United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *110th* CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 2007 *No. 17*

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 29, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN BAIRD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

''Stern as death is love, relentless as the nether world is devotion; its flames are a blazing fire. Dry waters cannot quench love, nor floods sweep it away.''

Lord God, Your word strikes to the heart. One is not deceived by love and devotion, for true love expands one's vision and moves one to be focused beyond self-interest.

Measure our faith and commitment to truth by the intensity and sincerity of our love and devotion. May our love of country and devotion to the work of government lead us to a deeper respect for people and for other nations and cultures as well.

Help this Nation create systems of communication, reconciliation and collaboration that will confirm love and build trust now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. 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.

HONORING THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN BULGARIA

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I participated in the American University in Bulgaria's Board of Trustees meetings. I am honored to serve on the board which promotes world-class education for students throughout Eastern Europe.

This September marks the university's 16th year. The first American-style undergraduate liberal arts educational institution in Eastern Europe, AUBG has more than quadrupled in size since its opening. University President Michael Easton, Provost Ann Ferren, and Chairman of the Board David Glanagan are to be commended for their dedication to AUBG and their vision for its future.

As the people of Bulgaria continue their democratic transformation, AUBG's mission statement best exemplifies the institution's commitment to Bulgaria's prosperity, The mission of the American University in Bulgaria is to educate future leaders committed to serving the needs of the region by promoting the values of an open, democratic society.

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

FATHER ROBERT DRINAN

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Robert Drinan, or Father Robert Drinan as he was always known, the only priest to serve in the House of Representatives. He was the colleague of many who are still in the House. He was my own colleague at Georgetown Law School where he served on the faculty after he left the Congress.

Father Drinan, while he was in Congress, wore his priestly garb because he always considered himself a priest, but when asked why he did not put on civilian clothes, he said, ''It's the only clothes I have.'' And they were.

He bowed to the discipline of his church when the ruling came down that priests should not serve in a legislative body. He took many of the concerns he had brought to this floor with him into books and studies, particularly in the field of international human rights.

I am beginning work on a resolution in honor of Father Drinan. He has already been honored by this House with the Congressional Distinguished Service Award.

We are going to be on a retreat on Thursday. I hope that we can make some arrangements so that many of us who would want to attend the funeral on Thursday may do that and then go to the retreat.

I will save further remarks for such time as a resolution or other fitting period of memorial for Father Drinan is offered here on the House floor.

SEND ME HOME SO I WON'T GO TO JAIL

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, crimes by illegals continue to plague American cities.

Jose Vallejo is another illegal charged with a vicious crime, this time rape of a 4-year-old in Illinois. The judge in that case set a $150,000 bond, and the defendant actually made the bond; but ICE arrested the individual and took him to an immigration judge for deportation. Vallejo begged the immigration judge to deport him so he wouldn't have to be tried in Illinois for the State charge. The judge, unaware of the rape charges, agreed and ordered Vallejo immediately deported back to Mexico. But before Vallejo could pull off this legalized jail break from Illinois, he was rearrested to stand charges on the rape case.

Federal authorities should not order illegals like Vallejo deported until they have been tried and served prison time for their crimes in State criminal courts; then they should be deported, otherwise more illegals will agree to be deported before their criminal trials and try to fraudulently avoid U.S. justice and the consequences of their crimes by hiding in their own homeland.

And that's just the way it is.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 92

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, this weekend over 300 Members of the House violated the House rules. They did so not with malice or any intent to violate the rules, but they did so because of the hubris of the leadership of the House.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House prohibit Members from taking nongovernmental aircraft by any organization, any corporation that has a lobbyist. Mr. Speaker, I might point out that there are lobbyists for United Airlines, Delta, U.S. Air and a litany of other airlines. These rules are unfair, unreasonable and unenforceable, but they have not yet been changed; and under a closed rule, it was a take-it-or-leave-it on the entire package.

Mr. Speaker, I submitted for the House H. Res. 92 in order to clarify and reform these foolish, foolish rules that were instituted without any debate, without any hearings, and even without much notice. I would ask the House to seriously consider, Is it time to begin being honest and reputable? Isn't there a time to not break the rules and say, ''But everyone's doing it''?

DEMOCRATS' BROKEN PROMISES

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last year, Democrats promised the most bipartisan Congress ever in the history of our Congress. What we have seen so far is about as far from that as I could imagine. Not only have the rules been broken in terms of bills being rammed through, not going through regular order so that there can be debate and discussions, but even when there are bills that all Members can support, albeit that they are not as strong as we would like, they are mischaracterized.

Over the weekend, I read most of the debate that went on last week about H.R. 476 dealing with ethics reform in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: ''Please take note. The Democratic leadership of this institution plans to clean up the criminal and ethical morass it inherited. This bill is a down payment on the new ethical climate control system we are building.

''The American people deserve to know that criminal unethical behavior by any of our colleagues will be punished and that the penalties for violating the sacred trust which has been bestowed upon us by our voters and the States we represent will be substantive, serious and not window dressing.''

Well, ladies and gentlemen, we passed a bill tougher than the bill that was passed last week in the last Congress, and we don't need to keep making these kinds of comments if we want a bipartisan relationship.

SPRAY PAINTING THE CAPITOL

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday tens of thousands of protesters protested on the National Mall the war on Iraq, and in particular, the 21,500 troop surge. These Americans exercised their first amendment right, and indeed, I am grateful to live in a Nation where we can protest government policies. However, my colleagues, I read in The Hill newspaper one troubling incident that arose. It says, 300 self-described anarchists spray-painted symbols and slogans on the west front steps of the United States Capitol building.

More puzzling, the article says that helpless Capitol Police officers watched, reporting that they were ordered to avoid confronting the group. It seems U.S. Capitol Police Chief Phillip Morse defends that the graffiti was ''easily removed'' and, most significantly, the building was secure from the artists' entry.

I am not sure I agree with such dismissiveness. Protected free speech does not include vandalism. I ask the Speaker to investigate. Peacefully assembling to protest is permissible, defacing public property is unacceptable and it should not happen again.

PROTESTERS LOSE CIVILITY

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, you know, the subject of Iraq and the war in Iraq, the global war on terror, is indeed a subject that is a tense subject, it is a difficult subject. In districts like mine, with Fort Campbell, with our National Guard men and women, it is one that we talk about a lot.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I do fear is that in this debate, as we talk about it, we have lost civility in this debate. It has been of great concern to me that I have heard of some of the actions of the protesters who came to our Nation's capital this weekend. I am deeply disturbed by the report of a veteran who was counterprotesting the protesters that were here, and he was spat upon by those protesters, spat upon, a man who fought for our freedom, to protect the freedom that allows them to have a protest. That is shameful, and they should be ashamed; they should be dealt with.

You know, one of the things that we continue to hear from the Iraqis is, do not leave us until we are stable. That, Mr. Speaker, is something that we need to remember. It is imperative that we make certain that they move to stability and productivity.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 26, 2007, at 11:30 am:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 188.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

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

□ 1415

LANE EVANS POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 521) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2633 11th Street in Rock Island, Illinois, as the ''Lane Evans Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 521

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

SECTION 1. LANE EVANS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2633 11th Street in Rock Island, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the ''Lane Evans Post Office Building''.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BAIRD). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues and particularly the original cosponsor of this resolution, Mr. HARE of Illinois, in the consideration of H.R. 521, legislation naming a postal facility in Rock Island, Illinois, after former Member of Congress Lane Evans. This measure, sponsored by Mr. HARE, was unanimously supported by our committee and has the support and co-sponsorship of the entire Illinois delegation.

Mr. Evans proudly served our country as a Marine during the Vietnam War and was an outspoken voice for all veterans in the House of Representatives. During his 24-year political career, he sought aid for homeless vets, championed benefits for soldiers exposed to Agent Orange, and was an early critic of the Iraq War. He chaired the Vietnam-Era Veterans Caucus and was the ranking member of the Veterans Affairs Committee, where his service is fondly remembered.

Mr. Evans' ability to keep in close contact with his constituents made him an effective and compassionate legislator. He fought hard for working families and was a strong, progressive leader in the Congress. He continued his dedicated service while fighting Parkinson's disease for the past decade, and his presence is already very much missed in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the swift passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HARE), cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for bringing this measure to the floor; and I thank the gentleman from the great State of Illinois and coauthor of H.R. 521, my friend, Mr. RAY LAHOOD, for his leadership and the Illinois delegation for their support.

Thanks also to the distinguished chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Mr. WAXMAN; and Mr. DANNY DAVIS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service, and the District of Columbia; and to the leadership for their consideration of this tribute to a great Congressman, Lane Evans.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great admiration and respect that I rise today in support of H.R. 521, a bill to designate the United States Postal Service facility located at 2633 11th Street in Rock Island, Illinois, as the Lane Evans Post Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one more deserving of this recognition than Congressman Lane Evans. On January 17, Mr. LAHOOD and I introduced this bill, and within days we received overwhelming support in favor of this legislation. To date, 82 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle have signed on as cosponsors of H.R. 521. Not only have Members of Congress expressed support for the bill, but it has also been well-received by staff members; one staff member saying ''Anything for Lane'' and another stating, ''He's a great man who I have tremendous respect and admiration for.''

We all know what kind of man Lane is, but for those who have yet to make his acquaintance, I am honored to have the opportunity to share with you the story of a very rare politician.

I met Lane on the campaign trail back in 1976. We were two young dreamers with the mutual goal of making a difference in this world. Soon after the election, we became a team. I traveled with Lane from one end of the district to another as he provided his legal services to working families, children and the poor. I can recall many times when Lane offered his services free of charge to elderly men and women in need of a will. It was not too long before the people of the 17th District of Illinois rewarded Lane for his sacrifices, his commitment to hard work and hardworking families.

In 1982, Lane ran for the congressional seat of the 17th District of Illinois. At the time, the manufacturing industry of western Illinois was suffering from an economic recession which left many looking for a new direction in representation. Lane's populist message, coupled with his plain-spoken personal integrity resonated with the people, and at only 31 years of age, this young legal services attorney was able to win the majority of the votes, which had been reserved for a Republican candidate for more than a century.

Mr. Speaker, Lane has succeeded in politics by following the Marine motto, Semper Fi, always faithful to his principles, to his constituents and to himself. For 12 elections the people of the 17th District sent Lane back to Washington with confidence that he would represent their interests.

The secret to Lane's success was the value he placed in their trust. He never took the people who elected him for granted, and it showed. To anyone that walked through his door, Lane and his staff were always ready, willing and able to go the extra mile in assisting them.

Although Lane was a man who delivered on his promises to bring jobs, he also had three outpatient clinics built, and what mattered most to the people was the manner in which he represented them. What always struck me most about Lane was the humility he showed.

