mr. Nelson enlisted in the United States Navy before he had the opportunity to graduate from high school. He continued to serve in the Navy during the Korean War. He served honorably and returned to Liberty, Missouri. Mr. Nelson recently received his high school diploma from the Marcus School District in Marcus, Iowa.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in recognizing Mr. Ted Nelson. His many years of distinguished service and commitment to serving his country have been an inspiration. I commend him for his service, and I am honored to represent him in the United States Congress.

HONORING PRESIDENT GERALD FORD

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, with the passing of President Gerald Ford our Nation, the U.S. House of Representatives and the Ford Family have lost a leader, a respected colleague and a loved one who was very special to their lives.

Few American leaders of our time have gained the admiration and appreciation so well deserved and earned by our 38th President. While our country has lost a distinguished leader and the Congress has lost a distinguished Member, Gerald Ford's life and public service will always remain a model for future generations.

In October of 1999, I had the pleasure to quietly sit and speak with President Ford at the conclusion of a Capitol Hill reception that was held after he was honored with the Congressional Gold Medal in the Capitol Rotunda. While I had met him before, what struck me on this special occasion was how such a great man receiving the highest honor from our Nation and Congress could be so humble, so gracious and so genuine.

How memorable it was for me to spend that special time with that gentle man and great American. How fitting it was that Gerald Ford returned this week to the Capitol and the Congress he loved. While this gentle man belongs to the ages, he will always share a special place in our hearts and fond memories.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN ABIJAH DAVIS

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to mark an important milestone in the life of one of my fellow Marylanders—John Abijah Davis—who today celebrates his 100th birthday.

John Abijah Davis was born January 4, 1907 in an upstairs bedroom of his parent's house on North Sherman Drive in Indianapolis, Indiana—a home built by his Uncle, Issac Davis. Named after another Uncle, John Davis, and his father, Abijah Alley Davis, John A. Davis grew up in that home, attending St. Phillip Neri school and parish, before moving on to Cathedral High School in 1920, graduating in 1924 with the first full four-year class in school history.

John Davis graduated from the University of Notre Dame in 1928 with a BA in English. At school, he counted among his friends Walter ''Red'' Smith, later a Pulitzer Prize winning sports columnist for the New York Times, Miller Brewing Company heir Fred Miller and Howard Phelan, who later in life donated the famous ''Touchdown Jesus'' mural that adorns the facade of the school library overlooking the football stadium.

In 1934, John A. Davis married Virginia Lyon in Notre Dame's historic Log Chapel in a mass presided over by his cousin, Rev. John O'Hara, then president of Notre Dame. In 1936, John and Virginia had a daughter, Mary Elizabeth Davis.

Moving from Indiana to New York, John Davis joined his brother Charles and opened the Browne-Davis Furniture Co. The business prospered and both became treasured members of the local community in Oswego. Selling their successful business after 40-plus years, the Davis brothers enjoyed a fulfilling retirement.

John briefly became a constituent of mine when he retired to Dameron, Maryland to live with his daughter Mary Elizabeth. Following her death in 2001, John moved to Cheverly, Maryland, residing with his grandson, John Davis Porcari, and his wife and five children. John Porcari served with great distinction as Maryland Secretary of Transportation under Governor Parris Glendening. He has recently been selected by Governor-elect Martin O'Malley to take on this position in his administration.

John Davis heads a family consisting of four grandchildren, 15 great-grandchildren and two great-great grandchildren. Dozens of nieces and nephews from four generations and scores of friends continue to look up to Mr. Davis, including his grand-nephew, Lt. Col. Harold VanOpdorp, USMC, who commands the First Battalion, 24th Marine Regiment in Anbar Province, Iraq.

According to his family, John Abijah Davis continues to teach life's most valuable lessons—humility, duty and hard work, devotion to one's God, family and friends. These lessons are reflected in all those he has touched. As he, his family and friends celebrate this milestone, they celebrate not the chronology of years, but the character of the man.

I join with his family and many friends in wishing him continued health and happiness on his 100th birthday.

RECOGNIZING CHAD BRENTON FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Chad Brenton, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 320, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Chad has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Chad has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Chad Brenton for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout. I am honored to represent Chad in the United States House of Representatives.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 211, THE CALLING FOR 211 ACT OF 2007

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I'm very proud to introduce the Calling for 211 Act of 2007, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee to move this legislation through Committee and bring it to the House floor. I have cosponsored this bill in previous Congresses with former Rep. Mike Bilirakis, and I'm confident that we now have the momentum to pass this legislation and send it to the President.

Every hour of every day, someone in the United States needs essential services for themselves or someone close to them. These services can range from finding an after-school program for a child, to securing care for an aging parent, to finding drug or alcohol counseling. Faced with a myriad of agencies and help lines, many people end up going without services they need just because they don't know where to begin.

When someone calls 2–1–1, an information and referral specialist assesses the caller's needs and determines which service provider is best equipped to handle their problem or crisis. These specialists are also trained to determine whether a caller may be eligible for other programs. 2–1–1 service providers maintain comprehensive databases of resources, including federal, state, and local government agencies, community-based organizations, and private non-profits.

In 2000, the FCC designated 2–1–1 for community information and referral purposes. Today, 2–1–1 reaches 193 million Americans—about 69 percent of the U.S. population—with call centers operational in 41 states and the District of Columbia. However, inadequate funding prevents universal access to 2–1–1 service in every state. 2–1–1 service is currently available statewide in only 17 states. The goal of the Calling for 211 Act of 2007 is to ensure that all Americans have access to quality community information and referral services through 2–1–1 wherever they live.

The largest barriers for communities seeking to implement 2–1–1 are funding and awareness. In many states, limited resources have slowed the process of connecting communities with this vital service. Current funding where 2–1–1 is operational comes from diverse sources including non-profits, state governments, foundations, and businesses.

The Calling for 211 Act is strongly supported by the United Way and builds on existing efforts to make it easier to connect people with important community services and volunteer opportunities. The legislation provides federal matching grants to enable much-needed changes to the way people connect to community social services, including:

Providing the infrastructure to connect individuals with precise information and social services that address their needs;

Empowering the nation to better respond to large-scale emergencies and homeland security needs by relieving pressure on overwhelmed 9–1–1 call centers. During the Hurricane Katrina disaster, 2–1–1 served as a crucial backup in areas where 9–1–1 centers went down;

Providing aggregated data from 2–1–1 systems nationwide to better assess the needs of our communities.

I believe the 2–1–1 system has great potential; this legislation will establish a federal partnership with states and local communities to give more Americans access to 2–1–1 services. By augmenting existing funding from state and local governments, nonprofits, and the business community, we can ensure that 2–1–1 can finally be a truly national system. A small investment at the national level would pay immediate dividends in terms of faster, more efficient responses to non-emergency but still critical situations.

In a crisis no one has time to flip through their phonebook. When an urgent medical or safety issue arises, we dial 9–1–1 knowing we can get help anywhere and at anytime. We should expect the same when it comes to tracking down important social services as well.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and help to implement this critical safety net for all Americans.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEGRITY AND PENSION FORFEITURE ACT, H.R. 14

HON. MARK STEVEN KIRK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing the Congressional Integrity and Pension Forfeiture Act, H.R. 14, which would deny Members of Congress their pension should they be convicted of a felony. I feel strongly that taxpayers should not be responsible for funding the pension of one of us if we have broken the law, broken the public's trust, and been convicted of a felony.

I introduced the same bill in the 109th Congress and a portion of it was included in the Lobbying Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006, H.R. 4975. Unfortunately, this bill was never considered by the Senate. So I am reintroducing it today.

I based my bill almost exclusively after Congressman Randy Tate's bill from the 104th Congress, H.R. 4011. This bill, with 74 cosponsors, passed the House of Representatives on September 26, 1996 by a vote of 391–32 and 1 Present. It was never considered by the Senate.

The very first version of this bill was introduced by my predecessor, Congressman John Edward Porter, in 1990 during the 101st Congress. Congressman Porter had successfully passed a similar bill in the Illinois General Assembly prior to coming to the U.S. Congress. In the mid–1970s, two Members of the Illinois General Assembly were convicted of felonies, resigned, but were still allowed to receive their state pension. State Representative John Porter did not think that was right. Luckily, his bill passed the Illinois General Assembly and reform began.

An elected official should not be permitted to draw a publicly funded pension after violating the very law he or she took an oath to uphold. We should be held to a higher standard than others. We swore to uphold the constitution and if we fail to do that, we should not receive anything back from the public. A breach of law by a Member of Congress is a very serious offense that should have very serious consequences.

A TRIBUTE TO DALE DEMERS

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dale E. Demers on the occasion of his retirement from the Department of Veterans Affairs Regional Office at Togus, Maine after more than 30 years of dedicated service. Dale will be greatly missed, and I join his many friends, co-workers and the veterans he served in wishing him the best of luck in the next phase of his life.

Dale's service to our country began in 1968, when he joined the U.S. Air Force. He began his VA career at the Togus Regional office in 1972 as a GS–1 Clerk. Dale has held several positions at Togus including Adjudicator, Supervisory Adjudicator, Assistant Service Center Manager, Service Center Manager, Assistant Center Director for Regional Office Activities, and most recently as the Director for the Regional Office.

While working full time at Togus, Dale went back to school and in 1977 received a bachelor's degree in Psychology from the University of Maine.

During Dale's career, he has been involved in many VBA initiatives. He was instrumental in Togus being chosen as a resource center site. The Togus Resource Center has been a huge success and has exceeded its goal every month since its inception. Dale was also extremely involved in the development of the current Claims Processing Improvement (CPI) Initiative, which has assisted VBA national in reducing both the duration of the response and backlog of claims processing.

Dale will be missed for his dedication and for his compassion by the veterans of Maine. I am pleased to join his colleagues, his family, and his friends in congratulating Dale on this milestone. I wish him a rewarding and enjoyable retirement.

REINTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

HON. CLIFF STEARNS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased on this first day of the 110th Congress to introduce several pieces of legislation that I have been pursuing over the years, and for which I will continue to advocate these next 2 years.

Ultrasound technology provides us with a fascinating "womb with a view," allowing doctors to better treat their pregnant patients. But many underprivileged pregnant women cannot afford this important option. These women desperately need access to these free services to safeguard their health and prenatal well-being. That's why I am reintroducing the "Informed Choice Act," which authorizes the Secretary of Health and Human Services to

make grants to community-based, non-profit health clinics that do not charge for their services, for the purchase of ultrasound equipment. The centers that receive these grants will be better able to offer free examinations—under medical supervision—to women who might otherwise have no access to such critical care.

I respect our code of law and our society founded on religious freedom for all Americans. I believe the Ten Commandments are a concise set of values that represent the historic foundation of our nation's laws and our common view of what is right and wrong. Stories of murder, rape, drug abuse, and school violence dominate the media and reveal our society's need to be reminded of our moral compass. That is why I am reintroducing my legislation to have the Ten Commandments prominently posted in the Capitol building as a symbolic reminder of our heritage and the values we aspire to govern by.

I am reintroducing my Right to Carry Reciprocity bill that would allow for a person to carry in all 50 states if he possesses a valid permit in his home state. I believe that a person's right to self-defense should not be limited to within a state line. Today, 46 states have laws permitting concealed carry of firearms, and 38 states, accounting for two-thirds of the U.S. population, have Right To Carry laws, which dramatically reduces their incidence of violent crimes. In fact, the FBI statistics show 9 of the 10 states with the lowest violent crime rates are RTC states. It is important to note this bill would not create a federal licensing system, but merely requires states to recognize each others' carry permits, just as they recognize drivers' licenses and carry permits held by armored car guards. This bill has enjoyed bipartisan support in the past with 102 cosponsors, and I look forward to again working with my esteemed colleagues for its passage in the 110th Congress.

I am also reintroducing two bills pushing further reforms to the United Nations. On March 15, 2006, the U.N. replaced the discredited Human Rights Commission with a new Human Rights Council. Unfortunately, the new Council looks set to fail just as miserably as its predecessor. While making superficial structural changes, no reforms were implemented. The new elected membership includes such human rights violators as China, Cuba, Saudi Arabia, and Russia. My legislation would require the Secretary of State to withhold from the U.S. contribution to our U.N. dues an amount equal to the U.S. percentage of the cost of the Council (approximately $500,000 a year). The U.S. should not support the U.N. Human Rights Council until it upholds the ideals of the U.N. Charter and the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, and its membership is made up of free and democratic nations.

My other U.N. reform legislation deals with financial accounting for the renovation of the United Nations building in New York. There have been numerous reports of wasteful spending in this project, and my legislation would prevent U.S. federal funds from being used for this endeavor unless the President submits a report to Congress affirming the United Nations is abiding by internationally recognized best practices in contracting and resource management.

I am excited to again introduce legislation to help all American savers. My legislation, the Simple Savings Tax Relief Act of 2007, simply eliminates the taxation of interest earned in savings accounts, such as passbook savings accounts or bank certificates of deposit. I think at least some of this interest should be tax-free, as we have been working towards other forms of non-earned income. This legislation would end a punitive tax, especially assist low and middle-income earners, and ultimately contribute toward the goal of encouraging individual responsibility and taking charge of one's own financial destiny.

Because I believe that health care access for all begins with tax parity, I am pleased to again sponsor the Health Care Tax Deduction Act of 2007. This would allow deductions for amounts paid for health insurance premiums and unreimbursed prescription drugs. This would provide much needed relief to individuals struggling with the high cost of health insurance and prescription drugs through a tax deduction, and tax parity with those of us who have employer-provided tax-deductible health insurance. Expansively, this benefit extends to all IRS-defined health insurance premiums such as an HMO, PPO, a traditional indemnity plan, a new HSA, and also long-term care premiums. Right now, under the current tax code, in order to claim health care expenses individuals must file an itemized tax return. My bill would simplify and extend this tax preference for all filers.

Because Members of Congress should put our money where our mouths are, I am pleased to reoffer my Deficit Accountability Act of 2007. It would prevent any automatic pay adjustment for Members of Congress in the year following a fiscal year in which there is a Federal budget deficit. It is needed to hold Members accountable for the Federal budget, and any resulting deficits.

