

DEMOCRATS RAISE TAXES AFTER ONLY TWO WEEKS IN POWER

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Speaker, on the first day that Republicans took control of the Congress in 1995, one of their very first actions was to establish a rule that required a supermajority, or three-fifths vote, to raise taxes. This was a good thing, Madam Speaker. On the very first day of Congress in 2007, however, the Democrats established new rules in this Chamber to make it easier to raise taxes with a simple majority vote.

And now, after just 2 weeks in power, the Democrats, our colleagues, have already passed legislation today to raise taxes. What is worse, the taxes that are collected under this new bill will not be going toward deficit reduction or toward paying down the Federal debt. The money is going to be set aside in a special account for more spending.

In Minnesota, we had a phrase when we were in session. We said, hold on to your wallets. And we can say that to the American people right now.

As a Federal tax litigation attorney myself, as a small business owner with my husband Marcus, and as a mother to Lucas, Harrison, Elisa, Caroline, and Sophia, and our 23 foster children, I can tell you as a parent the best way to grow an economy, the best way to raise more jobs is not to raise taxes but to let people, families, keep more of their hard-earned money.

In 2003, tax relief was passed, and the great thing is that 7.2 million jobs were created. In fact, our economy has been adding jobs for 40 straight months. The unemployment rate is incredibly low, at 4.5 percent, well below the average of the last 40 years.

Nowhere are the results more evident, Madam Speaker, than in my home State of Minnesota, which has closed out the calendar year with 54,000 more jobs than at the end of 2005, the strongest job growth since 1999. Our State's annual job growth rate of 2 percent has outpaced the national rate of 1.4 percent. Our unemployment rate is the envy of the Nation, phenomenally low at 4.2 percent.

Meanwhile, tax revenues are absolutely surging into the Treasury. Guess what? Federal receipts rose 14 percent in 2005, 11 percent in 2006, and they kept rising by 9 percent the first 2 months of 2007. These are the highest consecutive revenue increases in the past 25 years.

America, did you hear that? The highest revenue increases in the past 25 years. They come on the heels of the largest tax relief measures in American history.

□ 1900

And the budget deficit, in turn, has fallen \$165 billion over 2 years. And just as the economy is gaining tremendous momentum, now, unfortunately, my

Democrat colleagues are saying, this is the time to raise taxes.

Madam Speaker, I have learned very quickly in the few days I have been here in Washington, D.C., that facts don't always get in the way of people's opinions here in this fair city. But it is hard to dispute 3 years of unparalleled prosperity.

It is important that we recognize what tax relief does for the average American. It gives us money, a chance to grow a business, a chance to raise our kids while growing the economy and raising a lot more jobs in the process.

I urge my colleagues here in this Chamber, my esteemed colleagues who I have come to respect, to reject new taxes. Instead, let's do this. Let's work to make the tax reduction rates permanent now, while we can, and continue to reduce the overall tax burden.

The American people deserve our best, and the colleagues here are the best from across the country. Let's do that for the American people.

SRI LANKA'S CIVILIANS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to bring attention to the full blown violence taking place in Sri Lanka. The last round of talks in Geneva ended up in a failure, and there are no signs of new negotiations. There is no peaceful solution in sight, and it is the civilians who are desperately suffering.

Since 1983, the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) has been in a military confrontation with the Government of Sri Lanka to win a separate ethnic minority Tamil state. Since last April, more than 200,000 people have been displaced from their homes by the escalation in violence and insecurity. And this is in addition to more than 310,000 people who were displaced previously due to the conflict.

Now, because of this violence, the main highway connecting the two major areas in the north and east region of the country is closed, forcing civilians to use tortuous routes to reach safety. In recent months about 20,000 people have fled through jungles and treacherous waterways towards the government-controlled territory.