I thank the gentlewoman for allowing me to speak this morning on behalf of the wonderful Congressman, and I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 521.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from the District of Columbia, Ms. HOLMES NORTON for bringing this measure to the floor of the House. I thank the gentleman from the great State of Illinois and co-author of H.R. 521, Mr. LAHOOD, for his leadership and the Illinois Delegation for their support. Thanks to the distinguished Chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. DANNY DAVIS, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service, and the District of Columbia. And to the Leadership for their consideration of this tribute to Congressman Lane Evans.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great admiration and respect that I rise today in support of H.R. 521, a bill to designate the United States Postal Service facility located at 2633 11th Street in Rock Island, Illinois, as the ''Lane Evans Post Office Building''.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one more deserving of this recognition than Congressman Lane Evans. On January 17, Mr. LAHOOD and I introduced this bill and within days we received overwhelming support in favor of the legislation. To date, 82 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle have signed on as cosponsors of H.R. 521. Not only have Members of Congress expressed support for the bill, but it has also been well-received by staff members, one staff member saying ''Anything for Lane'' and another stating ''He's a great man who I have tremendous respect and admiration for''.

We all know what kind of man Lane is, but for those who have yet to make his acquaintance, I am honored that I have the opportunity to share with you the story of this rare politician.

I met Lane on the campaign trail back in 1976. We were two young dreamers with the mutual goal of making a difference in the world. Soon after the election, we became a team. I traveled with Lane from one end of the district to another as he provided his legal services to working families, children and the poor. I can recall many times when Lane offered his services free of charge to elderly men and women in need of a will. It was not too long before the people of the 17th district of Illinois rewarded him for his sacrifices and commitment to hard working families.

In 1982, Lane ran for the congressional seat of the 17th district of Illinois. At the time, the manufacturing industry of western Illinois was suffering from an economic recession, which left many looking for a new direction in representation. Lane's populist message coupled with his plain-spoken personal integrity resonated with the people, and at only 31 years of age, this young legal services attorney was able to win the majority of the votes, which had been reserved for a Republican candidate for more than a century.

Following the election, Lane asked me to represent him as his District Director. I was flattered that Lane thought so highly of me and entrusted me with the care of his constituency. I accepted because Lane promised me that I would never have to lie, and I can proudly say that in 24 years he kept his promise. It was not too difficult because even those who disagreed with Lane respected him and his commitment to serving on behalf of the middle class family.

Mr. Speaker, Lane has succeeded in politics by following the Marine motto, ''Semper Fi''. Throughout his career, he has been ''always faithful'' to his principles, to his constituents and to himself. For 12 elections the people of the 17th sent Lane back to Washington with confidence that he would represent their interests. The secret to Lane's success was the value he placed in their trust. He never took the people who elected him for granted, and it showed. He prided himself on maintaining a first-rate constituent service program. To anyone that walked through his door, Lane and his staff were always ready, willing, and able to go the extra mile in assisting them.

Although Lane was a man who delivered on his promises to bring jobs to the Rock Island Arsenal and build veteran outpatient clinics, what mattered most to the people was the manner in which he represented them. What has always struck me most about Lane was the humility he showed towards everyone he knew. To everyone he was just Lane. He was more than a Congressman to the people of the 17th district, he was a friend.

Mr. Speaker, Lane's sincere rapport with people was not limited to the 17th district. As a Vietnam era veteran of the Marine Corps himself, Lane had the remarkable ability to relate to our service men and women. His career in Congress is marked with legislative victories on behalf of the Nation's 24 million veterans.

Always a man of great conviction, Lane challenged those who ignored the harmful effects of Agent Orange exposure. Eventually, Lane was successful in his effort to pass legislation awarding compensation to vets exposed to Agent Orange. In the 108th Congress, he built on that legislative milestone by winning passage of a law that delivers health and compensation benefits to children of veterans exposed to Agent Orange who were born with spina bifida, representing the first time children of veterans will receive government benefits.

Mr. Speaker, Lane's crusade for veterans did not stop there. He was one of the first Congressional voices to speak out about problems experienced by Persian Gulf veterans, what is now known as the Gulf War syndrome. He also pushed Congress to increase funding for veterans programs, which were so important to him because they delivered needed government services to working class families.

At the end of the 109th Congress, Lane retired after serving 24 years as a distinguished Member of Congress. It was a sad day for veterans and the people of the 17th district of Illinois when Lane announced he would not run for reelection, but no one was more disappointed than Lane. In spite of all his legislative accomplishments, Lane still felt there was so much more that he could have done.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that my first legislative action will be to honor my good friend and mentor, Congressman Lane Evans. My only hope is that when I leave this body I can do half the things that Lane has done for the 17th district, the State of Illinois, and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 521.

Lane, thank you for your support throughout the years. It means more to me than you will ever know.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 521 to rename the post office in Rock Island, Illinois, for Congressman Lane Evans.

The Congressman was born in 1951 in Rock Island, Illinois. Mr. Evans grew up the son of a firefighter and joined the Marines out of high school and fought in the Vietnam War. After that, he earned an undergraduate degree from Augustana College and a law degree from Georgetown.

Just 4 years later, he found himself in the House of Representatives, a Democrat representing a largely Republican 17th District of Illinois, where he quickly developed a reputation as an advocate for regular Americans.

Known in his district, which covers Moline, Rock Island, Quincy, Decatur, Galesburg, and parts of Springfield and the Quad Cities, for excellent constituent services, he also fought hard for working families and especially for veterans. He became chairman of the Vietnam-Era Veterans Caucus here in the Congress, where he pushed for legislation particularly to improve health care for vets and those with disabilities such as post-traumatic stress syndrome. That disorder today still affects many Americans of that era. He also supported legislation to eliminate land mines and assist land mine victims, and later he helped those affected with Gulf War syndrome.

After Hurricane Katrina, long into a debilitating disease, he fought hard to make things right for those people affected so desperately by the hurricanes.

Even after being diagnosed in 1995 with Parkinson's, he continued to serve for another six terms in the House and served with great distinction, never giving up the fight.

In his final term, the Congressman and I had the pleasure of flying for over 14 hours across the United States and all the way to Iwo Jima to commemorate the 60th commemoration of that great battle. He did so at a time in which he needed a physician's assistant, in which he was uncomfortable at all times, and in which most men afflicted with Parkinson's would never have considered such a trip. He did so because, first of all, he was a Marine. He did so, secondly, because he cared so much about this country and about the battles that men and women had fought for this country.

I will remember Congressman Lane Evans for that trip. For someone who went above and beyond what the public saw to do what was right and what was important, even while putting himself in tremendous potential physical harm for those long hours in an aircraft is something that most Members with less afflictions would not have done.

I will remember him, and I ask that all Members vote positively on this bill.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to not only thank the gentleman from California but to just for the record state that in calling Mr. HARE I was calling him out of order. I was yielding him part of my time, because you, of course, by rights were entitled to the next speaker, and I appreciate your statement.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD).

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding; and I also want to thank Congressman HARE for bringing this issue forward. Having worked with Congressman HARE over the last month or so, I know he is going to fill the shoes of Congressman Evans and fight for veterans issues. I really appreciate that.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 521, designating the post office in Rock Island, Illinois, as the Lane Evans Post Office Building. It is right that we should honor Congressman Lane Evans.

Lane Evans will be known for the years he spent fighting for veterans and their families and for attacking issues like mental health, toxic exposure and homelessness. These issues were once brushed aside. Now, because of Lane Evans, we face them and we deal with them. Because of Lane Evans, many Americans will lead healthier and better lives.

He never sacrificed what he felt was important. He always remembered why he came to Washington and who sent him here.

Even though he is no longer in Congress, I know that he will continue to fight for what he believes in. His influence will be felt in all the work that we do for the rest of our times here in Congress.

Congressman Evans has been a mentor to me and many others in this body. It is an honor for me to speak in support of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 521 honoring our dear friend and colleague and fighter for our veterans.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure that I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), one of the Members who knew Lane Evans both as a staff member here on the Hill and then as a fellow colleague.

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman HARE for reintroducing this bill.

Last year, when Congressman Evans announced that he was leaving the House because of his very debilitating illness, Parkinson's disease, I introduced a bill, along with the rest of my

colleagues from Illinois, to name the post office in Rock Island in honor of Lane. I did that because I met Lane Evans when he was a young, energetic, enthusiastic young man in 1982 running for Congress.

At the time, I happened to be working for the sitting Congressman from that district, a fellow by the name of Congressman Tom Railsback. It was Lane's good fortune that Mr. Railsback lost his primary to a very conservative Republican, and that opened the opportunity, as Phil knows, for Lane to win that seat that had been held for a long, long time by Republicans.

Since the time that Lane Evans was elected to Congress, he has distinguished himself with really three particular groups of people in the 17th District. He has been a voice for those people, particularly, in the 17th District who might not have had a voice here in Washington; and I speak of senior citizens who he is beloved by. I speak of veterans who he is equally beloved by, and I speak of the hardworking men and women, the blue-collar workers of the 17th District. Those are the people that Lane Evans truly represented in Washington, D.C., in a way that distinguished his career for 24 years here in the House, but, more importantly, back in the western part of Illinois in a way that I think will not be replicated.

Lane was probably one of the hardest-working congressmen, but he is someone who never forgot where he came from. He grew up in Rock Island. He was educated, at least his undergraduate degree, in Rock Island; and he continued to travel back and forth to his district every weekend. That is what made him so popular.

When people would come to me and talk to me about the idea of running against Lane as a Republican, I have told people the story that I think there are some people in politics that are impossible to beat, and Lane Evans was one of those people.

□ 1430

The only way that Lane would ever leave this place would be voluntarily, which he did at the end of the last term. But it was because of his hard work and his dedication to senior citizens, to veterans and to hardworking blue-collar people in the western part of Illinois that made him a politician and a public servant that set the highest standard possible, a standard that all of us can look to in doing our work.

So the least we can do today is name the post office in Rock Island in his honor. I am sure there will be many other honors bestowed upon him. I don't know if Lane is watching this from a television in his home in Moline; but if he is, I want him to know this is one Republican in the House that has great admiration and great respect for him because of the work that he did, and because of the way he represented people from western Illinois.

We wish him Godspeed. We wish him good health. We want him to know that he is in our thoughts and prayers today as we vote on the bill to honor him, but we will long remember his distinguished service and long continue to pray that he will have the healing hand of God placed on his shoulder.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support this bill. I want to commend Representative HARE and Representative LAHOOD for their support on this bill, and I appreciate their eloquence in support of a truly great man and a great friend.

I was on the staff of Congressman Joe Moakley of Massachusetts when Lane Evans first came to Washington. Immediately, Joe knew that he had a new ally in the fight to protect human rights in El Salvador. Lane regularly met with people from Central America here in Washington and in his district. He traveled to the region, did his homework, and became an active Member in the effort to change U.S. policy and bring peace to that troubled region.

As a marine who served in Vietnam, Lane chaired the Vietnam Era Veterans Caucus in the House. Having seen war up close and personal, he worked with David Bonior, Jack Quinn, Senator LEAHY and Senator HAGEL and the Vietnam Veterans of America to push for a U.S. and international ban on the production and use of anti-personnel landmines. When I was privileged to be elected to Congress in 1996, one of the first things I did was go to Lane Evans and pledge my support for his work on landmines.

Lane's personal experience made him the champion of two other important causes. As the son of a union member, Lane consistently spoke out against the abuses facing so many workers around the world as they struggled to achieve their most basic rights. As a veteran himself, he made sure that we don't treat with suspicion the questions raised by those returning from war, whether on the effects of agent orange, gulf war syndrome or post-traumatic stress; and we must never reward their service with neglect, homelessness, underfunded health care, or reduced benefits.