My last piece of legislation is one of inspiration, the Museum of Ideas Act of 2007. It would create a commission to develop a plan for establishing a Museum of Ideas. In our Nation's Capital, we are enriched with museums exhibiting arts, natural sciences, modes of transportation, musical instruments, tools of industry and production, live plants and live animals, and other such tangible artifacts of our universe, we lack a museum of the conceptual, of thoughts, concepts, and philosophies throughout the history of the world.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on all these important pieces of business for the Nation.

IN CELEBRATION OF ERMA CRAVEIRO TROWE'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 90th birthday of Ms. Erma Craveiro Trowe, a wonderful friend and loving community member.

Erma's life story is quite fascinating. She was delivered by her grandmother on January 8, 1918 in Lanare, California. She was a graduate of Caruthers High School and California State University Fresno, formerly known as Fresno State College. Upon the completion of her studies, she pursued a successful career as a teacher at Madison Grammar School, Ahwahnee Middle School and St. Anthony's School in Fresno, California.

On February 21, 1938 Erma married Joe Craveiro. Their home was in Fresno's Kearney Park neighborhood, where they raised their four children: Audrey, Jerry, Bob and Thomas. They also operated a dairy and grew alfalfa, cotton and sugar beets.

Aside from her commitments to her family, career and the ranch, Erma has a lifelong involvement in various community activities. She is a member of the Fig Garden Women's Club, served as a Cub Scout Mother, and volunteered on the Parent Teacher's Association (PTA). Erma was also instrumental in the development of the Houghton-Kearney Elementary School.

Further, Erma has been a very dear friend to the Costa family. She was my belated mother's best friend and actually drove her to the hospital at the time of my birth.

Erma's life has been an exceptional role model for all women. She attained a higher education degree, had a career in an important field, is a person who has demonstrated endless devotion to her family and has cared deeply about the welfare of her community. It is for these reasons that I join Erma Craveiro Trowe's family and friends in wishing her a blessed 90th birthday and continued health and happiness in the years to come.

PRESIDENT'S SURGE AND ACCELERATE POLICY

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 2007

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, President Bush's war in Iraq has now gone longer than America's involvement in World War II. Now we learn President Bush intends to escalate the number of American troops in Iraq. The great question across the land today is: is more of the same, the answer? Will more of the same stabilize Iraq, or for that matter the Middle East?

In all this long war in Iraq, we cannot help but wonder, what if?

What if we had not gone to war?

What if we had listened to that very important and vocal minority who stood against the war when the President lead us down that misbegotten road? Oh yes, I agree we are where we are today and we need to get out of this mess together. I have been patient since my "no" vote on this war four years ago and my "yes" vote almost 17 years ago for the first Gulf War.

Of course, there are others who are also asking what if. They are the family and friends of the young men and women who served their country. They are the loved ones of those who have not been lucky enough to make it home. They are those who sacrificed marriage, children, jobs, all in the name of a war many now casually say was a mistake.

They are those, like my son-in-law, who sacrificed seeing the birth of his and my daughter's first child.

These moments are painful for families across the country as we recently celebrated the holiday season. These moments make us want to dwell in the hope of the question, what if?

But we must not dwell, because in reflection we sometimes miss opportunity. The President is set to announce that he wants to see a ''surge'' force of approximately 20,000 extra soldiers to support the ongoing civil war in Iraq.

Madam Speaker, it does not take a rocket scientist to calculate the odds that more troops will mean more wounded, more fatalities, more losses to American families. Is the President ready for 20,000 more grieving families? Worse yet, has the President considered what this will do to the existing all volunteer force?

Retired Army Colonel Douglas McGregor has been quoted as saying, ''It will break the force, which in my estimation is broken already. It will leave you with no strategic reserves.'' Retired Army Colonel David Hunt has said, ''Everyone we met was on a second tour, at least, and many were on their fourth or fifth combat tour in either Iraq or Afghanistan. The soldiers are tired; the families are going nuts. It's not the solution.''

But then, Madam Speaker, the President has not shown that this is truly about the sacrifice of our men and women. If it were, all of the options presented to the President would be open for consideration, not just the ones that already fit into his ideological philosophy. The report from the Iraq Study Group would not have been as casually tossed aside as were the advisements of the Presidents own military leaders—career servicemen and women who have given their entire professional lives to protecting America.

Over 3,000 have already lost their lives, and that's only the Americans. One journalist in particular, is asking what if on his own. Keith Olbermann, host of Countdown with Keith Olbermann has asked:

''What if he had already sacrificed 3,003 of them—and was then to announce his intention to sacrifice hundreds, maybe thousands, more?

''This is where we stand tonight with the BBC report of President Bush's ''new Iraq strategy,'' and his impending speech to the nation, which, according to a quoted senior American official, will be about troop increases and ''sacrifice.''

''The president has delayed, dawdled and deferred for the month since the release of the Iraq Study Group.

''He has seemingly heard out everybody, and listened to none of them.

''If the BBC is right—and we can only pray it is not—he has settled on the only solution all the true experts agree cannot possibly work: more American personnel in Iraq, not as trainers for Iraqi troops, but as part of some flabby plan for ''sacrifice.'' (Countdown, MSNBC, 1/2/07)

Madam Speaker, the President's proposal reminds me of the ostrich who would rather stick his head in the sand, than face the reality that Americans want our soldiers home now. Not after another 20,000 have had to die for a strategy that is entirely wrong.

In Olbermann's words, ''The additional men and women you have sentenced to go there, sir, will serve only as targets.'' Which is exactly what they will be, bodies to absorb the surge in the number of insurgents which this senseless war has created. This senseless, endless war, as Mr. Olbermann states has succeeded in two ways:

''It has succeeded, Mr. Bush, in enabling you to deaden the collective mind of this country to the pointlessness of endless war, against the wrong people, in the wrong place, at the wrong time.

It has gotten many of us used to the idea—the virtual ''white noise''—of conflict far away, of the deaths of young Americans, of vague ''sacrifice'' for some fluid cause, too complicated to be interpreted except in terms of the very important-sounding but ultimately meaningless phrase ''the war on terror.''

And the war's second accomplishment—your second accomplishment, sir—is to have taken money out of the pockets of every American, even out of the pockets of the dead soldiers on the battlefield, and their families, and to have given that money to the war profiteers.'' (Countdown, MSNBC, 1/2/07)

Which, Madam Speaker, brings me back to the question of what if? In light of all of the evidence to the contrary, what if we, as Congress, allow the President to send tens of thousands of more men and women to keep a peace that does not exist?

Madam Speaker, it is my hope that four years from now, I will not have to look back on this question of what if with the same heavy heart that I do for the past four years.

RECOGNIZING BRADLEY JOHNS FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Bradley Johns, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 393, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Bradley has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Bradley has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Bradley Johns for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout. I am honored to represent Bradley in the United States House of Representatives.

INTRODUCTION OF THE UNIVERSAL RIGHT TO VOTE BY MAIL ACT

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Universal Right to Vote by Mail Act of 2007—a bill to allow any eligible voter to vote by mail in a federal election if he or she chooses to do so.

In my home state of California, voters already have this right. California is one of the twenty-eight states that already provide this convenient alternative to voters.

While I love the ritual of going to the polls to vote, I know that getting to the polls on Election Day is often difficult. For some, it's impossible.

That is why I have introduced a bill that builds upon the growing trend of states to bring the polls to the voters. I believe we should try to meet our constituents halfway by increasing access to the electoral process.

What I am proposing is not new or even untested. States ranging from my home state of California, to Wisconsin, to North Carolina, to Maine have already adopted this voter-friendly policy.

With mail voting, citizens can vote from the convenience of their own homes. They will have more time to mull over their choices and make informed decisions, and they will be able to do so on their own terms.

Not surprisingly, studies have shown that some of the biggest supporters of voting by mail are parents, who must schedule time to go to the polls around so many other obligations.

Studies have also indicated that adding the option to vote by mail does not create a partisan advantage for one political party over the other.

Republicans and Democrats both benefit from similar increases in voter turnout when voters are given the choice to mail in their ballots.

In fact, overwhelming support for voting by mail is consistent across nearly every demographic—including age, income level, race, education, employment status and ideology. It is a win-win for all Americans.

After adopting a universal right to vote by mail system in 1978, California saw a thirty percent increase in the use of mail-in ballots.

In my district of San Diego, over 40 percent of voters opted to mail in their votes during the 2006 election.

Other States that have implemented this policy have seen the same degree of support from voters, which is why it is hardly surprising that States offering the option of mail-in ballots often experience greater voter participation.

There is also an extremely low incidence of fraud with voting by mail when compared to other methods of voting.

As the former President of the League of Women Voters of San Diego, I care deeply about the integrity of our electoral system.

Twenty-eight States have already proven this option works, and it is safe. It is time to give voters in the remaining States this convenient, secure and affordable alternative.

While I am proud to be from a State where citizens already have this right, I believe democracy works best when all citizens have an equal opportunity to have their voices heard.

Right now, an uneven playing field exists between States that already offer the option of mail-in ballots and States that do not.

When the same election is more accessible to voters in California than it is to voters in Michigan, the system is unfair.

States that fail to offer this choice stand to compromise their leverage in Federal elections by curbing the greatest level of voter participation.

We should follow the lead of over half of our Nation's States and ensure a uniformity of rights for all voters.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this effort to strengthen the democratic process and give American voters the choices they deserve.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PERSONAL HEALTH INVESTMENT TODAY ACT

HON. JERRY WELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, as we move through the 21st Century, we are constantly facing new challenges to our public welfare that we had not previously seen.

A more recent challenge that has surfaced is the relative epidemic of obesity, and the onset of disease and health care difficulties resulting from lack of a healthy lifestyle.

I think that many agree with me that a key component of living a healthy productive life is found through regular exercise and the benefits that it brings.

The Department of Health and Human Services predicts that spending on healthcare will consume 20 percent of the nation's gross domestic product by 2015 if current trends hold true.

At this rate of growth, America is on track to spend roughly $4 trillion on healthcare within the next ten years. This level of spending for medical treatment is unsustainable and can only be curbed through efforts to prevent disease before treatment is necessary.

Given the healthcare crisis we are facing in this country today, I strongly believe that creative solutions are necessary to improve the nation's fitness levels.

This need for creative solutions is why I am reintroducing the The Personal Health Investment Today (PHIT) Bill, (RR. 5479 in the 109th Congress).

This bill allows for expenditures for exercise and physical activity, such as health club memberships, some exercise equipment, and sports programs, to be payable out of various tax-favored investment accounts: flexible spending accounts (FSAs), health savings accounts (HSAs), medical savings accounts (MSAs) and/or medical reimbursement arrangements, up to $1,000.

If enacted, PHIT would give parents the opportunity to pay for their children's soccer league fees out of their HSAs. They could join a fitness center and pay for the membership fees with pretax dollars or they could purchase a home gym to help them fight the onset of obesity, a primary risk factor for developing anyone of several chronic diseases which are currently fueling the frightening increase in our national healthcare expenditure.

Depending upon a consumer's individual income tax bracket, the PHIT initiative could help Americans save 25–30 percent on their exercise costs.

Health experts agree that regular physical activity substantially reduces the risk and symptoms of numerous diseases and medical conditions and is associated with fewer hospitalizations, physicians' visits, and medications, resulting in lower healthcare costs.

The PHIT tax incentive represents an important step to induce more people to get the levels of exercise they need to improve their level of fitness and help lower healthcare costs for all Americans, which is why I am proud to reintroduce this bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHARLIE NORWOOD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. NORWOOD. Madam Speaker, on roll call no. 7; On adoption of Title 2 of the Resolution. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

RECOGNIZING MARTHA C. STONUM

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Martha C. Stonum of Lawson, Missouri. Martha will celebrate her 100th birthday on January 31, 2007, and it is my privilege to offer her my warmest regards on achieving this important milestone.

Mrs. Stonum was born in Lathrop, Missouri where she began her education in a one-room school house, before ultimately attending William Jewell College. Mrs. Stonum is a loving mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother to two sons, one step son, four grandchildren, two step grandchildren, eight great-grandchildren, three step great-grandchildren, and one step great-great-grandchild. Mrs. Stonum is still an active member of her community, visiting her beauty shop and church weekly.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in recognizing Martha C. Stonum. It is an honor to represent her in the United States Congress, and I wish her all the best for many more birthdays in the future.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL BOARD-CERTIFIED TEACHERS IN LOW-PERFORMING SCHOOLS ACT

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce the National Board-Certified Teachers in Low-Performing Schools Act of 2007.

I have been pro-active in promoting professional teaching standards throughout my public service and strongly believe certification is more important now than ever.

We know that schools in the United States are falling behind in the core subject areas of math and the sciences. Teacher certification is a step toward gaining ground against other nations as well as working to close the Achievement Gap here in our own nation.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards provides America's teachers with high-quality training and professional certification. Research shows the benefits of this advanced credential.

Students of certified teachers showed year-end testing improvements averaging 7 to 15 percent more than students learning from non-certified teachers.

Another study by the University of North Carolina found that the depth of learning for students was greater in the classrooms of certified teachers. That is, these students show greater cognitive gains overall than students of non-certified teachers.

I am convinced we must do more to encourage our dedicated teachers who are already in the classrooms.

My legislation authorizes a pilot program to give teachers with certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards a $5,000 annual stipend when they teach in a low-income school or a school that is underperforming.

Professional teaching certification would improve education in the United States and help make our nation competitive and I am pleased for the opportunity to promote this certification in Congress.

Madam Speaker, thank you very much for the opportunity to introduce the legislation today.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COMBAT MILITARY MEDICALLY RETIRED VETERANS ACT

HON. JERRY WELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, we owe our veterans a great debt of gratitude. Their sacrifices have protected the democratic ideals that are the foundation of our country, and their heroism continues to be an example for all Americans.