Thousands who have not fled are trapped in eastern Sri Lanka and caught between the intense crossfire. Every day there are more news stories highlighting the increasing casualties among the civilian populations, especially children and young adults. Violence continues in other parts of the island nation as well. And many civilians have been killed in air raids and bus bombings in recent weeks. Families live in constant fear, anxiously hoping for their security.

Now, meanwhile, Madam Speaker, access for humanitarian agencies has

been a growing problem over the past year. Civilians in Jaffna in the north and in the affected districts of the east have had great difficulty obtaining necessary food and medical supplies.

Both the government and the Tigers should commit to providing humanitarian agencies with unregulated access and full support.

Madam Speaker, the army says the civilians are being used as human shields by the Tamil Tigers. The Tigers deny this claim and accuse the army of targeting civilians to facilitate their forthcoming offensive. And regardless of blame, innocent civilians are dying.

After nearly 25 years of violence, it is clear: there can be no military solution to the conflict. A negotiated political settlement must be reached, and that one will have to be fair to all of the ethnic communities living in the country of Sri Lanka.

I am deeply troubled by the worsening situation in Sri Lanka, Madam Speaker, and it must be addressed by the United States. I commend the commitment by the Bush administration to provide funding for refugees, but I strongly urge President Bush to further U.S. involvement to help secure a lasting peace.

Last week I added my name to a letter urging President Bush to appoint a special envoy for Sri Lanka. The letter is being circulated by my friend from New Jersey, Mr. RUSH HOLT. And I urge my colleagues to also sign on. By naming a special envoy, the U.S. can create a personal monitoring presence in the country and make recommendations for steps to lead to peace. Sri Lanka, more than ever before, needs U.S. engagement.

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

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

EVERYONE SUPPORTS THE TROOPS

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

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I have never met anyone who did not support our troops. Sometimes, however, we hear accusations that someone or some group does not support the men and women serving in our Armed Forces. But this is pure demagoguery, and it is intellectually dishonest. The accusers play on emotions to gain support for controversial policies, implying that those who disagree are unpatriotic. But keeping our troops out of harm's way, especially when the war is unnecessary, is never unpatriotic. There is no better way to support the troops.

Since we now know that Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction and was

not threatening anyone, we must come to terms with 3,000 American deaths and 23,000 American casualties. It is disconcerting that those who never believed the justifications given for our invasion and who, now, want the war ended, are still accused of not supporting the troops. This is strange, indeed.

Instead of questioning who has the best interest of our troops at heart, we should be debating which policy is best for our country. Defensive wars to preserve our liberties, fought only with proper congressional declarations are legitimate. Casualties under such circumstances still are heartbreaking, but they are understandable. Casualties that occur in undeclared, unnecessary wars, however, are bewildering. Why must so many Americans be killed or hurt in Iraq when our security and our liberty were never threatened?

Cliches about supporting the troops are designed to distract from failed policies, policies promoted by powerful special interests that benefit from war, anything to steer the discussion away from the real reasons the war in Iraq will not end anytime soon.

Many now agree that we must change our policy and extricate ourselves from the mess in Iraq. They cite a mandate from the American people for a new direction. This opinion is now more popular and, thus, now more wildly held by politicians in Washington. But there is always a qualifier. We can't simply stop funding the war because we must support the troops. I find this conclusion bizarre. It means one either believes the support-the-troops propaganda put out by the original promoters of the war, or that one actually is for the war after all, despite the public protestations.

In reality, support for the status quo and the President's troop surge in Iraq means expanding the war to include Syria and Iran. The naval buildup in the region and the proxy war we just fought to take over Somalia demonstrate the administration's intention to escalate our current war into something larger.

There is just no legitimacy to the argument that voting against funding the war somehow harms our troops. Perpetuating and escalating the war only serves those whose egos are attached to some claimed victory in Iraq and those with a determination to engineer regime change in Iran.

Don't believe for a minute that additional congressional funding is needed so our troops can defend themselves or extricate themselves from the war zone. That is nonsense. The DOD has hundreds of billions of dollars in the pipeline available to move troops anywhere on Earth, including home.