When I think of Lane Evans, I think of an easy-going, likeable Midwesterner. I also think of courage and conviction in how he lives his own life and how he continues to confront the challenges facing America.

Mr. Speaker, I miss his voice and his presence in this House, and I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my thanks to the honorable Lane Evans and urge passage of this bill to name a U.S. post office in his hometown of Rock Island, Illinois, in his honor.

Lane's service to America and its veterans began with his enlistment in the Marine Corps in the Vietnam War. Lane began his congressional career by winning election for the 17th District in Illinois in 1982 and promptly became a staunch advocate for veterans. He kept this commitment through the 109th Congress.

This bill will provide a small but important recognition of Lane's service and commitment. He championed issues such as agent orange, women's health care, spina bifida benefits and many others.

We hear a lot about bipartisanship in this body, and truly I had the opportunity to win a special election, came up, and one of the first people that I met as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee was Lane Evans.

As soon as he realized that I was certainly willing and wanted to help veterans, then nobody could have been any nicer. Nobody could have extended any more help than Lane Evans.

It is sad, sad and not sad, I have mixed emotions, certainly, about Democrats taking control of the House, but it is sad that with his retirement his picture will not be on the wall. Because of his hard work, he certainly very much deserves that sort of honor.

On the other hand, like I say, nobody, nobody has worked any harder and done a better job for our Nation's veterans. I certainly urge passage of this bill.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to grant the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) 2 minutes, noting that in the Iraq war he has lost more than any other Member, more members from his district than any other district in the United States.

Therefore, I know he feels strongly about Lane, who devoted his entire time in the Congress to focusing on veterans and their needs.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I thank the gentlelady from the District of Columbia for allowing me to say a few words to express my deepest appreciation to the gentleman that I have known for years now, since becoming a Member of this great institution.

I also would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois, my good friend Mr. HARE, for sponsoring this legislation, and the spirit of bipartisanship, knowing that our Republican Members also have said nothing but praise for the legacy of this great American and as a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I had some long discussions with this gentleman, Mr. Evans. In the years past, he came to Vietnam in 1969, and I was just there the year

before, from 1967 to 1968, in that terrible conflict.

If there is anything that I would like to say, point out not only his leadership, but the service of this great American to our Nation, as the senior member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I want to say that Mr. Evans, in my humble opinion, is certainly one of the great leaders and advocates of the needs of our veterans throughout the country.

It was one experience, as our good friend from California mentioned, that they went with Mr. Evans to Iwo Jima. He came to my district. If anybody wants to share that sense of experience, well, you have to fly 15 hours to get to my district. Mr. Evans was willing to make that kind of a sacrifice just to see that, as small as my district may be, we have about 3,000 to 4,000 veterans living in my district, and he felt it was important enough for him to come and see and hear some of the concerns that our veterans have in my district.

I want to say to my colleagues and the Members of this House how fitting it is. I wish we could do more than just naming this post office after this great American Congressman, Lane Evans. I hope if there is a chance he might be listening to this proceeding, I just want to express and let him know how much I love him, not only as a friend but a truly great American.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from American Samoa, I too agree with you that a post office is just a good first down payment for somebody who did so much for veterans; and I, for one, look forward to finding a veterans facility somewhere in the United States or a hospital for veterans that would be fitting and appropriate for the man who would be the chairman of the Veterans' Committee were he still in the Congress.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service and achievements of my dear friend, Lane Evans.

For the past quarter of a century, Congressman Evans led efforts on behalf of veterans, including the fight to give Filipino veterans the benefits that they had been promised. He also became legendary in his advocacy for our nation's middle class. As a champion of these causes he earned the respect of America's veterans and their families.

He also stood as a tireless champion in the fight to provide justice for over 200,000 ''comfort women'' who were forced into sex slavery by the Japanese Imperial Army during World War II. He has been a voice for these voiceless women who are still holding out hope that they will receive a formal apology from the Japanese government for the indignity they suffered. I have assured him that I will do my best to continue his work and legacy on this issue after his retirement this year.

Today I am pleased to vote in favor of naming a Post Office after a man who deserves our greatest respect. Mr. Speaker, for his leadership, mentorship and companionship, for his work on behalf of those who would have otherwise been forgotten, and for his unparalleled work these past 24 years, I emphatically raise my voice in support of naming a Post Office after my friend, Congressman Lane Evans.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 521, a bill designating the post office located at 2633 11th Street in Rock Island, Illinois, as the ''Lane Evans Post Office Building''. I want to thank Congressman PHIL HARE, the former District Director to Lane Evans and the new Representative from Illinois' 17th Congressional District. The post office is located in Lane Evans' hometown of Rock Island and will serve as a testament to his long, distinguished career as a Marine, a champion for social justice and a fine Member of this body.

Today's debate gives us the opportunity to take a moment to recognize and thank Lane Evans for his service to this country, to this Congress and to our nation's men and women who have worn the uniform. I have had the honor and the privilege of serving with Lane on the Veterans Affairs Committee since I came to Congress in 1993. He is a good friend, an important ally and an unwavering advocate for Veterans in Illinois and across the nation. Although he never was able to chair the House Veterans Committee, he stands as one of this body's finest and most committed legislators for veterans. He made the issues of veterans health care and veterans benefits the cornerstone of his legislative career, and I could think of no better way to honor Lane than for this Congress to continue that fight.

While Lane may have been diagnosed with Parkinson's disease, it did not affect his razor sharp intellect or lessen his commitment to the issues he cares about. He has approached his disease with dignity, class and courage, and he has served as an inspiration to others with Parkinson's disease. This Congress, I am going to miss having my friend and my colleague in the Illinois delegation, but you can bet when I need guidance about the best way to protect Illinois veterans, my first call will be to Lane.

Mr. Speaker, the least we can do today is pass this bill honoring Lane Evans and his career, and I urge swift passage of this bill.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 521, legislation to name a Post Office in Rock Island, Illinois after recently retired Congressman Lane Evans. I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation, as Lane has been my great friend and colleague over the last 18 years. I would like to thank Congressman HARE for introducing this bill, and as glad as we are to have him join us in the House, this institution misses Lane Evans. We miss his leadership, we miss his quiet dignity, and we miss his advocacy for veterans and working people. This is a small gesture, but it is a way to honor his dedicated service to our country.

Lane devoted most of his entire professional life to service to the United States of America. He grew up in Rock Island and entered the Marine Corps out of high school, serving in Vietnam. When he returned, he went to college and earned his law degree at Georgetown, and worked as a legal aid attorney before he was elected to Congress in 1982.

During his tenure in Congress, Lane put his head down and worked hard, not seeking attention for the many legislative victories he achieved, particularly in the realm of veterans' issues. Because of Lane, affected veterans are compensated for their exposure to Agent Orange, and he led efforts to learn more about Gulf War Illness and ban land mines. Lane was awarded the Vietnam Veterans of America's first annual President's Award for Outstanding Achievement in 1990 and he received the AMVET's Silver Helmet Award in 1994, known as the ''Oscar'' of veterans' honors.

Lane was also a tireless protector of the rights of working people, fighting for fair trade, a fair minimum wage and the right to collectively bargain. He worked for a cleaner environment and the protection of the family farm.

Over the last 8 years, Lane has faced another battle, this one against Parkinson's disease. The dignity with which he has faced this disease has inspired many, and helped educate the public, and the Congress, about the disease. You would never know how difficult a disease Parkinson's is by watching Lane. He does not complain, he just keeps going forward, helping people at every opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, Lane Evans has given a tremendous amount to the United States of America, and we owe him our gratitude. Naming this post office after him assures that his contributions will live on for succeeding generations to appreciate. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and I thank Lane for his continuing friendship.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 521, a measure to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2633 11th Street in Rock Island, Illinois, as the ''Lane Evans Post Office Building.'' Indeed, I wholeheartedly support Congressman PHIL HARE in his efforts to bring this measure to the floor today and I appreciate his quick actions on this matter. As many know, Mr. HARE was the District Director of Congressman Evans for many years and now represents the 17th district of Illinois himself, the district that Lane Evans represented for 24 years.

Mr. Speaker, Lane Evans served with distinction in the U.S. House of Representatives since 1982; he was elected 12 times in a row by the good people of the 17th district of Illinois. Indeed, they proudly sent their best from the heartland America to serve America.

Lane has always been a champion for working families, students, servicemembers, veterans and military families. He went to college and law school on the GI Bill and returned to Illinois to be a legal aid lawyer, representing the less fortunate among us.

A Marine Corps veteran of the Vietnam era and a senior member of both the House Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs Committees, Lane Evans's advocacy and record in the Congress on behalf of the military and veterans is admirable and unquestioned.

There is no federal program for veterans which does not bear his mark of oversight and improvement. Simply put, veterans enjoy increased education benefits, improved health care access and services, a strengthened home loan program, judicial review of their benefits claims, additional opportunities for veteran-owned small businesses and a host of other improved and expanded benefits. No doubt such improvements are in no small measure due to Lane Evans's insistence that veterans be given the fair shake they earned in service to their country.

Lane Evans made his mark on Congress and in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee

right from the start by elevating concern for and promoting action on the issues affecting Vietnam veterans; specifically working to highlight post-traumatic stress disorder, the effects of Agent Orange and other herbicide exposure. He was also an outspoken advocate to address the problem of homelessness and substance abuse among veterans from the Vietnam era.

Congressman Evans led the effort in Congress to increase education benefits in order to keep pace with the rising costs of higher education and restore purchasing power to the Montgomery GI Bill. He also worked to revise, update and improve veterans' employment counseling and job-search assistance systems, and has helped ensure adequate resources to provide dignified final resting places for the Nation's veterans.

Perhaps what best sums up Lane Evans's character, drive and his service here in Congress, are his own words: Speaking on the Floor of the House of Representatives, he said: ''Our veterans—those returning from Iraq, those who scaled the cliffs above the beaches of Normandy, those who walked point in the jungles of Vietnam, those who survived the brutality of Korea and other battlefields, all who honorably served or who are now serving, have earned the assurance that VA—their system—will be there when they need it . . . just as we practice on the battlefield that we leave no one behind, we should not slam the door on any veteran who needs the VA system.''

Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more. The House of Representatives, the VA Committee and the veterans community will surely miss Lane Evans. We should honor Lane Evans by continuing his work here in Congress to ensure that servicemembers, veterans and military families are treated with respect and receive the benefits they have earned.

I urge all members to support H.R. 521.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I raise today in support of H.R. 521, which would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located in Rock Island, Illinois, as the ''Lane Evans Post Office Building.'' I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill that honors my good friend and former colleague.

Lane has always served his country with honor. From 1969 to 1971, he served in Vietnam in the U.S. Marine Corps, and as they say, ''once a marine, always a marine.'' When he was elected to Congress in 1982, he immediately worked to make sure veterans were given the benefits that they deserve, and he lent his voice to issues that might otherwise have been ignored. For almost a quarter of a century in Congress, Lane was a champion of America's veterans, and his passion for this cause is truly missed.