Perhaps now, more than any time in recent history, it is important to remember that our Nation has remained strong because of those who have fought and died for our country. By answering the call of duty and risking their lives to protect their fellow citizens, these patriots have inspired us with their courage, compassion, and dedication.

Many of these brave men and women become severely wounded due to combat related injuries, and are forced to retire as physically unfit to perform his or her duties. Once forced out of the service, many are unable to find gainful employment due to their injuries while at the same time being rated at less than their actual disability rate by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). They have little to fall back on and deserve better for their sacrifice.

That is why I am reintroducing the Combat Military Medically Retired Veterans Act, (H.R. 995 in the 109th Congress), which allows combat military medically retired veterans who received the Purple Heart to collect their prorated military retirement pay.

This legislation differs from the current concurrent receipt benefit because it exempts combat military medically retired veterans from the current 20-year service requirement. The benefit will match their time of service.

The Congressional Budget Office scored my bill at $496 million over ten years, certainly a small price to pay for those who have sacrificed so much for our great nation.

I am proud to state that my bill has been endorsed by the American G.I. Forum of the United States; American Legion, Department of Illinois; American Legion, National Office; Blinded Veterans Association; Gold Star Wives of America; and the Hispanic War Veterans of America.

All military combat veterans who are military medically retired from combat related disabilities and have been awarded the Purple Heart should be exempt from the requirement of 20 years of service in order to be entitled to their prorated military retirement pay.

America's disabled combat veterans gave their all for us and should not be penalized just because they are receiving compensation from the VA. While many disabled veterans go on to enjoy happy productive lives, many are unable to due to the severity of their wounds.

Under any doctrine of fairness it is our moral obligation to ''care for him who shall have borne the battle.'' This bill is a good step in correcting the inequity of retirement and disability benefit to our combat disabled veterans.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHARLIE NORWOOD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. NORWOOD. Madam Speaker, on roll call No. 6; on adoption of Title I of the Resolution, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

RECOGNIZING CHRISTOPHER D. ROBERTS FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Christopher D. Roberts, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 351, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Christopher has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Christopher has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Christopher D. Roberts for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout. I am honored to represent Christopher in the United States House of Representatives.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL MENTORING ACT

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution recognizing and honoring those who make a difference in the lives of our young people across the United States.

This January marks National Mentoring Month as proclaimed by the President of the United States. It is a month-long celebration honoring those who are mentors and drawing attention to the great need for more mentors.

Mentors make a tremendous difference in the lives of our children. When a responsible and reliable adult becomes a mentor, the benefits to the mentee can last a lifetime. Countless stories show the great benefits of a good role model.

Chris Moran became a mentor to Joshua Becerra in my hometown of San Diego through the Big Brothers Big Sisters program when he was just 9 years old in 1999. Chris and Joshua have gotten together on a weekly basis ever since for horseback riding, chess, and other activities. The relationship has been meaningful for both.

Spending time with a young person gave Chris a healthier perspective on what is important in life—helping others, he said. Joshua, now a student at San Diego's High Tech High, is looking forward to attending college and has already visited UCLA, San Diego State University, and other campuses trying to decide where to apply. Joshua attributes his academic success in large part to his mentor.

Joshua plans to study music when he goes on to college and would like to become a professional musician. Chris is helping him locate a college with an excellent music program.

These types of relationships between reliable adults and our young people are invaluable. Millions of adults nationwide are acting as excellent role models while providing guidance and advice to our young people—many of whom face problems at home or difficulties at school. Without a good, solid role model, our kids are more likely to drop out of high school or to become involved with drugs or alcohol.

Madam Speaker, this resolution honors and recognizes the adults across the United States who are mentors to our young people. This resolution also calls on more adults to become mentors to those in need.

Unfortunately, research shows that about 15 million children across the United States are in need of a mentor and a good role model. It is crucial that we begin to reach these children.

Finally, this resolution highlights the need to support programs that teach our young people about mentoring and the need to become involved. There are programs, for example, that encourage high school students to become mentors to younger children. These types of programs will teach the great benefits of mentoring at a young age and result in adults becoming mentors later—creating a ''cycle'' of mentoring.

Madam Speaker, thank you very much for the opportunity to offer a resolution honoring America's mentors on the occasion of National Mentoring Month 2007.

INTRODUCTION OF KIDSAVE

HON. JERRY WELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, commentators on the political left and right agree about one thing: There are too many political disagreements in Washington, D.C. Of course, the best way to change that would be for those of us who are lawmakers to find common ground and begin passing legislation that virtually everyone can agree on.

Where to begin? How about with a program that has the support of moderates, liberals, and even the conservative Heritage Foundation? That program is KidSave.

This common-sense program would allow every American child—regardless of parental income—to save up tens of thousands of dollars for retirement.

KidSave is fairly simple. If it was in effect today, at birth every child would receive a loan of $2,000 from the Social Security Administration. The initial amount would be linked to inflation, so it would increase slightly year to year. The money would be deposited into an account that couldn't be opened until the owner retires or dies.

This account would be managed by the Thrift Savings Plan, the same plan that federal employees—including those of us in Congress—use to manage our retirement funds. Right now there are three low risk, low-cost options offered through the TSP: A government-bond fund, a corporate-bond fund and a stock index fund.

The child's parents would decide which fund to deposit the initial investment in, and it would grow untapped for decades and decades. According to a study by the Heritage Foundation, the opportunity for growth is so great that, even if no money was ever added to the initial investment, that loan could still grow to $50,000 by the time the child reached retirement age.

Parents and grandparents also could contribute additional money tax-free. They could add as much as $500 per year every year until the child turned 19, and that money could be diverted from their own retirement plans. That's an additional $9,500, all of it being compounded year after year until retirement.

This is one of those rare Washington programs with the power to change everyone's outlook for the better.

Wealthy people have long taken advantage of long-term investments—indeed, families such as the Rockefellers and Vanderbilts have lived for decades off the money earned by their forefathers. Today, thousands of middle-class grandparents are opening education accounts for their newborn grandchildren.

But KidSave would allow all children to enjoy the benefits of compound interest. Imagine an entire generation of working-class senior citizens with tens of thousands of dollars to spend as they wish. They'd be virtually guaranteed a secure retirement and could spend their newfound wealth on themselves or share it with their children and grandchildren.

A portion of this money would be passed from generation to generation, either as gifts to grandchildren or through donations to churches or community groups. That would help build a more secure future for generations to come.

Best of all, KidSave is a loan from Social Security, not a gift or a new government entitlement. That's one reason it enjoys such broad support. And it doesn't end up costing taxpayers anything. When the account owner reaches age 30—an age at which most people are well along in their working lives—the original loan would be repaid in five annual installments. The repayment amount would be linked to inflation, so an initial $2,000 loan would be returned to the government as, say, $3,500.

Lawmakers today are deadlocked over how to reform Social Security, how to improve welfare and how to close military bases, to name just three difficult issues.

But we could get started on solving those if we'd first implement common-sense programs that enjoy wide support. KidSave seems like a good place to start building a better future for all Americans. That is why I am reintroducing for the 110th Congress, this important bill.

RECOGNIZING EVAN S. KNOLL FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Evan S. Knoll, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 351, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Evan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Evan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Evan S. Knoll for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout. I am honored to represent Evan in the United States House of Representatives.

SECOND OPINION COVERAGE ACT

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, today, I am introducing the Second Opinion Coverage Act—legislation that will ensure the accessibility and coverage of medical second opinions.

Imagine that your doctor tells you that you must undergo radical surgery that may threaten the use of a limb or leave you with a serious chronic condition. Understandably, you would request a second opinion from another physician. Most health care groups see the value in such requests and provide patients with a second opinion. Besides giving patients much needed peace of mind, second opinions can benefit health plans by reducing the number of invasive procedures and result in better patient care through increased dialogue about treatment options.

However, when I was a member of the California State Assembly, I heard from a number of patients who experienced a glitch in their health care coverage. They noticed the absence of a clear process for obtaining medical second opinions. These patients, many struggling with challenging health conditions, had difficulties obtaining second opinions through their health plans.

After meeting with patients, physicians and health groups, I authored a law in California that guarantees coverage of second opinions. Patients, meeting any one of several qualifying conditions, are entitled to a timely second opinion by a "qualified health care professional," within 72 hours in cases of serious or imminent health threat. When another expert is not available within the provider group or network, the organization will pay for an appropriately qualified doctor outside of the plan. Patients are responsible for the costs of applicable co-payments.

The law in California was a good first step. Unfortunately, this legislation does not cover individuals enrolled in self-insured, federally regulated health plans. Nationwide, this translates into 67 million persons without guaranteed access to second opinions. I believe the time has come to make access to second opinions a national standard.

I urge you, Madam Speaker, and all of my colleagues to pass this critical legislation into law.

INTRODUCTION OF THE TECHNOLOGY RETRAINING AND INVESTMENT NOW ACT

HON. JERRY WELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, as we move further into the 21st Century, I continue to have deep concerns over the need to maintain America's competitive edge as we continue to grow our Nation's economy.

As the U.S. economy becomes more dynamic, the types of growing industries are also changing. Increasingly new jobs in many fields require the application of technology skills. These include workers across all industry sectors, not just in the IT industry sector.

In order to keep up with the rapid rate of technological changes, expanded information technology (IT) skills education and training in many industries is essential to create a more effective and productive workforce and remain both domestically and globally competitive.

In recognition of the growing importance of information technology skills to the competitiveness of the U.S. workforce there needs to be greater awareness on the importance of increased investment in worker IT education and training

That's why I am introducing the Technology Retraining And Investment Now Act (TRAIN Act), a bill that will improve opportunities for America's workforce in an ever-changing world.

The TRAIN Act would provide a tax credit for an amount equal to 50% of information and communications technology training (ICT) program expenses paid or incurred by the taxpayer for the benefit of: an employee of the taxpayer; or, an individual who is not employed on up to $10,000 per year. Expenses may include payments in connection with: course work, certification testing and other expenses that are essential to assessing skill acquisition.

This tax credit is necessary because technology skills are increasingly important to workers in more and more industries. It is no longer just the software programmers who create the technology, but increasingly engineers, machinists, architects, call center workers and many others who must continuously upgrade their skills in the use of the ever-changing tools of technology if they are to remain competitive in an increasingly global and service-oriented workforce market.

Just as the research and development tax credit helps companies make continuous investments in new product development, today a complimentary human resources technology development tax credit is now equally necessary to assure that there is a continuous investment in the technology skills of the U.S. workforce so it is competitive in the new worldwide economy.

RECOGNIZING DAVID I. HON FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize David I. Hon, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 351, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

David has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years David has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending David I. Hon for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout. I am honored to represent David in the United States House of Representatives.

THE WOMEN'S OBSTETRICIAN AND GYNECOLOGIST MEDICAL ACCESS NOW ACT (THE WOMAN ACT)

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, today I am reintroducing the Women's Obstetrician and Gynecologist Medical Access Now Act, the WOMAN Act. This bill will ensure that every woman has direct access to her OB-GYN.

I believe women should not need a permission slip to receive OB-GYN care. Unfortunately, that is the reality faced by many women when they need to see their doctor. Numerous managed care plans require women to visit their primary care physicians before seeking the health care services they need from the providers they want. Denying direct access or forcing women to jump through numerous bureaucratic hoops to see their OB-GYN is not acceptable treatment.

The WOMAN Act recognizes women have different medical needs than men and the significant role OB-GYNs play in women's health. Women who see an OB-GYN on a regular

basis are more likely to receive important screening services, such as pelvic exams, as well as counseling on critical reproductive health issues. My legislation removes the barriers complicating women's access to their doctors. Women will no longer have to contend with the gatekeeper system that can prevent or delay appropriate care.

It is easy to understand what a difference direct OB-GYN access makes in women's health care. Imagine, for a moment, a woman in San Diego who works 45 hours a week and has limited sick and vacation time. Now, imagine she has an urgent medical problem requiring an OB-GYN visit. On Monday, she calls from work to make an appointment with her primary care physician. If she is lucky, she gets an appointment for the following morning. She takes time off Tuesday to go see her doctor. Her primary care doctor agrees she should be seen by her OB-GYN and gives her a referral. Tuesday afternoon, she returns to work and calls her OB-GYN for an appointment. The doctor is in surgery on Wednesday, but they offer her an appointment on Friday morning. On Friday she takes another morning off from work, and finally, after almost a week, gets the care she needs. The unnecessary referral process resulted in her taking an extra morning off work and delayed her proper medical care by five days. The patient, employer, primary care physician, and health plan provider would have saved money and time if the patient had been able to go directly to her OB-GYN.

The public overwhelmingly supports direct access to OB-GYN care. A survey conducted by the Kaiser Family Foundation and Harvard University found that 82 percent support direct access legislation and 63 percent would support it even if their health insurance costs increased.

While serving in the California State Assembly, I heard from many women who experienced the same problems I have outlined today. After meeting with women, obstetricians and gynecologists, health plan representatives, and providers in the State of California, I wrote the State law allowing women direct access to their OB-GYN. That law was a good first step; however, it still does not cover women enrolled in self-insured, federally regulated health plans. This means that even if a woman lives in a State with direct access protections, like California, she may not be able to see her OB-GYN without a referral if she is covered by a federally regulated ERISA health plan. In addition, there are almost a dozen states which still do not provide women with direct access to OB-GYNs.

Women save time and money with better access to OB-GYN care. I believe the time has come to make direct access to an OB-GYN a national standard.

I urge you, Madam Speaker, and all of my colleagues to pass this critical legislation into law.

3,000 REASONS TO WITHDRAW TROOPS

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, New Year's Eve marked another grave milestone in Iraq, as the United States lost its 3,000th soldier since the war began. Attacks on our troops are increasing as civil war spreads. America lost more troops in Iraq in December than in any other month during the previous two years.

As we honor the fallen, we must remember the daily life and death consequences of President Bush's policies. The time to begin withdrawing our troops from Iraq has long since passed. The longer we have stayed the course, the worse conditions in Iraq have become.