We shouldn't forget that the administration took \$600 million from the war in Afghanistan and used it in Iraq before any direct appropriations were made for the invasion of Iraq. Funds are always available to put troops in harm's way. They, likewise, are always available for leaving a war zone.

Those in Congress who claim they want the war ended, yet feel compelled to keep funding it, are badly misguided. They either are wrong in their assessment that cutting funds would hurt the troops, or they need to be more honest about supporting a policy destined to dramatically increase the size and the scope of this war. Rest assured, one can be patriotic and truly support the troops by denying funds to perpetuate and spread this ill-advised war.

The sooner we come to this realization, the better it will be for all of us.

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

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CLEAN ENERGY ACT OF 2007

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I was pleased to cast my vote today for the CLEAN Energy Act of 2007.

Some of us have been urging energy independence for decades. In fact, President Jimmy Carter had it right over three decades ago when he said the Arab oil embargo was the moral equivalent of war. But America lost sight of his compelling vision for energy independence. We need to give birth to a new sustainable energy age that is bold and develops alternative energy supplies and the infrastructure to support it.

President Bush suddenly realized last year that we have become addicted to foreign oil, of course, most of it coming from the most undemocratic regimes in the world. But during his administration, we are importing 1 billion more barrels of oil from those very undemocratic places since he assumed office. Simply put, his rhetoric doesn't match reality.

I am pleased today that we took some important steps in shifting how Federal resources are dedicated, taking them away from preferential treatment to an oil industry with record profits and little social conscience. Instead, we must incentivize a domestically owned energy industry that has record potential, a shift that America wants and we must take.

While \$14 billion over 10 years is nothing to ignore, it is still far too little, especially since more than a third of this amount, a little more than \$5 billion, doesn't become available until the 10th year. According to the Government Accountability Office, this government has spent more than \$130 billion on subsidies to the oil industry over the last 3½ decades. So today's step forward is the first rung of the ladder to energy independence.

As this country spends billions on oil addiction, 75 percent of it being imported from the most undemocratic places in the world, I might repeat, consider an estimate by the Congressional Research Service which shows the recent increase in oil prices accounts for an additional \$60 to \$75 billion rise in our country's abysmal trade deficit.

While the oil companies manipulate the market, they continue to rake in billions. During President Bush's tenure, their profits have been record. From 2001 until the first quarter of 2006, ExxonMobil, alone, made \$118.2 billion. Now, in the bill today we talk about \$14 billion over 10 years. They made \$118.2 billion over the last 3 years. Shell has earned \$82.3 billion. Shell, one company. BP has made \$67.8 billion. Our bill today had \$14 billion over 10 years. Chevron Texaco has made \$43.1 billion, and Conoco Phillips made \$31.1 billion.

We are talking \$14 billion over 10 years, with \$5 billion in the very last year. Recognizing that those companies' profits were beginning to infuriate the public, does it surprise you that gasoline prices just happened to drop 75 cents a gallon during the run-up to last year's election for Congress?

As we consider this bill today, prices across our Nation, conveniently, are dropping. Imagine, in a place like Toledo, Ohio, they dropped from \$2.40 a gallon to \$1.75 a gallon. Isn't that strange during the week that we considered this bill?

Imagine an industry earning so much in profits it can manipulate the world and manipulate every single person in our country. Imagine the jobs we could create if we were to dedicate \$14 billion, not over 10 years, but each month, rather than spending that money on oil wars in far-flung places, invest it in solar, in wind, in geothermal, in photovoltaic energy, in fuel cells and hydrogen and clean coal production and distribution. Imagine the jobs we could create if we had vision.

These accomplishments that we seek will require not just real imagination, but real leadership. Hopefully this bill today offers a glimmer. America will, at long last, at long last, take seriously what President Jimmy Carter envisioned. He was right then. He remains right today: America must become energy independent. Our people want it. Why shouldn't this Congress deliver it?

□ 1915

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

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