Lane and I were able to develop a friendship that transcended politics. We worked together on many issues as members of the House Armed Services Committee. Serving others, especially his constituents, was something Lane did exceedingly well. I was able to see this firsthand when I traveled to his district in 2004. I was impressed, but not surprised, by the enormous number of people who showed up at an event he hosted, which certainly speaks to how well-liked and respected he was, and is, in the 17th district of Illinois. Serving with Lane was truly an amazing and educational experience, and his constituents were fortunate to have such a dedicated public servant as their representative in Washington.

Unfortunately, Lane has had to battle Parkinson's Disease since 1995. In his fight against this debilitating disease, he has shown his characteristic courage and perseverance that proved to everyone that he was not going to easily give up. Lane has also been a great partner in the effort to advance stem cell research, which is a matter of tremendous importance to me. While we miss having him fighting with us in Congress, he can be assured that our efforts will continue so that patients with spinal cord injuries, Parkinson's Disease and other conditions will benefit from this research in the future.

Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege to work with Lane Evans in the House of Representatives, and I am proud that today we honor his hard work and inspirational life with this bill.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 521, naming a post office building in Rock Island, IL, as the Lane Evans Post Office Building.

For the past 11 years, I have had the great pleasure and high privilege to serve in the Illinois Congressional delegation with a true American hero, Lane Evans. At a young age, he heroically served our country by joining the Marine Corps after high school to fight in the Vietnam War. He has never forgotten his friends and has fought diligently for the rights of veterans. Lane Evans led the charge to compensate Vietnam veterans for diseases linked to Agent Orange exposure, fought to ensure that children of veterans received government benefits and that women veterans had access to the same services as their male counterparts.

A son of a firefighter and a nurse, Lane Evans understood the needs of working families and has been a tireless fighter of protecting American jobs, providing affordable health care for all Americans and increasing the minimum wage. He is a soldier, activist and defender of the underdog and has given a voice to millions of veterans and especially to the good people of the 17th Congressional district of Illinois.

I pay tribute to a man that has well served his constituents and has become a trusted colleague and friend. His work on the House Committee on Veterans Affairs will serve as a blueprint for future legislators. He has shown tremendous political courage over the past 24 years in office and will show even more courage as he continues his battle with Parkinson's Disease.

At this time our Nation demands fearless leaders that stand up for American families and dedicate their lives for the improvement of others. Lane Evans has committed his life to others as a courageous public servant, a man that deserves the title, ''The Honorable.'' I too was drawn to public service, believing that I can help the people of my district and those outside my district. I have not lost that feeling, and I know Lane Evans has not either. We need more leaders in this institution that constantly remember why we are here—to serve the public shoulder to shoulder.

Lane Evans has worked for his district, country and for the freedom of all. His subtle style and modest voice will always reverberate loud in my ears. Congressman Evans, I would like to thank you for your leadership, determination and willingness to fight! Your work in Congress will forever be remembered and your legacy will live on.

Mr. BRALEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to express my strong support for H.R. 521, a much-deserved honor for a great American, Congressman Lane Evans.

Although Rock Island, Illinois is not in my district, it is part of the Quad Cities that includes Davenport and Bettendorf, Iowa, which I am privileged to represent.

The entire Quad Cities region has benefited from Congressman Evans' many years of leadership in this body. His passionate advocacy for veterans and working men and women earned him a special place in the hearts of his constituents, and his voice will be sorely missed.

I am proud to serve with his successor, another great champion for veterans and working families, my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Congressman HARE.

Mr. Speaker, I'm honored to call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 521 as a living testimonial to the many years of public service rendered by Congressman Evans in the United States Marine Corps and in the House of Representatives. Please join me in renaming the United States Post Office in Rock Island, Illinois as the ''Lane Evans Post Office Building.''

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, it is enormously fitting that we honor our much-loved colleague by naming a post office after him. Lane Evans epitomizes all that Members of Congress should be: smart, dedicated to the founding principles of our Constitution, a tough-as-nails fighter, a veteran, and a deeply kind man.

He represented Illinois' 17th District with excellence and vigor. Lane took care of his constituents as though they were family . . . and he commanded great respect among those for whom he toiled in Congress.

A former Marine, Lane served with distinction; then served his country in Congress with that same dedication, integrity, and humility. His service experience largely shaped his career and legacy in Congress.

His tireless efforts on behalf of our Nation's veterans led to a successful fight for compensation of veterans exposed to Agent Orange early in his Congressional career. As Ranking Member of the Veterans Affairs Committee, Lane expanded benefits for women veterans, pushed for additional medical care for veterans suffering from PTSD, supported veterans' outpatient clinics, and crafted legislation to attend to homeless veterans.

Lane knew the bottom line for his neighbors in Illinois was an economy that rewarded their effort, so he worked hard to promote economic growth and equal access in rural communities. He was a giant on the House Armed Services Committee and brought new jobs to the Rock Island Arsenal.

Understanding both the national security implications and the resource for Illinois farmers, Lane advocated ethanol-producing resources in his district and championed increased development and use of ethanol and biofuels in Illinois.

Not only does Lane inspire all of us who are familiar with his service, but his courageous and brave battle with Parkinson's disease have inspired all of us, plus the millions of Parkinson's sufferers around the nation. Lane is precisely the type of public servant that we all strive to be.

In his work in Congress, in his love and work for the people of the 17th district, and for our nations' veterans, Lane embodied the Marine motto, Semper Fidelis (''Always Faithful'').

Mr. Speaker, I love Lane like a brother, and I'm proud to support this bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located in Rock Island, Illinois, as the ''Lane Evans Post Office Building.''

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a former colleague, a great American patriot, and a great friend, of Honorable Lane Evans from the State of Illinois, and to voice my support for H.R. 521, designating the Post Office in Rock Island, Illinois, as the ''Lane Evans Post Office Building.''

Lane served his constituents with great distinction in the House for 24 years. During his tenure in this great and honorable body, Lane was a champion of our Nation's veterans. As a veteran myself, having served 20 years in the United States Army, including two tours-of-duty in Vietnam, I feel fortunate that veterans across the Nation had such a strong and stalwart advocate in the United States House of Representatives. His fight to secure assured funding for veterans' health care and better services for our Nation's veterans will always be remembered fondly.

Lane also serves as an inspiration for many in our Nation struggling with a debilitating illness. When Lane was diagnosed with Parkinson's disease, he did not shy away from it. He continued his service to his constituents in this great House. Many can look at Lane as an example that life does not have to end when confronted with great uncertainty. One can persevere, and can continue fighting for what one believes in.

I, along with other veterans across our great Nation will never forget the tireless efforts of Lane Evans—a great American patriot, and a tireless advocate for the beliefs he held so dear.

I, along with many in this House, wish Lane nothing but the best for the future.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 521, the Lane Evans Post Office Bill. By naming this Post Office after our distinguished former colleague, we pay tribute to Lane Evans and recognize his long, distinguished career of public service.

Prior to being elected to the House of Representatives in 1983, Lane Evans served in the Marine Corps at the time of the Vietnam War. His experience in the military and his firsthand knowledge of veterans' issues led Lane to become a leading advocate for veterans during his time in Congress. On issues such as Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, homelessness among veterans, and the aftereffects of exposure to Agent Orange, Lane Evans consistently took the lead in crafting real policy solutions. Lane's leadership on veterans' issues was formally recognized in 1995, when he was named Ranking Member of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs.

In addition, Lane always dutifully served his constituents and the state of Illinois. He was a strong advocate for working Americans and was one of the first to see the need for renewable forms of energy such as ethanol.

With Lane Evans' decision to not seek reelection last year, Congress, Illinois, and the nation lost a great public servant. Now, by naming a Post Office after our former colleague, we can say thanks to Lane, and lift up his impressive legacy of service as an example for others to follow.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to show my support for H.R. 521, a bill that would name a post office in Rock Island, Illinois for former Congressman Lane Evans. This is a fitting honor for a man with such a long and distinguished career.

It was my pleasure to serve with Lane Evans on the House Armed Services Committee. He showed unwavering support for our troops and their families both in his service to that committee and the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, where he was the Ranking Member. As a Marine and veteran of the Vietnam War, Lane understands the sacrifices made by those in uniform and their families and worked tirelessly in Congress to ensure that those sacrifices would be honored.

I want to thank Lane Evans for his many years of service. We will miss him sorely.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 521.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GERALD R. FORD, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 49) 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''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 49

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

SECTION 1. GERALD R. FORD, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 North Frontage Road West in Vail, Colorado, shall be known and designated as the ''Gerald R. Ford, Jr. Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Gerald R. Ford, Jr. Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 49, legislation naming a postal facility in Vail, Colorado, after the late Gerald R. Ford, Jr.

President Ford helped ease a Nation during tense times. But even before he was President, he was widely known in this Chamber as a man of great integrity and openness. Although never elected to the office of President or Vice President, President Ford was appointed to mend a bruised American psyche and maneuver our country through the only Presidential resignation ever, to help end the Vietnam War, and to help ease rising inflation.

He succeeded, and for that extraordinary service to his country his legacy should be remembered by all in our country and throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the swift passage of this bill.

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of another down payment on thanking President Gerald Ford for his legacy, a legacy that really began, flourished and was all about this body. We are recognizing Gerald Ford as the 38th President of the United States because he did spend 2½ years as our President. But, uniquely, the man born in 1913 in Grand Rapids, Michigan, was, in fact, a man of the House.

During his entire tenure in the House, he did not enjoy time in the majority. Yet his goal was to be Speaker of the House. He had no higher calling, never sought one, but accepted the one that was cast upon him.

At the time that he was selected to be Vice President of the United States, we were already mired in the Vietnam War and disgrace had been brought upon the Vice Presidency. It was Gerald Ford who came in impeccably honest, undeniably a man of the people and a man who was only for the people.

That is how he was selected, that is why he was selected, it is why the Senate and the House thought he was the only man for the job. Who would have known that just a short time, 10 months later in fact, he would find himself cast into an even larger role, another role that he did not ask for.

Yet that was who Gerald Ford was, a man who came out of athletics and out of university to serve in the United States Navy in 1942 because it was the right thing to do. He had represented a district that would have returned him to the House to this very day if, in fact, he were still alive.

Instead, he answered a call, a call that each of us in the House has answered by coming to this body. That was the call of service to the United States.

As I support this naming of this post office in the place he loved, in the place he skied, in the place that he called home for his immediate period after leaving the White House, I do so as the second man of the House that we are recognizing here today, first Congressman Lane Evans and then Congressman/President Gerald Ford.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 49, legislation to name the postal facility in Vail, CO, after our Nation's 39th President, Gerald R. Ford, Jr.

I believe this bill is fitting as another means of honoring the legacy of President Ford, in large part because of his special connection to Colorado and the Vail Valley. I am pleased by the support it has received; all members of the Colorado delegation have co-sponsored the legislation.

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. President Ford served on the board of directors of the Vail Valley Foundation. Vail also serves as the home of the Betty Ford Alpine Gardens and the Gerald R. Ford Amphitheater. President 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 the 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, CO, in his honor.