November's elections were a mandate for change in Iraq. As more and more members of the President's own party deem the Administration's policy a failure, an overwhelming majority of Americans are calling on President Bush to draw down our troops from Iraq. It has become resoundingly clear that a military solution is not possible. Our troops were not trained for or sent to Iraq to referee a civil war. An extended American military presence will just continue to fuel the insurgency.

The Republican co-chair of the Iraq Study Group, James Baker, warned that "We no longer can afford to stay the course," and Lee Hamilton, the Democratic co-chair, agreed. "The current approach is not working and the ability of the United States to influence events is diminishing. Our ship of state has hit rough waters. It must now chart a new way forward." Instead of continuing to stubbornly defend his administration's failed war strategies, the President must now work with Congress and foreign leaders to chart a diplomatic strategy that reduces the violence in Iraq.

The President left the U.S. with no good options, but increasing the number of American servicemen and women in Iraq is an unacceptable course. The new Congress must use its authority to ensure that the calls of the American people do not fall on deaf ears.

It will take many years for the U.S. to move beyond the setbacks we have suffered in Iraq. Our military is overstretched. Our diplomatic authority has been severely diminished. We have shifted our focus away from Afghanistan, and a resurgent Taliban is increasing its attacks on American troops.

For those families whose sons and daughters died in the war, the wounds will never heal. Illinois is one of eight states that lost more than 100 troops in Iraq. From Rock Island to Champaign, from Skokie to Carbondale, more than 100 families have suffered the ultimate loss. It is time to change course.

RECOGNIZING KENNETH G. SAMPSELL FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Kenneth G. Sampsell, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 351, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Kenneth has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Kenneth has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Kenneth G. Sampsell for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout. I am honored to represent Kenneth in the United States House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES BEACH, III

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an exceptional Kentuckian, Mayor Charles "Charlie" Beach III. After serving 32 years as mayor of the City of Beattyville, Kentucky, Mayor Beach is leaving office. I want to express my deepest gratitude for his many contributions and years of public service.

Throughout his tenure, Mayor Beach has led a number of initiatives to improve the lives of Lee County residents, build hope in our Appalachian region, and serve as an economic and community development leader for the entire Commonwealth. Southern and Eastern Kentucky has been plagued with inadequate water and sewer infrastructure and poor housing opportunities. Mayor Beach has been the driving force behind construction of two water plants, a sewage treatment plant, and installation of necessary piping to serve and reach the rural residents of Beattyville and Lee County. In addition, Mayor Beach is well-regarded throughout the Commonwealth for his vision of providing quality, affordable housing.

Since 2002, Mayor Beach has been a critical partner in our regional anti-drug initiative "Operation UNITE." Beach was a key early supporter and critical ally in getting drugs off our streets and cleaning up our communities. He has consistently backed efforts to educate our children on the dangers of drug use and our program to help drug users find treatment options.

In addition to his duties as mayor, Charles Beach is also the Vice-Chairman of the Peoples Exchange Bank where he provides business development and public relations leadership. He is the former President of the Kentucky League of Cities and has served as the Chairman of the Kentucky River Area Development District. These organizations promote the welfare and economic growth of Kentucky's rural and urban areas.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Mayor Beach for his selfless sacrifice and service on behalf of the people of the City of Beattyville, Lee County, and the Commonwealth of Kentucky. His dedication and integrity are an inspiration to us all and I know his contributions will live on for many years to come.

A NEW DAY FOR AMERICA

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, now begins a new day for America. During the first ''100 Hours'' of the 110th Congress, Democrats will answer the voters' call for change. We will restore honesty, openness, and civility to Congress, require Medicare to negotiate for lower drug prices, lower the cost of higher education, raise the minimum wage, invest in '' saving embryonic stem cell research and alternative energy, and strengthen our homeland security.

The election of NANCY PELOSI as Speaker of the House is a historic moment—a testament to Nancy's able, dedicated, and unifying leadership. I am confident that Speaker NANCY PELOSI (D–CA), Majority Leader STENY HOYER (D–MD), Majority Whip JAMES CLYBURN (D–SC), Caucus Chairman RAHM EMANUEL (D–IL), and Caucus Vice Chairman JOHN LARSON (D–CT) will lead us in a new direction that makes our country stronger and more just. While we will make great strides during the first ''100 Hours,'' it's just a downpayment. Even greater change is on the horizon.

On November 7th, Americans demonstrated that they will not wait for change in Iraq. Three thousand of our troops have lost their lives and civil war is spreading. Even the Republican co-chair of the Iraq Study Group, James Baker, warned 'We can no longer afford to stay the course.' I will work with members of both parties to pressure the Bush Administration to begin to draw down troops as quickly as possible so that a diplomatic course may be pursued.

While corporations and the few at the top have profited from tax breaks and giveaways, the majority of workers and families in our country have been left behind. My fight to provide opportunity and economic security for the majority of Americans continues. I will work provide good jobs with strong benefits, to end waste and abuse in the government contracting process, and to protect consumers from corporate wrongdoing.

The challenges facing our great nation are many. With a focus on our most urgent priorities, Democrats will lead the United States to thrive again, as a force for good that provides opportunity for all.

RECOGNIZING NICHOLAS J. MOORE FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Nicholas J. Moore, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 900, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Nicholas has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. When Nicholas achieved the rank of Eagle Scout this summer at Bartle Camp, he became the first Eagle Scout in Boy Scout Troop 900. Over the many years Nicholas has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Nicholas J. Moore for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

THE IMPORTANCE OF BREAST CANCER AWARENESS

HON. CHRISTOPHER SHAYS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Speaker, breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer death among American women and more than 40,000 women will die from breast cancer this year alone. Three of four women diagnosed with breast cancer have no known risk—no family history.

While the diagnosis rate of this cancer continues to increase, I am thankful the breast cancer death rate is steadily decreasing, which is in large part due to advancing medical treatments and an increase in early detection. By continuing to support breast cancer research and early diagnosis, we can help bring an end to this disease that takes a new life once every fourteen minutes.

In recognition of last year's Breast Cancer Awareness Month, Karen Stevenson, a resident of New Canaan, Connecticut, gave an address at the launch of the ''Paint the Town Pink'' program at New Canaan Town Hall. I submit the text of Ms. Stevenson's remarks to be entered into the RECORD.

Good morning. Active and healthy—definitely much more fit than I am now—with no history of the disease in the family, I was completely blindsided by a breast cancer diagnosis 5 years ago based on an unusual mammogram result. I had a mastectomy and reconstructive surgery followed by 5 months of chemotherapy. My daughters were 7 and 10 at the time.

With the warm generosity of family, friends and colleagues who supplied moral support, hugs, and many a meal to help maintain normalcy in the girls' routine at home, we navigated through that difficult period and came out the other side.

The kids were troopers. To this day they still find such humor in telling the story of Mom having melted her wig on Thanksgiving Day with a sudden blast of heat from the oven while basting.

My situation is not unique, but rather, representative of what so many women in our community have faced.

I shared the first few weeks of chemo with a group of spectacular women and we quickly banded together to help carry one another through the various rounds of surgeries, chemo, radiation, genetic testing, additional surgeries, and follow-on treatments in all the years since.

Licia, a young professional diagnosed only 4 months after being married,

Kerry, an exceptionally talented marketing director, artist and mom, diagnosed only 1 week before giving birth to her second child,

Debbie, a teacher and beautiful mother of three young school children,

Julia, a NYC actress and mother of two teenagers,

Chris, an attorney and mother of two preschool daughters.

Of note, while we were a randomly assembled group of six, four of us were under 35 years old and all of us were under age 43.

Breast cancer is everywhere and I'm sure you can each add several names of patients and loved ones to the growing list. While the topic doesn't typically surface in casual conversation it always amazes me how often we discover this common sisterhood.

While the diagnosis itself is daunting, we are the fortunate beneficiaries of the drug trials and experiences of the many who have gone before us over the past 20 years, and as a result, there are many more treatment options available, as well as access to solid information about their efficacy and managing side effects. In my case and for many others, early detection and the rapidly evolving treatment have ensured we can continue to attend the soccer games and school plays, host family holidays and be here to enjoy our families.

The harsh reality is that even the treatments available today are not successful for all of us and the implication of later diagnosis is significantly added risk. It is just heartbreaking to watch so many vibrant women in our community struggle and suffer for years, exhausting treatment options that will hold back their cancer and pain while trying to continue care for their families.

We are so fortunate to live in an area with such excellent access to quality care locally—for regular check-ups, for mobile mammograms, and should it be necessary, for both proven and innovative cancer treatments. But we must take advantage of that access!

Ask yourself tonight as you are tucking your children into bed . . . or talking to your college student via phone this weekend . . . or watching your grandson's football game . . . Are you willing to put this in jeopardy unnecessarily when it takes only an hour of your time to make and keep a screening appointment? As you walk past the waves of pink on Elm and Main Streets, won't you take a pledge today to ensure all the important women in your life make this a priority?

On behalf of all of those who have been touched personally by Breast Cancer—and I'm sure there are many here today—we offer our profound thanks to the merchants of New Canaan and to Janet Blaylock and the team of volunteers she has mobilized. Your efforts to Paint the Town Pink for a weeks in October as a collective call to action will most certainly be a positive turning point in the lives of many families in our community.

HONORING DAVID OGG ON HIS PROMOTION TO BRIGADIER GENERAL

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor David Ogg on earning the rank of Brigadier General in the U.S. Army. Today, BG Ogg is being honored in a ceremony to commemorate this great achievement.

During the course of his 28 years of distinguished service, BG Ogg has served in Germany, where he was on the front line of the

cold war in Europe. Later, his career transitioned to project management, and he worked with some of the military's most important and most sophisticated new hardware, such as the M113 and Stryker combat vehicles.

While his military service has led him around the globe, BG Ogg has never forgotten where he comes from. Although he is currently stationed in Michigan, BG Ogg still calls Murfreesboro, Tennessee, home. In fact, he returned to his alma mater, Middle Tennessee State University, to teach ROTC for 4 years. And his two sons now are continuing the family tradition and seeking their degrees at MTSU.

As a fellow MTSU alumnus and former student of MTSU's ROTC program, I thank BG Ogg for his service to his country, and I commend him for his hard work and dedication. I also commend his wife, Pam, and their sons, Jason and Stuart, for the sacrifices they have made as BG Ogg has proudly worn the uniform of this Nation. I wish David Ogg and the entire Ogg family continued success and happiness.

RECOGNIZING SEAN T. COWDEN FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Sean T. Cowden, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 395, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Sean has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Sean has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Sean T. Cowden for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout. I am honored to represent Sean in the United States House of Representatives.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GERALD FORD, 38TH PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. ARTUR DAVIS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, we overlooked Gerald Ford's significance when he served as President. His tenure was only slightly longer than a congressional term, a cruel irony for a politician whose political career was so grounded in the by-ways of the House. He was hardly a master politician, if the term refers to the winning of elections or the swift dispatch of opposition: Ford came within an inch of not being re-nominated, and he lost in the general election to the most obscure winner of our times.

This week, as we mourn Ford's passing, his legacy is much clearer: first, he gracefully presided over the aftermath of Richard Nixon's forced removal, and over the culmination of our debacle in Vietnam. Had he gotten either moment wrong, the country might have been ripped into two, bitter competing halves. As we contemplate the mistakes subsequent presidents have made, it is a virtue that Gerald Ford made not a single major error in judgment: he did not blunder into any ill-chosen wars, and as much as an opposition dominated Congress thwarted him, he never resorted to subterfuge in an effort to tip the scales.

Then there is the graceful way Ford practiced politics. The challenge from Ronald Reagan was perilous because even in 1976, Ford was not of a philosophic kin with most Republican primary voters. A less principled president would have demagogued on issues like busing or affirmative action; certainly, he might have abandoned the détente that was a major contributor to taming the Soviet Union. A modern, win-at all cost politician would have savaged an unknown like Jimmy Carter. The fact is that the 1976 election season was at once breathtakingly close and remarkably civil.

Imagine if Gerald Ford's major value, the cultivation of common ground, had dominated the last two fractious decades. Our two major political philosophies would not have been at irreconcilable odds, with both tending to treat each battle as if it were the ultimate one or as if we weren't bound to share a future together. We mourn Gerald Ford's decency and we also mourn the loss of the political character that left the stage when we retired him.

HONORING DENNIS KAMPER

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in acknowledging the retirement of Mr. Dennis Kamper and his 38 years of public service to the United States Army Corps of Engineers, Memphis District.

Mr. Kamper began his career as a student earning both a Bachelor's and Master's Degree in Engineering at the University of Louisville. With the Corps, Mr. Kamper has served in the Louisville, Philadelphia, and Memphis Districts. At each assignment Mr. Kamper has received praise for his dedication to providing quality products and services to the Corps of Engineers and their customers.

Dennis has been a shining example of the Corps of Engineers' mission through his visionary leadership and exemplary managerial style. These contributions include the design and construction of numerous civil works projects, mentoring and recognition of his employees, his "open door" policy, and implementing and institutionalizing the Army Performance Improvement Criteria (APIC).

In addition to his professional responsibilities, Dennis Kamper has built a legacy as a model citizen and community leader. He is an active member in his church and the Society of American Military Engineers (SAME), a strong supporter of Memphis District's Adopt-a-School program, and a speaker at numerous Career Day programs promoting the engineering profession.

Please join me in honoring Dennis Kamper and wishing him the best in a well-deserved retirement.

RECOGNIZING RYAN E. MOSE FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Ryan E. Mose, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 374, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Ryan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Ryan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Ryan E. Mose for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout. I am honored to represent Ryan in the United States House of Representatives.

RECOGNIZING HEROISM

HON. CLIFF STEARNS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate this chance to recognize a true hero, someone who put aside the natural reaction to remain safe and instead risked his life to save another.

Wesley Autrey recently demonstrated heroism at the subway station at 137th Street and Broadway. Mr. Autrey was waiting with his two children on the subway platform when he saw a young man suffer a seizure and fall onto the tracks.