I urge all members support the legislation today.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 49.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1445

GALE W. McGEE POST OFFICE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 335) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 152 North 5th Street in Laramie, Wyoming, as the ''Gale W. McGee Post Office''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 335

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

SECTION 1. GALE W. MCGEE POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 152 North 5th Street in Laramie, Wyoming, shall be known and designated as the ''Gale W. McGee Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Gale W. McGee Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BAIRD). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

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

I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 335, a bill naming a postal facility in Laramie, Wyoming, after former Senator Gale W. McGee.

As a three-term Democrat from Wyoming, Senator McGee played an important role in improving the Post Office and securing deserved benefits for Federal workers. He was an expert on foreign policy and helped push our country into its current role as a world power. During his senatorial tenure that stretched from 1958 to 1976, Senator McGee served on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Appropriations, Foreign Relations, and Post Office and Civil Service Committees. He went on to be appointed by President Carter as U.S. Ambassador for the Organization of American States, where he was a strong advocate for the 1978 Panama Canal Treaty. He later started a consulting firm that helped Caribbean and Latin American countries facilitate economic growth.

Prior to his political career, Senator McGee taught high school history and eventually became a professor at the University of Notre Dame. His dedication to service should be remembered by the Congress of the United States.

I urge swift passage of this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to echo the praise of Senator Gale McGee. The gentlewoman from Wyoming has unfortunately been detained and will not be able to speak on the floor, but she authored this bill because, in fact, he did have a long career of service to this body in the sense of the Congress, and it is appropriate to name this post office after the Senator.

Certainly it is clear that the Congress often names post offices and other bodies after their own Members. But I think today on all three of these bills we picked appropriate candidates, candidates who, in fact, exemplify what this body on both sides of the Dome are about, a body of dedication and service by people who come here to work in a bipartisan way, who come here to make America better, who bring the values of their home State here but who recognize the value of the entire country is what we seek when we come here to meet together to debate and to vote.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering H.R. 335, a bill I authored to designate a facility of the United States Postal Service located in Laramie, Wyoming, as the ''Gale W. McGee Post Office.'' Gale W. McGee first came to my home State of Wyoming in 1946, to serve as an American History professor at the University of Wyoming. Gale and his wife Lorraine had three of their four children during his time in Laramie. His classes were said to be so popular that the students would ''hang from the rafters'' to be able to attend. He was a respected member of the community.

That respect was never more evident than 12 years later, in 1958. It was then that Gale McGee began a new chapter in his service to Wyoming, by being elected to the U.S. Senate in his first-ever attempt at public office. His accomplishments didn't stop there. During his entire 18-year tenure in the Senate, McGee served on the Appropriations Committee. In fact, he was the first Freshman in Senate history to be granted this coveted assignment. He also served as Chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee—a fitting position considering the designation I am asking you to support today. As Committee Chairman, he was widely credited with preventing a nationwide rail strike in 1973, and for spearheading the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970. After his Senate career was over, McGee later served as U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States from 1977 to 1981.

As a professor and Senator, Gale McGee dedicated 30 years of his life serving the people of Wyoming. In August of 2006, the Laramie City Council recognized that service by passing a resolution supporting the naming of their local post office after Senator McGee. Due to that local support, I was proud to introduce H.R. 335, and I am even prouder that the entire House will recognize this fine man's service to Wyoming and our Nation when it passes the bill today.

Gale McGee died on April 9th 1992, and his wife Lorraine passed just last March. Through the passage of this bill, we grant not only his family, but the State of Wyoming an official remembrance of our thanks.

I ask for your support of H.R. 335.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 335.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SANTA BARBARA MEN'S SOCCER TEAM, 2006 NCAA CHAMPIONS

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 70) congratulating the University of California at Santa Barbara men's soccer team, the 2006 National Collegiate Athletic Association Champions, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 70

Whereas the University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB) Gauchos claimed the 2006 NCAA Championship, 2–1, over the University of California at Los Angeles Bruins at Robert R. Hermann Stadium at Saint Louis University in St. Louis, Missouri, on December 3, 2006;

Whereas the UCSB Gauchos, in their 2006 season, had an overall record of 17–7–1, and a perfect 6–0 mark in the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) tournament;

Whereas the UCSB Gauchos won a Division 1 title for the second time ever in school history and first time ever in men's soccer;

Whereas the UCSB Gauchos have reached the NCAA finals twice in the past three years;

Whereas Nick Perera was named the tournament's offensive Most Outstanding Player and Andy Iro was named the defensive Most Outstanding Player; and

Whereas the 2006 NCAA championship soccer team members are Kyle Reynish; Jeff Murphy; David Walker; Andy Iro; Jon Curry; Greg Curry; Bryan Byrne; Paul Kierstead; Tino Nunez; Tyler Rosenlund; Alfonso Motagalvan; Eric Frimpong; Chris Pontius; Nick Perera; Eric Avila; Evan Patterson; Brennan Tennelle; Kyle Kaveny; Andrew Proctor; Bongomin Otii; Bryant Rueckner; Tony Chinakwe; Jason Badger; Jordan Kaplan; Drew Gleason; C.J. Cintas; and Guillermo Jalomo: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives congratulates the University of California at Santa Barbara men's soccer team, the Gauchos, and Coaches Tim Vom Steeg, Greg Wilson, Erick Foss, and Neil Jones on an out- standing championship season, a season that set the Gauchos among the elite in collegiate soccer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert material relevant to H. Res. 70 in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of California at Santa Barbara men's soccer team on their 2006 National Collegiate Athletic Association championship.

After a tough, hard-fought game, the Gauchos of UC Santa Barbara claimed the 2006 NCAA championship by a score of 2–1.

I would also like to congratulate the UCLA Bruins, the opposing team in the final game, on a well-played season. The Bruins had a season record of 14–6–4 and had three players named to the NCAA All-Tournament team.

Although the UC Santa Barbara men's soccer program appeared in the championship match twice in the last 3 years, this is the school's first men's soccer title and the university's second Division I title in athletics.

They accomplished many successes this year beyond the NCAA championship. The men's soccer team also won the 2006 Big West regular season championship and had a record of 17–7–1. The team was led to victory by head coach Tim Vom Steeg, assistant coach Greg Wilson, assistant coach Neil Jones, and goalkeeper coach Erick Foss. Also assisting the team was the UC Santa Barbara director of athletics, Gary Cunningham.

Mr. Speaker, I again congratulate the student athletes, coaches, and the University of California at Santa Barbara on their 2006 men's soccer team's achievement.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such times as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 70. This resolution recognizes the outstanding 2006 record of the University of California at Santa Barbara men's soccer team as well as their triumph in winning the university's first-ever national title in soccer and only the second in any other sport.

With a 2–1 victory over the University of California at Los Angeles at the 2006 NCAA men's College Cup, the UC Santa Barbara Gauchos ended the season with a 17–7–1 record.

The two rivals, whose schools are separated by less than 100 miles, played hard despite game time temperatures of 24 degrees and a windchill of 11. Still, in a testament to their strength and senior leadership, the Gauchos overcame the weather, as well as a 7–6 mid-season record, to become only the second unseeded team since 2000 to win the national title.

Shortly after the season ended and for the second time in 3 years, UC Santa Barbara head coach Tim Vom Steeg earned the most prestigious honor a Division I coach can receive when he was named national Coach of the Year by the National Soccer Coaches Association of America. According to College Sports Television, ''in his eight seasons at the helm of UCSB, Vom Steeg has transformed a program that went 2–17–2 overall in the year prior to his arrival to a Division I power and reigning national champions.''

In the first 33 years of the program's existence, Santa Barbara had never reached the NCAA tournament but has now made five straight post-season appearances under Vom Steeg's guidance, including two trips to the College Cup.

I extend my congratulations to head coach Tim Vom Steeg and all the hard-working players, the fans, and to the University of California at Santa Barbara. I am happy to join my good friends and colleagues, Representatives CAPPS and GALLEGLY, in honoring this exceptional team and all of its accomplishments and wish all involved continued success.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to support this Revolution congratulating the University of California, Santa Barbara men's soccer team for winning the NCAA Division I National Championship.

Along with my colleague ELTON GALLEGLY, I am thrilled to have this opportunity to congratulate every player, coach, alumnus, faculty member and supporter of UCSB.

On December 3, 2006, the UCSB Gauchos captured the National Championship by scoring two goals against the University of California, Los Angeles. This is UCSB's second national title in school history.

While all the gauchos played their hearts out, I'd like to acknowledge two stand-out performances.

Sophomore Nick Perera scored a goal and assisted on Eric Avila's game-winner on his way to earning All-College Cup Most Outstanding Offensive Player of the Tournament honors.

Junior Andy Iro, despite playing through an injury, helped keep UCLA at bay and was named the All-College Cup Most Outstanding Defensive Player.

While the beginning UCSB's season was plagued by inconsistent play, the Gauchos fought to recover, winning 10 of their last 11 games, including 6 straight in the tournament.

Coach Tim Vom Steeg, a UCSB alum, and his staff, Greg Wilson, Neil Jones, and Erick Foss, deserve tremendous praise not only for their impressive leadership in the 2006 season but also for leading the dominating Gauchos to their second NCAA National Championship game in 3 years.

Coach Vom Steeg's colleagues were so impressed with his coaching abilities that they named him the National Soccer Coaches Association of America National Coach of the Year, the most prestigious award that a Division I soccer coach can receive, for the second time.

Mr. Speaker, while the men's soccer team is a great example of the excellence the University produces, there is much more to celebrate.

As many of you know, my husband Walter was a professor of Religious Studies for more than 30 years at UCSB.

Through his experiences as a professor, and my own as a graduate, I have watched the university rightfully gain national attention.

The university currently has five Nobel Laureates on faculty and was recently ranked in the top 15 best public schools in the Nation by U.S. News & World Report.

And with a breathtakingly beautiful campus, it's no wonder that the men's soccer team and the university can attract such notable talent from all over the world.

If any of my colleagues ever find themselves on California's Central Coast, I encourage you to stop by this beautiful campus and see for yourself all that it has to offer.

And of course, don't forget to catch a soccer game at Harder Stadium.

I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this resolution.

Go Gauchos.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 70, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 521 and H.R. 335.

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

There was no objection.

COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE CARDINALS FOOTBALL TEAM FOR THEIR 2007 ORANGE BOWL VICTORY

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 82) commending the University of Louisville Cardinals football team for their victory in the 2007 Orange Bowl, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 82

Whereas on January 2, 2007, the University of Louisville Cardinals football team defeated the Wake Forest Demon Deacons 24–13 at Dolphin Stadium in Miami, Florida, to win the Orange Bowl;

Whereas the Cardinals victory marked the climax of a 12–1 season, which yielded the most wins in the program's history, a Big East Championship, and the school's first Bowl Championship Series victory;

Whereas junior quarterback Brian Brohm was named the most valuable player of the game after completing 24 of 34 passes for 311 yards, and junior wide receiver Harry Douglas tied an Orange Bowl record with 10 catches totaling 165 receiving yards and finished the season with a school record 1,265 receiving yards;

Whereas the Cardinals offensive line provided protection and momentum throughout the season and was a major factor in the team's 457 yards of offense in the Orange Bowl;

Whereas the relentless defense of the Cardinals played a vital role in the Orange Bowl victory;

Whereas the Cardinals defense was led by senior cornerback William Gay, who broke up 2 passes late in the game and extinguished the final hope of the Demon Deacons with an interception;

Whereas the success of the Cardinals is due in no small part to the dedication of Coach Bobby Petrino and his staff, as well as the Cardinals coaches of the last 2 decades, who led a magnificent ascent begun by Coach Howard Schnellenberger;

Whereas Cardinals fans, who stuck with the program through darker times, now have the team they deserve;

Whereas the University of Louisville has achieved a formidable football program, which is consistently among the strongest in college football; and

Whereas the exceptional group of young men who comprised the 2006 Cardinals should be publicly recognized as the greatest football team in the history of the University of Louisville: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the University of Louisville Cardinals football team for their victory in the 2007 Orange Bowl;

(2) recognizes the achievements of the players, Coach Bobby Petrino and his staff, Director of Athletics Tom Jurich, and President James Ramsey at the University of Louisville for the hard work and dedication that led to the Cardinals Orange Bowl victory; and

(3) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to transmit a copy of this resolution to the director of athletics at the University of Louisville for appropriate display.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert material relevant to H. Res. 82 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to commemorate the University of Louisiana Cardinals' first BCS victory, and I can hardly believe the words coming out of my mouth.

To say that this moment was unthinkable to the football world 25 years ago is an understatement. After decades of lost games and revenue, the Cardinal football team was on the verge of packing it in for good. Denny Crum had won a national championship and had just taken the basketball team to its third Final Four in 4 years, and for a town and school that had grown accustomed to winning, faith that next year's football team would be different became harder and harder to come by.

But then athletic director Bill Olsen found a believer in the most unlikely of places. Fresh off a national championship and Orange Bowl win of his own, Howard Schnellenberger returned to his old hometown to resurrect the Cardinal football program from the burial ground of college never-had-beens. And he did just that.

In only 10 years at the helm of the University of Louisville, Coach Schnellenberger tripled the number of bowl wins in the school's history and laid the foundation for the program that John L. Smith and Bobby Petrino built into a perennial winner, which this year earned a trip to its ninth straight bowl game.

The ascent of the Cardinal football program emblemizes a ubiquitous spirit at the University of Louisville, not just in athletics but in all programs, in all walks of life.

When the FDA approved the first completely effective cervical cancer vaccine last year, it was two scientists from the University of Louisville, Ben Jenson and Shin-je Ghim, who were credited with the discovery.

At Louisville's Jewish Hospital, U of L faculty performed the first three successful hand transplants in the United States and implanted the world's first successful artificial heart.

And 3-year-old Chase Ford became the first child to regain the ability to walk after a spine injury, thanks to the work of U of L researcher Susan Harkema.

U of L also ranks first among major research universities in National Institutes of Health funding growth and just became the only higher learning institution in Kentucky to promise a debt-free education to students from low-income families through their landmark Cardinal Covenant program.

This spirit of success was exemplified by Orange Bowl MVP Brian Brohm, who never failed to live up to the tremendous hype that followed him to the school. His dedication to his team and his hometown grew all the more evident when he chose to bypass an NFL draft in which many predicted he would be the first player chosen so that he could continue his dream of playing in a Cardinal uniform.

Receiving 10 of Brohm's passes in the final game and tying the Orange Bowl record, Harry Douglas also captured the spirit of Louisville all season long and set the single season record for receiving yards at U of L with 1,265.

These two, along with a committee of skilled runners and receivers and an unmovable offensive line, created an offense that seemed to score at will. Coupled with an impenetrable defense led by Nate Harris, William Gay, Amobi Okoye, and special teams anchored by Art Carmody, the Nation's best kicker, they formed the greatest football team in the history of the University of Louisville.

While the Orange Bowl victory is unprecedented in our community, it epitomizes the dedication, work ethic, and success that we in Louisville have come to expect from our flagship university.

I stand here today to commemorate one win that served as a exclamation of a stellar season, but the victory is far from fleeting. This Orange Bowl and this 12-win season serve as a benchmark of long-term success; and as athletic director Tom Jurich hands the reins to new coach Steve Kragthorpe, there is no one left in the football world who is not confident that he has handed him a winner.

□ 1500

For the players who personified greatness on the field and the coaches who led them, for the program that defied the odds, producing the greatest team in its history, and for the university that consistently acts an example of excellence, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H. Res. 82, commemorating the 2007 Orange Bowl champion, U of L Fighting Cardinals.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 82. This resolution recognizes the 12–1 season of the University of Louisville Cardinals, as well as the come-from-behind 24–13 win over the Wake Forest Demon Deacons at the 2007 Bowl Championship Series in the Orange Bowl.

The Cardinals averaged 39 points a game and ranked second in the Nation in total offense this season, but fell behind 13–10 in the final quarter before their offense went into high gear. Touchdown drives of 81 and 71 yards on consecutive possessions sealed their first win in a major bowl since the 1991 Fiesta Bowl.

The final victory capped a storied season for the Cardinals that included a Big East championship and the school's first-ever win in a Bowl Championship Series game. I extend my congratulations to head coach Bobby Petrino and all of the hardworking players and fans and to the University of Louisville.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my good friend and colleague, Representative YARMUTH, in honoring this exceptional team and all of its accomplishments, and wish all involved continued success. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to approve this resolution and join me in honoring the ''Ville on the Hill,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res 82, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

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

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

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

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, in addition to Mr. TANNER of Tennessee, Chairman, appointed on January 11, 2007:

Mrs. TAUSCHER, California, Vice Chairman
Mr. ROSS, Arkansas
Mr. CHANDLER, Kentucky
Mr. LARSON, Connecticut
Mr. MEEK, Florida
Mr. SCOTT, Georgia
Ms. BEAN, Illinois

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 521, by the yeas and nays;
H.R. 49, by the yeas and nays;
H. Res. 82, by the yeas and nays.

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

LANE EVANS POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 521.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 521, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 3, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—405

Abercrombie	Boustany	Costa
Ackerman	Boyd (FL)	Costello
Aderholt	Boyda (KS)	Courtney
Akin	Braley (IA)	Cramer
Alexander	Brown (SC)	Crenshaw
Allen	Brown-Waite, Ginny	Crowley
Altmire	Buchanan	Cubin
Andrews	Burgess	Cuellar
Arcuri	Burton (IN)	Cummings
Baca	Butterfield	Davis (AL)
Bachmann	Buyer	Davis (CA)
Baird	Calvert	Davis (IL)
Baker	Camp (MI)	Davis (KY)
Baldwin	Campbell (CA)	Davis, David
Barrett (SC)	Cannon	Davis, Lincoln
Barrow	Cantor	Davis, Tom
Bartlett (MD)	Capito	Deal (GA)
Barton (TX)	Capps	DeFazio
Bean	Capuano	DeGette
Becerra	Cardoza	Delahunt
Berkley	Carnahan	DeLauro
Berman	Carney	Dent
Berry	Carson	Diaz-Balart, M.
Biggert	Carter	Dicks
Bilbray	Castle	Dingell
Bilirakis	Castor	Doggett
Bishop (GA)	Chabot	Donnelly
Bishop (NY)	Chandler	Doolittle
Bishop (UT)	Clarke	Doyle
Blackburn	Clay	Drake
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Dreier
Blunt	Clyburn	Duncan
Boehner	Coble	Ehlers
Bonner	Cohen	Ellison
Bono	Cole (OK)	Ellsworth
Boozman	Conaway	Emanuel
Boren	Conyers	Emerson
Boswell	Cooper	Engel
Boucher		Eshoo

Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
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 (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
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)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
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
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
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
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
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)

NAYS—3

Garrett (NJ) King (IA) Shadegg

NOT VOTING—27

Bachus Graves Ros-Lehtinen
Brady (PA) Grijalva Shays
Brady (TX) Gutierrez Simpson
Brown, Corrine Hastert Souder
Culberson Latham Tanner
Davis, Jo Ann McCaul (TX) Terry
Diaz-Balart, L. McDermott Towns
Edwards Neal (MA) Wamp
English (PA) Norwood Young (FL)

□ 1856

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 58 I was unable to vote due to weather and traffic delays. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF FATHER ROBERT DRINAN

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of announcing to the House that one of our most beloved former Members, Father Robert Drinan, has passed away. He served five terms in the House of Representatives, from 1971 to 1981. Those of us who served with him and those who came to know him subsequently through his work as an educator and a moral leader admired his lifelong commitment to public service, loved him for his friendship and will miss his remarkable spirit. He was truly a great man.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House be made in order so that we may observe a moment of silence in memory of Father Robert Drinan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will rise and observe a moment of silence.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

GERALD R. FORD, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 49.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 49, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
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 (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
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
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
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
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller (NV)
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 (FL)
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)
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)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
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
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
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
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
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)

NOT VOTING—26

Bachus
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Diaz-Balart, L.
Edwards
English (PA)
Graves
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastert
Latham
McCaul (TX)
McDermott
Neal (MA)
Norwood
Ros-Lehtinen
Shays
Simpson
Souder
Tanner
Terry
Towns
Wamp
Young (FL)

□ 1907

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 59 I was unable to vote due to weather and traffic delays. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE CARDINALS FOOTBALL TEAM FOR THEIR 2007 ORANGE BOWL VICTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 82, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 82, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—408

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
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 (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
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
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
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
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
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)
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)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
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
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
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
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
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)

NAYS—1

Barton (TX)

NOT VOTING—26

Bachus
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Diaz-Balart, L.
Edwards
English (PA)
Graves
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastert
Latham
McCaul (TX)
McDermott
Neal (MA)
Norwood
Ros-Lehtinen
Shays
Simpson
Souder
Tanner
Terry
Towns
Wamp
Young (FL)

□ 1916

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 60, I was unable to vote due to weather and traffic delays. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 2007, I was returning from the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland and, therefore, missed three recorded votes.

I take my voting responsibility very seriously and would like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to reflect that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on recorded vote number 58, "yea" on recorded vote 59 and "yea" on recorded vote 60.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber today. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall votes 58, 59, and 60.

REAUTHORIZE SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the failure of Congress to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act is a breach of faith to more than 600 forested counties and 4,400 school districts across America.

Mr. Speaker, 78 percent of the land in Deschutes County, Oregon, is controlled by the Federal Government. It is a recreational and outdoor paradise. Funds from this program have supported public safety, emergency medical, search and rescue operations, and much more to protect the more than 2 million people who come to central Oregon to recreate every year.

County Sheriff Les Stiles says, ''Search and rescue is a matter of life and death in central Oregon, and supporting these programs is essential given the surge in outdoor recreation.''

Our school kids are hurt, too, because this program has not been reauthorized yet. At the Bend-LaPine School District, administrators face the task of bigger class sizes or fewer teachers as they struggle to meet State and Federal mandates. School Superintendent Doug Nelson says, ''These funds help us ensure programs which don't leave kids behind.''

Mr. Speaker, Congress must keep the Federal Government's word to timber communities. Pass H.R. 17. Time is running out.