Realizing that a train was approaching and with no chance of helping the young man off of the track, Mr. Autry jumped down onto the tracks and placed his body on top of the victim to protect him from the train. The train missed Mr. Autry by mere inches and both emerged unscathed.

In a world plagued by terrorism, indifference, and selfishness, Mr. Autrey's action demonstrated a commitment to preserving life and showed that we still have heroes among us. I commend a real American hero, Wesley Autrey.

INTRODUCTION OF THE URBAN AREA SECURITY INITIATIVE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2007

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, national security is our highest priority. Congress has created risk-based grants to direct limited federal funds toward areas facing higher threats, in order to ensure that our country is protected against and prepared for any future terrorist attack.

Over the past year, however, my attempts—along with the efforts of a bipartisan coalition of my colleagues—to work with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to address concerns about one of those risk-based grants, the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI), have been fruitless. This experience has led me to question whether we are successfully directing funds as this grant was intended.

For this reason, I am introducing the Urban Area Security Initiative Improvement Act of 2007. Using the information I have gleaned over the past year, this legislation will ensure the grant functions as it was proposed. It will also make certain that instead of making arbitrary decisions, DHS uses conclusive data to inform its policy.

The questions surrounding the UASI grant arose last January, when DHS released a list of 35 urban areas considered eligible to apply for UASI funding through the FY 2006 process. Eleven additional areas, including Sacramento, the Congressional District I represent, were placed in a second group and notified that their UASI funding may be terminated in future years if they did not meet the new risk assessment standards.

When DHS announced that Sacramento's UASI funds may be in jeopardy, the decision seemed unwarranted. Sacramento has a population of almost two million people, and is the capital of California—the most populous state in the nation and the sixth largest economy in the world. The city is also home to dozens of critical federal and state government buildings and much of the state's water, electricity, and telecommunication systems are managed from Sacramento. To suffer an attack would have repercussions beyond our region.

Immediately after learning about the changes to the UASI program, I requested meetings with DHS officials to understand their new risk assessment guidelines. After unsatisfactory responses from DHS, I led a coalition of my colleagues to demand information regarding DHS's revised guidelines for eligibility in an effort to urge them to change their policy.

The Chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, colleagues from San Diego and Sacramento, both of California's United States Senators and I requested a Government Accountability Office (GAO) investigation into the UASI grant process. The preliminary findings of that investigation were completed in mid-December. GAO analyzed the risk methodology and the effectiveness of the assessment, in addition to reviewing planned changes to both in the upcoming year. The report confirmed that DHS had made many arbitrary decisions during their UASI determination that skewed the outcomes of the risk-scenarios and grant awards.

Of particular concern is that DHS arbitrarily cut the number of eligible cities to 35 and created a second group of 11 of which were only able to apply for "sustainment" funding. Additionally, DHS assigned arbitrary values to assets and population without running a study of how the variation in the output of models (numerical or otherwise) used for such awards can be manipulated—a process commonly referred to as a "sensitivity" analysis. This analysis would have ensured that any changes to these values have little or no impact on the ranking of each urban area.

Both 9–11 and Hurricane Katrina demonstrated the role our first responders play in any incident, whether an act of terrorism or mother nature. And the Urban Area Security Initiative is a critical component to ensuring the preparedness of those brave men and women and, ultimately, our nation's preparedness. We all recognize that we need to direct our limited resources towards the most at-risk locations. However, and DHS has acknowledged this, they have overlooked critical infrastructure. These arbitrary decisions may have influenced the outcome of the UASI grant. This is poor national security policy and in an era when national security is a priority, it is unacceptable.

DHS will shortly be announcing those urban areas that will be eligible to apply for funding. However, Sacramento and all heavily populated urban areas will have to worry each year about whether DHS will arbitrarily change the number of eligible cities and thus, if they will even be able to apply for funding. This places significant and undue burdens on our regional homeland security efforts, as first responders attempt to prepare for and protect against any future threat, without knowing from year to year whether they can even apply for funding.

That is why I am introducing this legislation today. The UASI Improvement Act will allow the 100 most populous urban areas, as determined by the census and the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, to apply for UASI funds. While each urban area does not have to apply, this will guarantee that those urban areas who believe they need the funding or who find that they meet the eligibility guidelines as determined by DHS will be able to at least apply for these vital funds.

The bill also mandates that DHS conduct a sensitivity analysis. The GAO found DHS's decision to arbitrarily assign values during the risk-assignment without conducting a sensitivity analysis to be a significant flaw in the UASI grant determination process. By conducting such an analysis, DHS will have conclusive data rather than uninformed decisions to guide their decision-making.

Our local law enforcement and first responders continue to do an incredible job understanding the threats facing our country and are working hard to prevent and prepare for an attack. And while these heroes are doing their jobs, the federal government needs to do its job. Part of that is providing leadership by setting standards and the other is to provide resources. My concern is that the federal government has been shirking its responsibility, and so I am introducing legislation to make sure that Sacramento and all at-risk urban areas have the funding they need.

Madam Speaker, the Urban Area Security Initiative Improvement Act will guarantee that our most at-risk urban areas will have access to necessary federal funds, which our first responders and law enforcement need in order to protect our citizens. I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this bill in the newly-elected ll0th Congress.

TRIBUTE TO LARRY KING

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a true giant in the transportation community and a dedicated servant of the citizens of Pennsylvania, Larry King. After more than 30 years of service, Mr. King will be retiring from Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDot) later this month. While Larry's retirement is certainly well deserved and will provide him with more time to spend with his wife Betty and their family, all of Pennsylvania will feel the impact of his departure.

Larry joined PennDot in 1969 and has served in a variety of positions with a special focus on planning and programming. In 1991, Mr. King was appointed to serve as Deputy Secretary of Planning. In that role, he was responsible for overseeing the statewide planning process, maintaining the Commonwealth's 12 year plan and the management the state's highway and bridge program which consist of a yearly budget of roughly $1.25 billion. Additionally, Larry was charged with the difficult task of ensuring that projects moved forward in a timely and cost efficient manner.

In his time at PennDot, Larry has been a tremendous resource for members of the Pennsylvania Congressional delegation. He never hesitated to share his expertise with Members or our staff. When Congress took up the historic Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA–21), it was Larry's counsel that Members sought in their effort to ensure that Pennsylvania received its fair share of highway and transit funding. I think we all can agree that Pennsylvania certainly benefitted from his counsel. Larry not only possesses an intimate knowledge of the federal process, he also holds a true passion for improving transportation within the Commonwealth. Indeed, I remain convinced that there is not a road in Pennsylvania on which Larry King has not traveled.

For more than 30 years, Larry has remained dedicated to serving the citizens of Pennsylvania and the Commonwealth has benefitted exponentially from his service. The numerous projects that have moved forward under his watchful eye will greatly benefit not only Pennsylvanians, but all who travel through the Commonwealth. While we all wish Larry all the best in his retirement, we must also let him know how much he will be missed. Thank you, Larry, for your many years of service and your friendship.

THERE'S A NEW LAWMAN IN TOWN: CHRISTOPHER JAMES McCAIN

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, earlier this week, as the sun set in South East Texas, on January 3, 2007, 35 highly-trained, well-disciplined, dedicated disciples of the law were sworn in as new Houston Police Officers. One of those officers was Christopher McCain.

McCain comes from a law enforcement family. His stepfather, Eddie, an HPD Officer for over 25 years, pinned the new police badge on McCain at the Police Academy Graduation. Present at the graduation were his proud mother, Janet, who has spent most of her career helping people of the Houston community, and his brother Ryne.

Madam Speaker, peace officers are the last strand of wire in the fence between good and evil. They are what separate us from the anarchy of the lawless. By wearing the badge, they swear to protect, defend, and serve the citizens.

McCain, 28 (born 1978), is a single parent of 2 small children. His youthful wife met an untimely death in 2005. When this occurred, McCain accepted the duty to raise his children alone.

Although becoming an HPD officer is the beginning of a new career, McCain has spent his life in public service. After receiving his GED, McCain volunteered and joined the U.S. Marine Corps. He served 4 years on active duty as a non- commissioned officer in Special Operations, assigned to the desert sands of the Middle East and he also served in Japan. After being discharged, he was recalled to active duty in 2003. McCain's dramatic enthusiasm for serving our Nation as a Marine was another trait of our Nation's great warriors.

Here's what President Ronald Reagan said about the Marines:

> Some people spend an entire lifetime wondering if they made a difference in the world. But, the Marines don't have that problem.

Christopher McCain was one of those Marines.

When his tour of duty was over with the Marine Corps, McCain went to work for the Harris County (Houston), Texas Juvenile Probation Department. He was a Master Sergeant in the training division of the boot camp. Boot camp teaches youthful offenders discipline, hard work, and self worth. He spent 5 years (2001–2006) helping the troubled youth of the streets of Houston.

But all of his life, Christopher McCain wanted to be a peace officer. Now that dream has been accomplished. Christopher McCain is a Texas Lawman!

Peace officers, who wear the badge, are the best we have to offer to our towns and cities. Serving the people, protecting the citizens, capturing outlaws and bringing them to justice, is what these peace officers do for the rest of us.

In Houston, we call our peace officers "Houston's Finest." Officer Christopher McCain is now one of those who wear the badge and the blue uniform of "Houston's Finest." He, like his fellow peace officers, is a cut above the rest of us—and that's just the way it is.

INTRODUCING THE FAIR MINIMUM WAGE ACT OF 2007

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, as part of this first 100 hours of the 110th Congress, I am proud to introduce the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007. The introduction of this bill provides Congress with a long-overdue opportunity to stand up for the dignity of those 5.6 million workers in the United States making minimum wage, or near minimum wage.

The Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 would increase the federal minimum wage to $7.25 per hour in three steps over two years. Under this bill, sixty days after enactment, the wage would rise from the current $5.15 per hour to $5.85 per hour. One year later, it would rise to $6.55. And a year after that, it would finally rise to $7.25 per hour. The bill also extends federal minimum wage coverage, under a separate timetable, to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

For almost a decade, the federal minimum wage has remained at just $5.15 an hour. The nation's poorest workers have suffered through the longest period in the history of the law without a pay raise. As a result of congressional inaction, the real value of the minimum wage has hit a 51-year low. If the rate remains unchanged in 2007, a minimum wage employee working full-time will earn only $10,712, which is $5,888 less than the $16,600 needed to lift a family of three out of poverty. This is unconscionable. These Americans have suffered at poverty wages for far too long. It is time for Congress to demonstrate that it values hard work.

Nearly 13 million American workers will see their pay rise as a result of the Fair Minimum Wage Act—5.6 million workers directly and 7.4 million workers indirectly. This number includes 7.7 million women, 3.4 million parents, and 4.7 million people of color. 79 percent of these workers are adults, and the majority of these workers work full-time.

Families with affected workers rely on those workers for more than half of their family's income. 46 percent of child-rearing families with affected workers rely solely on the earnings from those workers. If this bill becomes law, over 6.3 million children would see their parents' income rise. For a family of three this means an additional $4,400 a year, equaling 15 months worth of groceries or two years worth of health care for these families. It will mean greater dignity on the job.

Congress has a moral duty to raise the minimum wage. Churches, synagogues, and other faith groups are calling on Congress to support the Fair Minimum Wage Act. In this country, an average CEO earns more before lunchtime in one day than a minimum wage worker earns all year. This is a moral outrage in the richest country on earth. With the costs of health insurance, gasoline, and college tuition increasing, it is important, now more than ever, that we raise the minimum wage so that these hard working Americans are able to meet basic human needs.

Raising the minimum wage is not only the right thing to do, it is also economically prudent. Increasing the minimum wage will help boost the economy as a whole, putting more money into the hands of those people who need it and will spend it—indeed, spend it on basic necessities. Last year, some 665 economists, including several Nobel Laureates, signed a statement in support of raising the minimum wage. As they explained, the "minimum wage helps to equalize the imbalance in bargaining power that low-wage workers face in the labor market. The minimum wage is also an important tool in fighting poverty."

Raising the minimum wage is critical to fighting the middle class squeeze in this country. America's middle class is this country's economic backbone. It is what makes us strong. Yet the middle class is shrinking. Since 2001, the number of Americans living in poverty has increased by 5.4 million, to 37 million. More than one in six American children now lives in poverty. The Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 is an important first step for this new Congress in its efforts to stand up for the middle class and to stem the squeeze.

INTRODUCING WE THE PEOPLE

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise to introduce the We the People Act. The We the People Act forbids federal courts, including the Supreme Court, from adjudicating cases concerning state laws and polices relating to religious liberties or "privacy," including cases involving sexual practices, sexual orientation or reproduction. The We the People Act also protects the traditional definition of marriage from judicial activism by ensuring the Supreme Court cannot abuse the equal protection clause to redefine marriage. In order to hold federal judges accountable for abusing their powers, the act also provides that a judge who violates the act's limitations on judicial power shall either be impeached by Congress or removed by the president, according to rules established by the Congress.

The United States Constitution gives Congress the authority to establish and limit the jurisdiction of the lower federal courts and limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. The Founders intended Congress to use this authority to correct abuses of power by the federal judiciary.

Some may claim that an activist judiciary that strikes down state laws at will expands individual liberty. Proponents of this claim overlook the fact that the best guarantor of true liberty is decentralized political institutions, while the greatest threat to liberty is concentrated power. This is why the Constitution carefully limits the power of the federal government over the states.

In recent years, we have seen numerous abuses of power by Federal courts. Federal judges regularly strike down state and local laws on subjects such as religious liberty, sexual orientation, family relations, education, and abortion. This government by Federal judiciary causes a virtual nullification of the Tenth Amendment's limitations on federal power. Furthermore, when federal judges impose their preferred polices on state and local governments, instead of respecting the polices adopted by those elected by, and thus accountable

to, the people, republican government is threatened. Article IV, section 4 of the Untied States Constitution guarantees each state a republican form of government. Thus, Congress must act when the executive or judicial branch threatens the republican governments of the individual states. Therefore, Congress has a responsibility to stop Federal judges from running roughshod over state and local laws. The Founders would certainly have supported congressional action to reign in Federal judges who tell citizens where they can and can't place manger scenes at Christmas.