REAUTHORIZE SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I too rise on the issue of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act. As my colleague from Oregon just stated, this is a crisis. This is an economic, social and public safety crisis if these funds are not reauthorized. They are now preparing layoff notices for teachers in rural school districts, for deputy sheriffs in search and rescue, for people who maintain our critical road and highway infrastructure in the western and other States across the country.

This Congress must act, and soon, to keep faith with the counties and the school districts where the Federal Government owns a preponderance of the land and has changed forest policies and has dropped their revenues dramatically.

MEMBERS NOT ABOVE THE LAW

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

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Americans are fed up with elected officials acting like they are better than everyone else. We have seen scandal after scandal on a bipartisan basis, and people are sick of it.

Just last year, in the face of several inappropriate acts from Members of this Congress, some of our leaders decided that we were above the law. I cannot disagree more. When a local business fails to file its taxes, we investigate. When a parent abuses a child, we investigate. If a Member of Congress abuses his or her position, law enforcement officers must have the authority to follow the evidence regardless of where it may lead.

Listen up America. Last week I introduced H.R. 88 that declares to our constituents that we agree with them: Members of Congress should not be above the law. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation.

CHANGE POLICY IN IRAQ

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that all of us want what is best for the men and women on the front lines in Iraq. Certainly it is disturbing when we find that there is a confusion in the reporting of the incident that saw the loss of life of approximately four or five of our soldiers. First, it was represented that they died in a battle fighting against the insurgents and others; later to be determined that they had been kidnapped and shot in the head execution-style.

This, of course, speaks to the failed policy of this administration that our soldiers can declare victory and be returned home, but more importantly it certainly is a shame when we cannot tell parents and loved ones and others how their loved ones fell in battle.

Certainly it is a shame that we find that our young men and women on the front lines may be subject to capture and execution, like being shot in the streets in a most disgraceful manner.

We must fix the broken policies of Iraq. Redeploy our troops, engage our allies in the region, begin a political diplomatic solution, and stop falsifying reports to the American people, not knowing how their loved ones are being executed in the streets of Iraq. I ask for a new policy in Iraq.

PROTESTING IS ACT OF PATRIOTISM

(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, this weekend tens or hundreds of thousands of Americans came to Washington to protest the war. It was reminiscent of Vietnam, as so much of this war is reminiscent of Vietnam.

What these people did was an act of patriotism and courage, exercising their first amendment rights and expressing their opinion that the policy of this administration and this country is wrong. As they protested, and throughout the weekend, American soldiers lost their lives. It is unfortunate that it seems that the calls of the people are not being heeded.

It is particularly distressing, Mr. Speaker, to hear one of the Cabinet members suggest that people who disagree with the administration are lending aid and solace to the enemy. That is wrong. The first amendment is about free speech. The demonstrations, the protests that happened this week were correct. Samuel Johnson said: ''The last refuge to which a scoundrel clings is patriotism.'' I think we saw people try to find patriotism to be the refuge rather than response to protests and analytical discussions of the policies in Iraq.

FATHER ROBERT DRINAN

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Father Robert Drinan, a former Member of this House and a champion for the cause of peace and justice, died yesterday.

Father Drinan was a hero and a friend. He recognized early the folly of the Vietnam War, and he fought to end it. He was a critic of the current and senseless war in Iraq. He was outspoken and not faint on issues of human rights here at home and around the world. He was a friend to the poor, a courageous advocate for civil rights and civil liberties, and a well-respected legal scholar. He was also a Jesuit priest who was proud of his vocation and dedicated to the teachings of the Church.

We developed a strong friendship over the years. I certainly sought his advice and counsel on many, many issues; and he never hesitated to provide it. He called regularly, sent me articles and speeches, and always urged me to stand strong for what is right.

Mr. Speaker, our country, and indeed the world, is better off because of Bob Drinan. My condolences go out to his family and friends. He was a remarkable man and a true inspiration and he will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask to insert in the RECORD a copy of an article which appeared in today's Boston Globe honoring Father Drinan.

[From boston.com, Jan. 29, 2007]

CONGRESSMAN-PRIEST DRINAN DIES

(By Mark Feeney)

The Rev. Robert F. Drinan, who left Boston College's administration to become the first Roman Catholic priest elected to Congress and who in 1973 filed the initial impeachment resolution against President Richard M. Nixon, died yesterday at Sibley Memorial Hospital in Washington, D.C. He was 86.

The cause of death was pneumonia and congestive heart failure, said a spokeswoman for Georgetown University, where Father Drinan taught legal ethics and other subjects to more than 6,000 students during the past 26 years.

''Father Drinan was a forever gentle, resilient, tenacious advocate for social justice and fundamental decency,'' said Senator John F. Kerry, who was Father Drinan's campaign manager in 1970. ''He lived out in public life the whole cloth of Catholic teachings. In the most divisive days of Vietnam when things were coming apart, this incredible man and most unlikely of candidates showed America how a man of faith could be a man of peace .''

A five-term member of the House of Representatives, Father Drinan was one of its most liberal members. His strong anti-administration stands earned him a place on the Nixon ''enemies list.'' His upset victory over U.S. Representative Philip J. Philbin, a 14-term incumbent who was vice chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, in the 1970 Democratic primary in Massachusetts Third Congressional District was a high-water mark in the New Politics, which brought the antiwar movement to the ballot box.

Father Drinan's election was also a landmark in U.S. church-state relations.

A Catholic priest, the Rev. Gabriel Richard, had served in Congress in 1822 as a nonvoting delegate from Michigan Territory, but he had been appointed. And many Protestant clerics had served as U.S. representatives. Yet the sight of Father Drinan in the halls of Congress in his Roman collar was startling. Some even questioned the propriety of his wearing a cleric's collar and black suit on the floor of the House. Father Drinan had a standard response. ''It's the only suit I own,'' he'd quip.

Before entering politics, the Jesuit priest had long served as dean at Boston College Law School.

Supporters saw his entering Congress as a logical union of his legal and spiritual vocations. ''Our father, who art in Congress'' became a popular, if unofficial, campaign slogan.

Yet many of Father Drinan's most vehement detractors were Catholics who opposed him politically because they saw his electoral career as detracting from his priestly calling. He further angered some Catholics with his show of independence from the church, supporting federal funding of abortions and opposing constitutional amendments that would have banned abortion and allowed prayer in public schools.

In 1980, Pope John Paul II ordered Father Drinan to either forgo reelection or leave the priesthood. With ''regret and pain,'' Father Drinan announced he would not seek reelection.

''It is just unthinkable,'' he said of the idea of renouncing the priesthood to stay in office. ''I am proud and honored to be a priest and a Jesuit. As a person of faith, I must believe that there is work for me to do which somehow will be more important than the work I am required to leave.''

Father Drinan's unexpected announcement set off a scramble among prospective successors. The winner was U.S. Representative Barney Frank, then a state representative from Beacon Hill.

In announcing that he would not run again, Father Drinan described himself as ''a moral architect.'' It was an apt description of his political career. His election in 1970 was as much crusade as campaign, charged with a moral fervor that would characterize his entire political career. Father Drinan's critics called him 'the mad monk.'' In the context of those highly charged times, it could as easily be considered praise.

''He envisions political power as a moral power,'' Ralph Nader, the consumer advocate, once said. More advocate than legislator, Father Drinan was an outsider on Capitol Hill. (''You have collegiality much more in the church than you do in Congress,'' he said in a 1974 Globe interview.) A wag likened his membership on the House Internal Security Committee, the successor to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, ''which Father Drinan wanted to dissolve, to ''an atheist belonging to the World Council of Churches.''

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, Father Drinan gained a national profile in the summer of 1974 when the committee's hearings considering Nixon's impeachment were televised. The hearings would have taken place a year earlier, had Father Drinan had his way. On July 31, 1973, he introduced the first resolution to impeach the president—though not for any high crimes and misdemeanors relating to the Watergate scandal, but rather over the administration's secret bombing campaign in Cambodia.

Father Drinan prided himself on having filed that resolution. But its timing dismayed the House Democratic leadership, which thought it premature and counterproductive.

''Morally, Drinan had a good case,'' then-House Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill Jr. noted in his memoirs. ''But politically, he damn near blew it. For if Drinan's resolution had come up for a vote at the time he filed it, it would have been overwhelmingly defeated—by something like 400 to 20. After that, with most of the members already on record as having voted once against impeachment, it would have been extremely difficult to get them to change their minds later on.''

In 1975, Father Drinan filed an impeachment resolution against U.S. ambassador to Iran Richard Helms for his activities as director of the Central Intelligence Agency. That same year, Father Drinan was chief plaintiff in a suit filed by 21 Democratic congressmen to block U.S. military involvement in Cambodia. It was later dismissed.

Robert Frederick Drinan was born in Boston, the son of James John Drinan and Ann Mary (Flanagan) Drinan. Father Drinan grew up in Hyde Park. He played clarinet with the Boston Civic Symphony and participated on the debating team at Boston College. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1942, after earning his bachelor's degree at Boston College.

Father Drinan did his seminary work at Weston College in Cambridge. (Daniel Berrigan, who would later become a noted peace activist, was a classmate.) He received a master's from Boston College in 1947 and two law degrees from Georgetown University Law Center, the first in 1949 and a master's in law in 1951. Ordained in 1953, he received a doctorate in theology at Rome's Gregorian University.

In 1955, he returned to Boston College as associate dean and professor at its law school. He became dean a year later, a position he held until 1969. Father Drinan served as Boston College's vice president and provost from 1969 to 1970. During his deanship, the law school went from being ''a moribund institution,'' as a federal judge once described it, to ranking among the nation's more highly regarded law schools.

Father Drinan found himself increasingly involved in public issues. He served as chairman of the advisory committee for Massachusetts of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. As part of an ecumenical group, he went to South Vietnam in 1969 to assess the state of religious and political freedom there.

Asked in a 1970 Globe interview why he was running for Congress, Father Drinan answered with a series of questions. ''Why? Why not? Jesuit priests always have been avant-garde. Right?''

His candidacy drew nationwide attention. The conservative columnist William F. Buckley Jr. called Father Drinan ''the greatest threat to orderly thought since Eleanor Roosevelt left this vale of tears.'' He won a three-way race in November by 3,000 votes.

Also elected to Congress in 1970 were such vehemently anti war Democrats as Ron Dellums of California and Bella Abzug of New York. Yet Father Drinan drew particular attention. In January 1974, George H.W. Bush, who was then Republican Party chairman, said there wasn't another congressman whose defeat he more strongly hoped for than Father Drinan's. He promised a major GOP drive to unseat him. None materialized.

Last night, several of Father Drinan's colleagues said his character and conscience made him a strong voice on Capitol Hill. In a statement, Senator Edward Kennedy cited Father Drinan's principled commitment to, among other causes, ending the war in Vietnam. ''He was a profile in courage in every sense of the word, and the nation has lost one of the finest persons ever to serve in Congress,'' Kennedy said.

''When I arrived in Congress, Father Drinan was already serving as the conscience of the House of Representatives with every vote he cast,'' U.S. Representative Edward Markey of Malden said. '' He was a man of faith who never stopped searching for truth, and he was a committed educator who stayed true to his faith.''