Madam Speaker, even some supporters of liberalized abortion laws have admitted that the Supreme Court's Roe v. Wade decision, which overturned the abortion laws of all fifty states, is flawed. The Supreme Court's Establishment Clause jurisdiction has also drawn criticism from across the political spectrum. Perhaps more importantly, attempts to resolve, by judicial fiat, important issues like abortion and the expression of religious belief in the public square increase social strife and conflict. The only way to resolve controversial social issues like abortion and school prayer is to restore respect for the right of state and local governments to adopt policies that reflect the beliefs of the citizens of those jurisdictions. I would remind my colleagues and the federal judiciary that, under our Constitutional system, there is no reason why the people of New York and the people of Texas should have the same policies regarding issues such as marriage and school prayer.

Unless Congress acts, a state's authority to define and regulate marriage may be the next victim of activist judges. After all, such a decision would simply take the Supreme Court's decision in the Lawrence case, which overturned all state sodomy laws, to its logical conclusion. Congress must launch a preemptive strike against any further federal usurpation of the states' authority to regulate marriage by removing issues concerning the definition of marriage from the jurisdiction of federal courts.

Although marriage is licensed and otherwise regulated by the states, government did not create the institution of marriage. Government regulation of marriage is based on state recognition of the practices and customs formulated by private individuals interacting in civil institutions, such as churches and synagogues. Having federal officials, whether judges, bureaucrats, or congressmen, impose a new definition of marriage on the people is an act of social engineering profoundly hostile to liberty.

It is long past time that Congress exercises its authority to protect the republican government of the states from out-of-control federal judges. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the We the People Act.

MATH AND SCIENCE EDUCATION LEGISLATION

HON. VERNON J. EHLERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce a package of four bills aimed at improving our nation's math and science education at the pre-school through university levels.

Too often, our young students lack the academic background necessary to learn math and science skills in elementary school. The Math and Science School Readiness Act (H.R.) promotes pre-mathematics and pre-science school readiness in preschool-aged children enrolled in the federal Head Start program. The bill updates the current law provision that requires that Head Start programs develop preschoolers' "numeracy skills" by requiring that such programs instead ensure that children develop and demonstrate basic pre-math and pre-science skills, such as counting, grouping similar objects together, and deciphering whether items have been added or subtracted. I included a similar provision in the major Head Start reauthorization bills that passed the House in 2003 and 2005, but unfortunately these bills did not become law.

Now more than ever, our nation's future economic competitiveness and national security will depend upon a workforce equipped with necessary math and science skills. Our students lag behind their international peers on several key indicators, and our states and schools are not held accountable for K–12 science education. The Science Accountability Act (H.R.) holds states and schools accountable for ensuring that our K–12 students are learning science. It amends the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 to require that the science assessments, which begin in the 2007–2008 school year, be included in the state's accountability system beginning in the 2008–2009 school year. It also gradually phases in annual assessments in science in grades 3–8, matching the existing requirements for reading and math assessments.

This package of math and science bills also provides resources for improving math and science education. A tandem of bills provides incentives for teachers and businesses to enhance math and science education.

A key component of high-quality math and science education is a qualified teaching workforce. The National Science Education Tax Incentive for Teachers Act (H.R.) helps bring qualified math and science teachers to our K–12 schools and helps retain them. Eligible teachers may receive a tax credit of up to $1,500 per year.

A former science educator, I understand that students should learn math and science primarily by doing math and science. Schools lack the necessary equipment and some teachers lack training in how to use the equipment. The National Science Education Tax Incentive for Businesses Act (H.R.) encourages businesses to donate new and needed math and science-related equipment to schools or donate teacher training services. Businesses may receive a tax credit equal to 100 percent of the value of their donations.

I am hopeful that the House and Senate can quickly act on this legislative package and that President Bush will sign the bills so that our nation's math and science education may be improved on all levels.

TRIBUTE TO MR. ANTHONY L'ESPERANCE

HON. GARY G. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor Mr. Anthony L'Esperance, a fellow Southern Californian.

Mr. L'Esperance has lived a long and distinguished life. During World War II, he honorably served as a Lieutenant Commander in the Merchant Marines. His duty and commitment to this great nation have helped build the pillars of hope, peace and freedom that so many in the world still look up to.

Mr. L'Esperance was also featured in the pages of Life magazine for his work as a master magician and is credited for inventing a precise slide-calendar that incorporates the days lost due to the switch from Julian to Gregorian calendars.

But his greatest accomplishment and passion in life is his family. For more than 62 years, Mr. L'Esperance has been married to his wife Mary. They have been blessed with a son, Paul, a daughter-in-law, Jan, and granddaughter, Morgan.

Madam Speaker, I respectfully ask that this 110th Congress join me in saluting Mr. L'Esperance for his service to our country and community.

RENEWABLE ENERGY COULD TRANSFORM HAITI

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the following op-ed that appeared last week in the Orlando Sentinel. This article discusses how a U.S.-backed biomass policy for Haiti could move our Caribbean neighbor away from the trajectory of state failure. As the article notes: "Support for bioenergy as part of the solution to Haiti's economic dilemma—unemployment and lack of energy—could advance the development of Haiti, and reinforce the governance and security reforms that Haitians so desperately deserve." I hope all of my colleagues keep this article in mind as we enter the 110th Congress.

[From the Orlando Sentinel, Dec. 26, 2006]

HOPE AFTER H.O.P.E. FOR HAITI?

(By Johanna Mendelson-Forman)

In its final hours, the 109th Congress gave new life to Haiti's manufacturing sector, passing a trade bill that included the H.O.P.E legislation that would create up to 7,000 new jobs by allowing Haitian assembly plants to import, duty-free, textiles that would be made into clothing for the U.S. market. While not a long-term solution to Haiti's ills, the symbolism of this action went further to bolster the morale of the Haitian private sector than anything in recent years.

Haiti suffers from many problems, not the least of which is lack of jobs. Violence and kidnappings continue to undermine security in Port au Prince. Even with the presence of a robust U.N. Peace Mission, a country of 8

million people without jobs spells insecurity. The rigorous effort by the international community to reinvent the Haitian National Police is only part of the solution to a complex country where law enforcement is franchised to many different groups rather than controlled by the state. What vexes those who want Haiti to succeed is just how to create a viable and sustainable development program.

While H.O.P.E may represent a small victory, other positive signs may auger for a different approach. A donor's meeting at the end of November in Madrid yielded almost $80 million to support good governance. And the World Bank decision to offer Haiti debt reduction also will help alleviate the drain on Haiti's limited revenue. Successful municipal elections held this month marked the first time since 1995 that Haitians democratically elected leaders of local government. And even a new effort to create a non-corrupt civil service is under way.

But the most promising signs that may make the difference in the coming years will be centered on a push to help Haiti become energy independent through the use of biomass energy.

Renewable energy could transform Haiti. A World Bank study reported that growing energy crops creates jobs in addition to fuel. In a country totally dependent on foreign oil for its energy needs, such independence could prove revolutionary.

This is not science fiction. Haiti is a perfect candidate for growing oil-seed crops. In rural areas, where 70 percent of the population remains engaged in subsistence agriculture, developing an indigenous biofuels market could transform the countryside and prevent the urban migration that continues to swell the slums of Port au Prince.

The environment could also be saved. And the proven anti-erosion qualities of seed crops like Jatropha and Castor bean could also revitalize the soil in a country that is 96 percent deforested and where every rainfall puts thousands of people at risk for natural disasters. And with crops such as Jatropha, the bush is a natural fence since its leaves are poisonous to animals.

Unfortunately, helping Haiti to become energy self-sufficient is not a priority for donors despite the potential it represents. It never came up at the Madrid meeting. And U.S. development assistance has yet to see this type of sustainable agriculture in Haiti as a means of long-term poverty alleviation.

If real hope is to be restored in Haiti, it must go beyond the trade incentives embodied in the H.O.P.E legislation. Urgent action is needed so that a U.S. biomass policy for the Caribbean addresses not only the regional dilemma of foreign oil dependency, but also moves Haiti away from the trajectory of state failure, a threat that U.S. policymakers consider a grave danger to U.S. interests.

With Brazil as the lead nation in the U.N. peace operation in Haiti, the technical means for bio-energy transformation could get underway within the next year. The combined power of U.S. economic support, coupled with Brazil's biomass expertise, could certainly be applied to a place such as Haiti. It could also demonstrate that ending addiction to fossil fuels, a goal President Bush endorses, can also be applied to one of the great development challenges in our hemisphere.

In a country just a two-hour flight from the U.S. mainland, the risk of state failure looms large. Support for bioenergy as part of the solution to Haiti's economic dilemma—unemployment and lack of energy—could advance the development of Haiti, and reinforce the governance and security reforms that Haitians so desperately deserve.

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR HARRY KESSLER

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, late in the night of January 2, 2007, our community lost a giant. Our beloved "once and ways" Mayor Harry Kessler, who symbolized honest and dedicated leadership in the public realm, has passed from this life.

He set a community standard that endures. His tenure as Mayor from 1971 through 1977 brought growth and vitality to a struggling city, and his imprimatur is everywhere. He followed his Mayoral leadership by holding other elected offices for two decades after he decided to retire as Mayor. Few have defined the Mayor of Toledo as did Mayor Harry Kessler. A beloved father for our City, he lived and breathed his life to better our city and region. His kind and gentlemanly manner, his eternal smile, and his deep commitment to integrity, learning and libraries, community service, and athletics have left permanent legacies to future generations.

Mayor Kessler was a builder, a healer, a leader who knew how to bring our community together not just for today but for tomorrow. We can each learn much from him as we emulate his life of service to us, in the private sector, in public office, and so many other community ventures. His deep love for our City that he always called home inspired us all. He did all he could to make our place on earth a finer and more humane place in which to live.

We extend deepest sympathy and gratitude to his soulmate and partner for over half a century, Mary Lou, his children and extended family. We wish them strength and peace as, together, we adjust to his passing from life with us. May God rest his soul and place him in a leading role in the City beyond stars to watch over our earthly pursuits.

IT'S TIME TO STOP THE SLAUGHTER OF A LIVING SYMBOL OF THE AMERICAN WEST

HON. NICK J. RAHALL, II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation that I first authored in the 109th Congress to restore the prohibition on the commercial sale and slaughter of wild free-roaming horses and burros. I am again joined in this effort by my good friend and colleague from Kentucky, ED WHITFIELD.

In both 2005 and 2006 the House adopted amendments I offered to the Interior and Environment Appropriations bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the sale or slaughter of wild free-roaming horses and burros. While we were successful in the House, neither amendment made it into law. In any event, these amendments would have only been a temporary one-year fix. What is needed is a permanent solution to this problem. That is why I am offering my legislation today.

It was just a little over two years ago that 36 lines were hidden away in a 1,641 page appropriations bill that overturned more than 30 years of national policy on the protection and management of wild free-roaming horses and burros, allowing these "living symbols of the historic and pioneer spirit of the West" to literally be slaughtered through the use of a backdoor legislative maneuver enacted without public notice or input.

The public reaction to this change in law was swift and deafening. There was a good reason why it had been illegal for more than 30 years to sell or transfer wild free-roaming wild horses and burros for processing into commercial products. Americans were aghast to learn that these animals could be slaughtered for their meat to be served on dinner tables in such foreign countries as France, Belgium, and Japan.

Horses are an integral part of the tapestry of this country—a symbol, a promise of possibility, a companion, and a treasured childhood memory. Americans have always championed their survival, and expect that that these creatures will be protected. To allow them to be sacrificed and slaughtered represents great disrespect to the will of the American people and is an affront to our nation's history.

Instead of addressing long-term and widespread management problems the Bureau of Land Management, which administers the wild horse and burro program, has been forced to scurry to try to stop wild horses and burros from being sent to slaughter. Unfortunately for several dozen of these animals their attempts came too late and slaughter occurred.

Slaughter is all the more senseless since humane alternatives exist and federal agencies have the authority to carry out such humane measures as adoption, sterilization, relocation, and placement with qualified individuals and organizations.

The time has long since passed to restore the prohibition on the sale and slaughter of wild free-roaming horses and burros. I urge my colleague to heed the will of the American public and respond to common decency by supporting my legislation. We owe no less to these living symbols of the American West.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. LARRY N. DANTZLER

HON. ALLEN BOYD

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. BOYD of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the exceptional service of Mr. Larry N. Dantzler on behalf of Bay County military installations.

Mr. Dantzler is stepping down as the president of the Bay Defense Alliance, which is a group of volunteers committed to enhancing and preserving the missions of Tyndall Air Force Base and the Naval Support Activity Panama City.

Larry has served as its leader since the groups formation in 1993, and has spent countless hours in his role to defend these installations as Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) loomed. Under his leadership, the Bay Defense Alliance helped defend our installations in Bay County against two rounds of BRAC. Members of the Bay Defense Alliance have logged more than 15,000 volunteer hours in their efforts supporting the bases.

Mr. Dantzler has served as an advocate for the more than 11,000 men and women who serve our nation in support of Tyndall AFB, the Naval Support Activity Panama City and the Coast Guard Station Panama City. His hard work has helped build military and Congressional support for important missions in Bay County. He has served tirelessly as a liaison between Bay County, State, and Federal leadership in defense of our local bases.

This has been a job requiring great dedication—which he has done splendidly—despite his additional obligations as a business owner and his many other volunteer efforts. His additional volunteer efforts include work with the Bay County Chamber of Commerce, of which he is a past chairman, Rotary, United Way, Optimist Club, Bay Medical Center Foundation, Gulf Coast Community College Foundation, Panama City-Bay County International Airport Authority, Gulf Coast Community College Board of Trustees, Coastal Operations Institute, Girls Inc., Panama City Music Association, Bay Arts Alliance and others.

I invite my distinguished colleagues to join me in paying special tribute to Larry N. Dantzler for his invaluable service to Bay County, Florida. Through his leadership, he has laid the groundwork for preservation of our military installations for years to come and I would like to personally wish Larry, and his wife Nancy, the very best in their future endeavors.

TRIBUTE ON THE PASSING OF DAVID HERMANCE—THE FATHER OF THE AMERICAN PRIUS

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to David Hermance, who was killed in a plane crash in Southern California on November 25th. David was the North American Executive Engineer for Advanced Technology Vehicles at Toyota, whose headquarters is located in my congressional district.

Although most Americans may not know his name, David Hermance was one of the most influential engineers and environmentalists in the country. He was only 59 years-old when the experimental aircraft he was piloting crashed into the Pacific Ocean, and his tragic death is a stunning loss not only for his family, but for the larger community he served.

Equally respected in the environmental community and the automotive industry, David was known as the ''Father of the American Prius''—and for good reason. He had a knack for translating complex systems and technologies into easy-to-understand concepts, and he worked tirelessly to help lay-people understand the workings and benefits of hybrid and other advanced-technology vehicles.

It was David's passionate approach and commitment to the environment that helped persuade a skeptical industry and auto-buying public to appreciate the enormous potential of his work. In fact, Madam Speaker, my family drives two hybrid vehicles—one in California and the other in Washington, DC.

David will be sorely missed—as an outstanding individual and beloved colleague. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family: his wife Mary, his children Keith and Kathy, his grandson Colin and sister Bonnie.

INTRODUCTION OF THE IMPACT AID SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION BILL

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. TERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to help schools educating the children of U.S. service members and schools serving Native American children on federal lands.

My legislation will improve the distribution of school construction grants under the Impact Aid program. Impact Aid compensates schools affected by a federal presence such as military installations or Native American reservations. Because federal lands are exempt from local property taxes, school districts located on or near federal lands lose a major source of revenue without the federal Impact Aid program.

Currently, school construction grants under Impact Aid allow unequal funding between military school districts and Native American school districts. For example, although 36 percent of the one million federal students are from military impacted schools, the majority of school construction dollars are spent on the 12 percent of Native American students.

In 2005 and 2004, $27 million in Impact Aid competitive construction grants were awarded. In 2005, only 1 of 8 competitive grants was awarded to a military impacted school district. In 2004, only three of 15 recipients were military school districts, and only one of 17 recipients in 2003 was a military school. In contrast, the formula grants under the Impact Aid School Construction program are equally distributed between military and Native American schools.

Considering that Impact Aid has historically been underfunded in meeting the needs of local school districts serving military and Native American families, this legislation is critical to ensure the most equitable use of available dollars.

Instead of sending 60% of funding toward 12 percent of federal students, the legislation I am introducing today would ensure 80% of school construction funding will be equally distributed between military and Native American schools. This approach will help ensure a high-quality education for the children of our military members selflessly serving our Nation. Priority would also be given to Native American districts in qualifying for emergency construction grants in recognition of the poor condition of too many Native American schools.

This legislation will also help schools affected by Global Rebasing at the Department of Defense (DoD). Over the next four years, DoD estimates that 38,000 military children will be returning to U.S. schools from closing overseas military bases. Under this legislation, schools that experience a 10% increase in the number of military students would be allowed to apply for emergency Impact Aid construction grants.

I am confident this excellent legislation will improve the Impact Aid program to better serve American families. I am proud that both Native American school districts and military-impacted school districts support the commonsense approach of this bill. I look forward to working with my colleagues on the reauthorization of Impact Aid later this year, and urge every Member of Congress to review and cosponsor this legislation.

HONORING MICHAEL LOFTON AND THE AFRICAN AMERICAN MEN AND BOYS CONFERENCE

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Michael Lofton, an inspirational leader who is working each day to make a difference in the lives of young people in his community. This past summer Mr. Lofton implemented an idea to bring together 200 boys, men and parents in the first African American Men and Boys Conference. His goal was to counteract the trends where African American boys were lagging academically, disrupting classes, disrespecting themselves, and often ending up incarcerated.

His passion for helping children led him to the Austin School District, where he contacted parents, school principals, health specialists, professors, sociologists, judges, law-enforcement, businesses, community leaders and clergy, in order to create a concentrated effort to support young black men and boys in the Austin community.

The monthly African American Men and Boys Conference has continued to increase in participation since its inception this past June. It has also expanded from focusing on boys and their academic needs to working with the entire family to make a difference. Each month these boys and their families focus good decision making, managing anger, taking and passing standardized tests, completing high school, attending college, maintaining a healthy lifestyle, and knowing how and when to seek assistance with school work,

It is people like Michael Lofton that are the cornerstone of our communities making a difference each and every day. He was brave enough and passionate enough to go out into the community and establish his vision for change, and he has inspired others to work with him to better our society. I commend Michael Lofton for all the work that he has done, and know that this is merely the first step of many great things to come.

HONORING SISTER MABLE WILLIAMS

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and work of Sister Mable Williams, a longtime resident of Oakland, California. Sister Mable is a role model to us all, and has demonstrated her leadership through her commitment to members of her church as well as the community at large. On Sunday, December 31, 2006, Sister Mable's friends, family and congregation will come together to celebrate her many contributions.

Sister Mable was born on January 25, 1931 in Picayune, Mississippi. She lived there until the age of 13, when she and her family moved to Alameda, California. She attended Alameda High School and Merritt Business School.

In 1953, Sister Mable married Thomas Williams, and in 1955 they moved to Oakland, California. Mable and her family have lived in Brookfield Village in East Oakland since that time, providing spiritual support to family, friends and neighbors. She also served as an employee of the United States Post Office for over 30 outstanding years, retiring in 1989.

Sister Mable joined Bethel Missionary Baptist Church in 1944 and immediately committed herself to serving in many aspects. For example, she served as a Charter Member of the church, and also as a secretary for the pastor, Reverend Herbert Guice. Furthermore, she served as a Charter Member of the Bethel Bible Class, and as a Sunday School Teacher of the Young Adult class.

One of Sister Mable's most outstanding accomplishments is having served as the Director of the Junior Church of the Bethel Missionary Baptist Church for 50 years. Under her leadership, countless young people have had opportunities to serve and to brighten their communities. Her dedication has earned her the nickname ''Able Mable,'' because she is never too busy or too tired to give of herself.

On Sunday, December 31, 2006, the friends, family and colleagues of Sister Mable Williams will come together to celebrate her tireless work and commitment to our community. On this very special day, I join all of them in thanking and saluting Sister Mable for her invaluable service, and for the profoundly positive impact her work has had on countless lives here in California's 9th U.S. Congressional District.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL RICHARD A PLATT

HON. THOMAS M. REYNOLDS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor a respected military officer and great fighter pilot upon the occasion of his retirement from the United States Air Force and Air National Guard after 36 years of honorable and dedicated service.

Born in Silver Creek, New York, growing up in Suffern, New York, Major General Richard A. Platt began his military career June 1971 when he received his commission through the Reserve Officer Training Corps at Newark College of Engineering. After earning his pilot wings in June 1972, he flew F–4 Phantom fighter aircraft and was assigned to front line combat units in Southeast Asia, Europe and the United States.

Madam Speaker, from his early days as a fighter pilot in Vietnam to his role as a fighter weapons instructor General Platt has shown impressive leadership and combat flying skills. His flying experience includes two combat tours of duty, one in Vietnam and the other over the skies of Bosnia.

In 1981, Major General Platt left the active duty air force and continued his service flying the A-10 Warthog as a member of the 104th Fighter Wing of the Massachusetts Air National Guard. General Platt time and time again demonstrated his unparalleled vision and leadership. As a commander, he led the transformation of the 104th Fighter Wing into one of the premier fighting units in the entire American military.

Madam Speaker, following his flying career, General Platt served with distinction as he continued to provide vision and leadership to the Air National Guard. His assignments included commander of the Massachusetts Air National Guard and Air National Guard Assistant to the Commander of both Air Combat Command as well as United States Air Forces Europe. His last post brought him to Washington, D.C. where he was Assistant to the Director of the Air National Guard. In this role, General Platt was instrumental in beginning important changes to ensure the relevance and viability of the Air National Guard and United States Air Force, in this most challenging period of our country's history.

Madam Speaker, General Platt's dedication to the military has been evident from the day he joined his ROTC unit to his last tour of duty at the Pentagon; but perhaps more than any other assignment, nothing was more special to him than his role as commander of the 104th Fighter Wing. Even today, several years after General Platt's tenure, the wing is still recognized as an elite unit—his core values of integrity, dedication to duty, and patriotism remain strong. General Platt recognized that the fighter wing and our entire military are only as strong as the lowest ranking member—and no one member was more important than any other. For him the 104th Fighter Wing was more than just officers and airmen, they were, and still remain his family.

Madam Speaker, each and every American is safer and freer due to the service of Major General Platt and the men and women like him serving across all of our armed services.

Madam Speaker, in recognition of and in gratitude for his service, leadership and patriotism, I ask that this honorable body join me in honoring Major General Richard A. Platt upon the occasion of his retirement; and wish him great health and happiness in the days and years ahead as a father, husband and grandfather.

THE 110TH CONGRESS

HON. JAY INSLEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, yesterday, January 4, 2007, marked a historic day for progress in the United States of America for two reasons. The House of Representatives grew by taking further steps to represent the full fabric of the American People. The American people have selected their first woman speaker, Nancy Pelosi, and their first Muslim member of Congress, Keith Ellison. I am proud that Americans have rejected the statements from some who alleged Americans of all faiths are not welcome in Congress. This is also the first time the American people are represented by a speaker with a clear goal to move the United States towards energy independence. These advances represent steps forward in America's continuing experiment in democracy in which Congress represents America's stripes.

INTRODUCTION OF THE JOURNEY THROUGH HOLLOWED GROUND NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA ACT

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to create The Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Heritage Area. Senator WARNER will be introducing companion legislation in the Senate.

We remember the words of Abraham Lincoln in his Gettysburg Address:

> We cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have hallowed it far above our poor power to add or detract.

The Journey Through Hallowed Ground winds it way along U.S. Route 15 from Jefferson's home of Monticello, in Charlottesville, Virginia to Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. Starting as a trail used by the Susquehannock and Iroquois, America's early history can literally be traced along this corridor. Jefferson's Monticello, Madison's Montpellier, Monroe's Oak Hill and Ashlawn Highland, Zachary Taylor's homes, Eisenhower's cottage, Teddy Roosevelt's cabin, John Marshall's home, General George Marshall's home, and Camp David are situated along this route also dotted with numerous Civil War battlefields and sites from the underground railroad.

Designation of this historic route as a National Heritage Area will create a partnership between the federal, state, and local governments as well as local civic organizations to commemorate, conserve and promote the history and resources along the Route 15 corridor between Gettysburg and Monticello. It will help link national parks to historical sites, package tourism opportunities, and provide financial and technical support for sites in the corridor.

This historic corridor includes a significant part of the 10th District of Virginia, which I am proud to represent. I echo the sentiments of author and historian David McCullough when he said that ''[t]his is the ground of our Founding Fathers. These are the landscapes that speak volumes—small towns, churches, fields, mountains, creeks and rivers with names such as Bull Run and Rappahannock. They are the real thing, and what shame we will bring upon ourselves if we destroy them.''

This bill is modeled after the legislation Senator WARNER and I introduced which created the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District in the Shenandoah Valley in 1996. Through that legislation, the Civil War battlefield sites in the Valley are being preserved. As with that bill, local, state and federal officials, working along with landowners and business leaders will be able to better promote the history of the Journey Through Hallowed Ground attracting tourism and an appreciation for the unique history of this area.

I would like to thank the Journey Through Hollowed Ground Partnership which has been working to forge partnerships that span the four states that fall within the proposed boundaries of the heritage area. This group has laid

the groundwork in identifying the significant historical properties within such a concentrated area along U.S. Route 15. Dozens of towns and counties along the corridor have offered letters of support as have local civic groups. The Virginia General Assembly also has approved a resolution of support.

This legislation has been painstakingly drafted to ensure that the rights of private property owners within the district will not be usurped. In fact, designation as a heritage area increases the rights of property owners giving them an opportunity to learn more about the significance of their own property and allowing them to market their property as historically significant. Landowners should have the right to choose preservation and protection along with the right to choose to build town homes, malls and highways.

The legislation clearly states: "Nothing in this Act shall be construed to modify the authority of Federal, State, or local governments to regulate land use." Additionally, the only new federal funds accessible to The Journey Through Hallowed Ground Partnership will be for the management of the heritage area.

The bill also specifically prohibits the use of eminent domain and the ability of the management entity to regulate land use. The Government Accountability Office, the nonpartisan research service for the legislative branch, has investigated the effect of a heritage area designation on land use decisions. Its 2004 report states: "Heritage area officials, Park Service headquarters and regional staff, and representatives of national property rights groups that we contacted were unable to provide us with any examples of a heritage area directly affecting—positively or negatively—private property values or use."

This legislation is a local effort to recognize the history and beauty of this region. The organizers are local landowners who have the vision to appreciate that they live among the nation's most precious resources and history. The Journey Through Hallowed Ground Partnership conducted a poll of the residents in the heritage area and found that 81 percent of those polled expressed support for the initiative.

To understand the importance of this initiative, I refer to the words of Thomas Jefferson in his Notes on the State of Virginia:

> You stand on a very high point of land. On your right comes up the Shenandoah, having ranged along the foot of the mountain a hundred miles to seek a vent. On your left approaches the Potomac, in quest of a passage also. In the moment of their junction, they rush together against the mountain, rend it asunder, and pass off to the sea. The first glance of this scene hurries our senses into the opinion that this earth has been created in time, that the mountains were formed first, that the rivers began to flow afterwards, that in this place, particularly, they have been dammed up by the Blue Ridge of mountains, and have formed an ocean which filed the whole valley; that continuing to rise they have at length broken over this spot, and have torn the mountains down from its summit to its base. The piles of rocks on each hand, but particularly on the Shenandoah, the evident marks of their disrupture and avulsion from their beds by the most powerful agents of nature, corroborate the impression. But the distant finishing, which nature has given to the picture, is of a very different character. It is a true contrast to the foreground. It is as placid and delightful as that is wild and tremendous. For the mountain being cloven asunder, she presents to your eye, through the cleft, a small catch of smooth, blue horizon, at an infinite distance in the plain country, inviting you, as it were, from the riot and tumult roaring around, to pass through the breach and participate in the calm below.

The landscape Jefferson depicts has been inspirational to American leaders for hundreds of years. From Susquehannock Indian trading routes and to Revolutionary War battles; from the homes of the founding fathers to the first brave pioneers to make a home beyond the Blue Ridge Mountains; from the Civil War battles which threatened to divide the union to the underground railroad, our nation was forged along this route. From Blue Ridge Mountains to the west and the fertile Piedmont to the east of the corridor the route in many ways exhibits the birth and development of our nation's economy, social movements and political landscape. Perhaps even more significant than the battlefields that cluster along the route are the documents penned in the homes along the corridor. The Declaration of Independence, the Monroe Doctrine and the Marshall Plan have influenced not only this nation, but the entire world.

Every American citizen should take a trip along this route so that they know not only from where our nation has come, but also to where we are going. We cannot stand as a nation unless we know what this nation stands for.

As we come upon the 400th anniversary this year of America's birthplace at Jamestown, I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this legislation.

IMPLEMENTING THE 9/11 COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS ACT OF 2007

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 5, 2007

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, the 9/11 Commission produced an unprecedented, bipartisan evaluation of how terrorists were able to exploit our nation's security on September 11, 2001. The Commissioners made 41 valuable recommendations on how to prevent such an attack from occurring again. Unfortunately, not all of those recommendations were fulfilled by Congress and the Bush Administration. As a result, the American people remain at-risk, and our nation remains unprepared for a major emergency. When Hurricanes Katrina and Rita slammed into the Gulf Coast, we were reminded again of how unprepared we still are to deal with national disasters—whether caused by nature or a terrorist attack.

The "Implementing the 9/11 Commission Recommendations Act of 2007," which I am introducing today, will make the United States more secure by closing many of the security gaps that continue to expose our nation to the risk of a terrorist attack.

Enactment of this legislation will make it more difficult for terrorists to obtain nuclear materials, ensure that first responders finally have the equipment they need to respond to a disaster, airplanes will be more secure, our borders will be harder for terrorists to penetrate, our police and other local law enforcement will finally get the information they need about terrorist threats, and ports and other critical infrastructure will be made more secure. Perhaps most importantly, this bill makes these improvements in security without endangering our American way of life because it puts in place strong new privacy and civil liberties protections.

Specifically, this bill provides much-needed support to the first responders at the State, local, and tribal levels who bear the brunt of the emergency response and preparedness burden. The 9–11 Commission recommended that homeland security funds designed to improve emergency preparedness be allocated based on risk, and that steps be taken to provide first responders with communications systems that are fully interoperable in an emergency. This bill fulfills these recommendations by providing for risk-based evaluation and prioritization of homeland security grants and enhanced accountability for grant distribution and use, so that federal aid will go where it is most needed. Moreover, it creates a stand-alone grant program to help States, local and tribal governments erect the interoperable communications systems that are so vital to effective emergency response. It also encourages the use of a unified command during an emergency, so that Federal officials work more closely with State, local, and tribal governments in preparation and response efforts.

The 9/11 Commission found that many Federal agencies had information that could have led to the arrest and capture of the September 11th hijackers, but that this information did not reach the Federal, State, and local officials who could have acted on it. This bill acts on the 9/11 Commission's recommendation to improve intelligence and information sharing between Federal authorities and their State and local counterparts. First, it establishes the Fusion and Law Enforcement Education and Training (FLEET) Grant Program to strengthen the capabilities of local fusion centers and to foster cooperation among State and local law enforcement officers. It also establishes the Border Intelligence Fusion Center Program, which will put experienced Federal border security personnel to fusion centers in border States to enhance collaboration. Additionally, it provides more State and local law enforcement officers with the opportunity to gain valuable experience working in Washington with Department of Homeland Security officials. Finally, it ensures the Department itself has the technology and organization needed to facilitate intelligence and information sharing.

Our nation's aviation system, which was easily exploited by the September 11th hijackers, will also be made more secure through this bill. The 9/11 Commission found that more steps need to be taken to secure air cargo and checked baggage and to ensure airport checkpoints have the equipment necessary to detect explosives. This bill meets those concerns. First, it requires TSA to develop a system so that 100 percent of air cargo carried on passenger aircraft is inspected by 2009. Second, it provides for an additional billion dollars to be made available over the next four years to put modern baggage screening systems in place. It also creates an innovative new $250 million trust fund to address the risk of suicide bombers at the checkpoint by strengthening explosive detection at the checkpoint. The Department will also have to explain how it plans to undertake efforts to prescreen passenger

names against terrorist watch lists, a task the airlines are still charged with doing over five years after 9/11. At the same time, a new, streamlined system will be put in place for innocent people to establish their identities and prevent them from being misidentified against ''No Fly'' or ''Selectee'' lists.

One of the most frightening aspects of the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and Flight 93 is that the planes all took off from domestic airports, meaning that each of the hijackers was already in the United States. In response to these disconcerting facts, this bill strengthens accountability for plans to implement biometric verification of foreign nationals entering and exiting the United States, as well as improved integration of the Visa Security and Terrorist Travel Programs. Moreover, this measure authorizes badly needed support and personnel for the Human Smuggling and Trafficking Center, in order to enhance its ability to combat human smuggling, human trafficking, and terrorist travel.

In addition to addressing domestic homeland security gaps, this bill also contains multiple provisions that deal with security concerns outside the United States. Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, we have become increasingly aware of the growing threat posed by terrorists with access to nuclear materials and other weapons of mass destruction. This bill takes up those concerns by providing some of the building blocks needed to mitigate the international aspects of terrorism. This bill complements existing laws and provides resources to encourage international cooperation to stem proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. It also addresses the terrorism implications of the nuclear black market, and mandates that U.S. foreign assistance and arms sales be withdrawn from countries that condone or engage in nuclear proliferation networks.

Another way that this bill protects against the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction is to strengthen security procedures for cargo entering the United States from foreign ports. Building upon the recently enacted SAFE Ports Act, this bill requires all cargo containers to be scanned before they reach U.S. ports within five years, and requires port security personnel to use the best technology available in scanning containers for radiation and density.

While it addresses a number of security concerns, this bill would also strengthen protection of privacy rights and civil liberties. Although it was created in 2004 on the recommendation of the 9/11 Commission, the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board has been little more than a shell that has failed to live up to its promise and protect the basic freedoms of Americans. This bill would take three key steps toward making the Board a legitimate force of accountability and transparency in the federal government. First, it would remove the Board from the Executive Office of the President, making it an independent and autonomous body. Second, this bill would require all Board members to be confirmed by the Senate, which will minimize political influence by the President and other executive officials whose actions it oversees. Finally, this bill would empower the Board as the Chief Privacy Officer with the authority to subpoena witnesses and evidence, a key investigative tool that would greatly strengthen the Board's ability to uncover questionable or unlawful action.

The best way to honor those who lost their lives because of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 is to make sure that kind of attack never happens again. Similarly, there must be a stronger commitment to giving first responders and communities the resources they need to respond quickly and vigorously to terrorist attacks and significant natural disasters. The 9/11 Commission did an exemplary job of locating weaknesses and making recommendations for strengthening homeland security. Now it falls to us, the U.S. Congress, to follow through on those recommendations. The 9/11 Commission Recommendations Act of 2007 is a critical step in fulfilling that mission, and I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in supporting it.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. It will next meet at 11:30 a.m., on Monday, January 8, 2007.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 311 public bills, H.R. 1–4, 11–239, and 241–319; 2 private bills, H.R. 240 and 320; and 66 resolutions, H.J. Res. 1–11; H. Con. Res. 1–18; and H. Res. 1–37, were introduced. **Pages H109–23**

Reports Filed: A report was filed on January 2, 2007 as follows: Activities and Summary Report of the Committee on the Budget, 109th Congress (H. Rept. 109–750). **Page H109**

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Appointment: The Speaker announced her appointment of Representative Reyes, Chairman and Representative Hoekstra to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. **Page H59**

Policies of the Chair: The Chair announced her policies with respect to particular aspects of the legislative process dealing with (1) privileges of the floor; (2) introduction of bills and resolutions; (3) unanimous-consent agreements; (4) recognition for one-minute speeches; (5) decorum in debate; (6) conduct of votes by electronic device; (7) distribution of written material on the House floor; and (8) use of electronic equipment on the House floor. Without objection, the announcements will be printed in the Record. **Pages H59–61**

Adopting Rules for the One Hundred Tenth Congress: The House continued consideration of H. Res. 6, adopting the Rules of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred Tenth Congress. Pursuant to H. Res. 5, the question was divided among each of the five titles of H. Res. 6. Titles I and II were adopted on Thursday, January 4. **Pages H62–85**

Rejected the Ryan of Wisconsin motion to commit the resolution to a select committee composed of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader with instructions to report back the same to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 200 yeas to 232 nays, Roll No. 10. **Pages H83–85**

On adoption of Title III, the House agreed by a yea-and-nay vote of 430 yeas and 0 nays, Roll No. 8. **Pages H62–69, H82–83**

On adoption of Title IV, the House agreed by a yea-and-nay vote of 280 yeas and 152 nays, Roll No. 9. **Pages H69–79, H83**

On adoption of Title V, the House agreed by a yea-and-nay vote of 232 yeas and 200 nays, Roll No. 11. **Pages H79–82, H85**

H. Res. 5, the rule providing for consideration of the resolution, was agreed to on Thursday, January 4.

Agreed by unanimous consent to discharge from committee and pass S. 159, to redesignate the White Rocks National Recreation Area in the State of Vermont as the "Robert T. Stafford White Rocks National Recreation Area"—clearing the measure for the President. **Pages H85–86**

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business of Wednesday, January 10. **Page H88**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, January 9 for Morning Hour debate. **Page H107**

Recess: The House recessed at 4:16 p.m. and reconvened at 6:45 p.m. **Page H107**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H82–83, H83, H84–85, and H85. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:46 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 5, 2007

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

Congressional Program Ahead

Week of January 8 through January 12, 2007

Senate Chamber

On Monday, at 12 noon, Senate will begin consideration of S. Res. 19, a resolution celebrating the life of the late President Gerald R. Ford, to be followed by a vote on the adoption of the resolution.

During the balance of the week, Senate expects to consider any cleared legislative and executive business when available.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: January 10, to hold hearings to examine agriculture and rural America's role in enhancing national energy security, 9:30 a.m., SR–328A.

Committee on the Budget: January 11, to hold hearings to examine the long-term budget outlook, 10:30 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Finance: January 10, to hold hearings to examine tax incentives for businesses in response to a minimum wage increase, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: January 9, to receive a closed briefing regarding Iraq, 2:30 p.m., S–407, Capitol.

January 10, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine securing America's interests and the current situation in Iraq, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: January 10, organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures for committee operations and committee's rules of procedure for the 110th Congress; to be followed by a hearing to examine challenges and opportunities relating to health care for all Americans, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: January 9, to hold hearings to examine ensuring full implementation of the 9/11 Commission's recommendations, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: January 10, to hold hearings to examine balancing privacy and security, focusing on the privacy implications of government data mining programs, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

11:30 a.m., Monday, January 8

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of morning business (not to extend beyond 12 noon), Senate will begin consideration of S. Res. 19, a resolution celebrating the life of the late President Gerald R. Ford, to be followed by a vote on the adoption of the resolution.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10:30 a.m., Tuesday, January 9

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Biggert, Judy, Ill., E20
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1, E2, E4
Blackburn, Marsha, Tenn., E30
Boyd, Allen, Fla., E34
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E20
Capito, Shelley Moore, W.Va., E12
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E11
Costa, Jim, Calif., E23
Cummings, Elijah E., Md., E4
Davis, Artur, Ala., E30
Davis, Susan A., Calif., E1, E3, E24, E25, E26, E27, E27
Dreier, David, Calif., E10, E15, E16
Ehlers, Vernon J., Mich., E33
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E22
Forbes, J. Randy, Va., E6
Franks, Trent, Ariz., E12
Gallegly, Elton, Calif., E2, E3
Goodlatte, Bob, Va., E18
Gordon, Bart, Tenn., E9, E29
Graves, Sam, Mo., E14, E15, E17, E18, E19, E19, E20, E21, E21, E24, E25, E26, E27, E27, E28, E29, E30, E30
Harman, Jane, Calif., E35
Herseth, Stephanie, S.D., E8
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E21
Inslee, Jay, Wash., E36
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E35
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E34
Kirk, Mark Steven, Ill., E9, E22
Langevin, James R., R.I., E19
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E35
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E19
Markey, Edward J., Mass., E13
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E31
Meek, Kendrick B., Fla., E15, E16, E17
Mica, John L., Fla., E21
Michaud, Michael H., Me., E22
Miller, Gary G., Calif., E33
Miller, George, Calif., E13, E32
Moore, Dennis, Kans., E9
Murphy, Christopher S., Conn., E29
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E10
Norwood, Charlie, Ga., E25, E26
Oberstar, James L., Minn., E20
Pascrell, Bill, Jr., N.J., E11
Paul, Ron, Tex., E1, E2, E4, E5, E7, E9, E20, E32
Poe, Ted, Tex., E32
Porter, Jon C., Nev., E1, E3
Rahall, Nick J., II, W.Va., E23, E34
Reynolds, Thomas M., N.Y., E36
Rogers, Harold, Ky., E28
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E14
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E28, E29, E33
Sessions, Pete, Tex., E14
Shuster, Bill, Pa., E31
Stearns, Cliff, Fla., E22, E30
Terry, Lee, Nebr., E12, E14, E35
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E37
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E8
Udall, Mark, Colo., E10
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E14, E16, E17
Weller, Jerry, Ill., E25, E25, E26, E27
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E18
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E36
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E7
Young, Don, Alaska, E6

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are 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.