After leaving Congress, Father Drinan returned to academe, teaching international human rights, legal ethics, and constitutional law at Georgetown University Law Center. He published ''Can God and Caesar Coexist? Balancing Religious Freedom and International Law'' (2005).

In addition to keeping a heavy schedule of speeches and writing, Father Drinan served on the board of Common Cause, the citizens lobbying group, and spent two terms as president of the liberal organization Americans for Democratic Action. While in Congress, he had been a founder of the National Interreligious Task Force for Soviet Jewry. (Father Drinan was a strong supporter of Soviet Jews seeking emigration.) He also served on the board of Bread for the World, an organization dedicated to feeding the hungry. In a 1992 Globe interview, Father Drinan called ending world hunger his ''number one passion.''

In that interview, Father Drinan was asked what he felt about the Vatican's forcing him to choose between the clergy and Congress. ''History will have to judge whether or not that was a wise decision,'' he said.

He leaves a sister-in-law, Helen, of Newton Highlands, and three nieces.

Funeral arrangements had not been made last night.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

DON'T HURT THE FEELINGS OF CHINA

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, I want to talk about immigration chaos that is occurring in this country.

There has been a lot of talk about immigration, border security and all of the problems that are occurring. But let's talk about one that has maybe slipped through the cracks and we don't hear too much about.

We have people in this country that have come from foreign nations that are illegally in the United States. Some of those people are criminals. They have gone to penitentiaries throughout this country. Our Federal Government then captures those individuals, takes them to an immigration judge. They are ordered deported back to their nations, and here is what happens: eight of those nations refuse to take back lawfully deported aliens. They won't take back their own citizens. Remember, all of these people are illegally in the United States, many are criminals.

How many people are we talking about? Well, we are talking about 136,000 individuals. The cost to the taxpayers to incarcerate those individuals while they are waiting deportation hearings is $83 million. Who are those nations? Well, seven of the eight, Vietnam, China, India, Ethiopia, Iran, Laos, and Jamaica. They get a permanent get-out-of-jail-free card in the United States because we cannot permanently detain these people in jail after they have been ordered deported and their country of origin refuses to take them.

So what do we do about it? Well, I think that these countries, any nation that refuses to take back lawfully deported individuals, should not receive foreign aid from the United States. But many of these seven or eight that I have mentioned do not receive foreign aid. So why don't we make sure that these people take back their aliens? Well, we already have a law on the books that says under section 243(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, upon notification by Homeland Security that a country is not accepting or unreasonably delays repatriation of their citizens, the Secretary of State must discontinue granting immigrant or nonimmigrant visas to those citizens of that country until Homeland Security informs the Secretary of State the alien has been repatriated.

That sounds good, but the problem is Homeland Security doesn't enforce the rule of law; and the reason they don't enforce the rule of law, according to a letter we have received from Homeland Security, is that there are other sanctions that they must use because we have foreign policy issues specifically with the Chinese. So apparently Homeland Security is not even notifying our own Secretary of State to deport these individuals.

Mr. Speaker, this ought not to be. If a person is supposed to be lawfully deported back to their native country, even China, Homeland Security has the obligation to follow the law and tell the Secretary of State so these people can be shipped back to where they belong.

It is simple, if you come to America illegally, you go home after you are lawfully deported. If your own nation doesn't want you, then you don't get foreign aid, or you don't get any visas for any purpose.

These people that these countries will not take, 136,000, have become our problem because their nations don't even want their own citizens. Our government needs to be more concerned about the rule of law, the cost to the American taxpayer than it is about hurting the feelings of the Chinese on some foreign policy issue.

So, Mr. Speaker, we urge that Homeland Security follow the law and if you are ordered deported and these nations won't take them, then they shouldn't receive any visas to come to this country for any purpose.

And that's just the way it is.

TALIBAN RESURGENCE IN AFGHANISTAN

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 come to the floor this evening to once again discuss the mounting problems and increasing violence by Taliban fighters in Afghanistan and Pakistan. My concern is that the President continues to escalate the wrong war in Iraq while the war in Afghanistan is forgotten. I fear, as do many others, if the United States and NATO do not prioritize Afghanistan, the Taliban will reach a level of strength it has not had since prior to the inception of the United States mission in Afghanistan. This could lead to an impending offensive by the Taliban in Afghanistan which would drastically undermine the United States mission in this war-torn nation.

Over the weekend, the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, and other Members of the House leadership visited Afghanistan and Pakistan on a fact-finding mission in order to witness first hand the escalating problems facing those countries.

I was glad to see that the Speaker coupled her trip to Iraq with a visit to Afghanistan and Pakistan. Speaker PELOSI's trip to Afghanistan and Pakistan comes as President Bush announces his plan to ask Congress for $10.6 billion in aid for Afghanistan.

□ 1930

$8.6 billion of this aid money will go towards training and equipping Afghan security forces, as well as increasing the size of Afghanistan's national army. The remaining $2 billion will be provided for investment in Afghani infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, the President has stated that he will make a formal request for these funds next month, and I am pleased to see that he is finally realizing that the threat of the Taliban and al Qaeda remains in Afghanistan and that we need to do more.

The ongoing war on terror should focus on Afghanistan and Pakistan, not on Iraq. The United States must be committed to fighting terrorism in those areas in order to protect our country because that is where the war on terrorism and the attacks on our country began.

Earlier this month, Democrats took a significant step toward this goal by passing H.R. 1 which implemented the recommendations of the bipartisan 9/11 Commission. Included in this bill was language that would end U.S. military assistance and arms sales licensing to Pakistan in the 2008 fiscal year unless Pakistani President Musharraf certifies that the Islamabad government is making all possible efforts to end Taliban activities on Pakistani soil.

It seems that President Musharraf is paying the United States lip service by claiming to be supportive of the global war on terror, yet failing to take action against Taliban fighters that have set up training camps in the western region of his country. It is my hope that, coupled with international pressure, the language in H.R. 1 will convince President Musharraf to take immediate action against the Taliban militants in his country.

Mr. Speaker, while the Taliban continues to gain strength in Afghanistan and western Pakistan, it has also been leading an effort to win support of the people of Afghanistan by opening its own schools or madrasas in southern Afghanistan. The intentions of the Taliban are obviously to distract from their regime of terror, not to provide educational opportunities for the children of Afghanistan. Last year alone, the Taliban destroyed 200 schools and killed 20 teachers. It is more likely that the Taliban will use these madrasas not only to trick the people of Afghanistan into believing that they are advocating the expansion of education but also to recruit new Taliban fighters.

This is all part of the al Qaeda's growing propaganda operation. As Sahab, the TV production arm of al Qaeda, last year produced 58 videos, more than tripling its number from 2005, it is clear that the Taliban and al Qaeda are regrouping and working hard to win over the people of Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, it is very important for the United States to continue to funnel resources into Afghanistan. We must also ensure that none of our troops in Afghanistan are redeployed to bolster the President's plan to escalate the war in Iraq. We cannot let ourselves forget where the real war on terror started and continues to this day.

TWO U.S. BORDER PATROL AGENTS IN FEDERAL PRISON

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the pages are helping me put up the portrait of an injustice. The picture shows two U.S. Border Agents on January 17, 2007, turning themselves in to United States marshals to begin serving 11 and 12 years respectively in Federal prison.

U.S. Border Agents Ramos, who is at the bottom of this portrait, and Compean, at the top, were convicted last spring for wounding a Mexican drug smuggler who brought 743 pounds of marijuana across our southern border into Texas. These men never should have been prosecuted, yet they are now handcuffed in Federal prison.

Mr. Speaker, after months of silence, the President said in a television interview last week that he would take a sober look at the case and a tough look at the facts to see whether the agents should be pardoned. For the agents' sake, I am hopeful that the President will look into this case as soon as possible. The facts will tell the President what countless citizens and Members of Congress already know, that the U.S. Attorney's Office was on the wrong side in this case.

The agents fired shots during a foot chase with the smuggler who had fled in a van they were pursuing. The van contained approximately $1 million worth of marijuana.

Compelling physical evidence, the angle of the bullet that struck the drug smuggler, makes it clear that the smuggler was pointing something at the agents as he ran away, and the agents fired in self-defense. Yet the U.S. Attorney's Office prosecuted the agents almost exclusively on the testimony of an admitted drug smuggler who claimed he was unarmed.

The U.S. Attorney's Office prosecuted the agents and granted immunity to the drug smuggler for his testimony against our Border Agents. This drug smuggler received full medical care in El Paso, Texas; was permitted to return Mexico; and is now suing the border patrol for $5 million for violating his civil rights. He is not an American citizen. He is a criminal.

Since the agents were convicted, three of the 12 jurors have submitted sworn statements that they were misled into believing that there could be no dissent in the jury's decision and therefore believe that they had to give in to the majority opinion of guilt. Still, the judge refused to overturn the verdict.

Mr. Speaker, the extraordinary details surrounding the prosecution of this case assure that justice has not been served. The Department of Homeland Security Inspector General in this case has outrageously claimed that Agents Ramos and Compean admitted they were out to shoot Mexicans and confessed to knowingly shooting an unarmed suspect. But the Inspector General has failed to make good on his promise to deliver documents to Members of Congress to support these claims.

Nearly 2 years after the conclusion of the agents' trial, the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas has answered repeated requests for transcripts of the trial with nothing but excuses.

Mr. Speaker, real justice does not fear the truth. For the sake of the agents and their families and for the sake of the American people who they were working to protect, I encourage the President of the United States to review the facts on this case as soon as possible. The President alone can immediately reverse this injustice by pardoning these two innocent men.

With that, Mr. Speaker, before I yield back, I want to say to the families of Border Patrol Agents Ramos and Compean that there are Members on both sides of the political aisle in this House of Representatives that will not sit still until the President pardons these two men. They deserve the best of America, not the worst, and God bless America.

PEACE MARCH ON THE MALL

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, this weekend there was an extraordinary event right outside these windows. I come to the floor this evening to celebrate the hundreds of thousands of people who gathered on the Mall this Saturday because they have had enough of this immoral occupation in Iraq.

Groups like Code Pink, United for Peace and Justice, Win Without War, and Peace Action did an exceptional job of organizing the march and rallying their members. We were fortunate to have many celebrity activists in attendance, as well as several Members of the Congress.

But what made the event successful was the energy and the passion in the crowd. It was a testament to the power of the grassroots.

Hundreds of thousands, from the stage as far as the eye could see, packed on the mall, standing together to send a powerful message that Americans want to bring our troops home from Iraq.

Hundreds of thousands standing together to say that 4 years of bloodshed is enough, that over 3,050 lost American lives is over 3,050 too many for a war we never should have started in the first place.

Hundreds of thousands standing together to register the disgust with the President's Iraq policy, the staggering civilian casualties, the billions upon billions of dollars wasted, human rights abused, our global credibility shattered, terrorists emboldened rather than defeated.

Every objective measure we could possibly use leads to the conclusion that what we are doing in Iraq has been a tragic failure.

And everyone can see that, Mr. Speaker, except the President, the President of the United States, who is asking us to sacrifice more of our tax dollars and more lives and limbs so he can win in Iraq.

You know what they say: The definition of insanity is doing the same thing and expecting different results. Fortunately, we have an antidote to this insanity. It is not another Iraq study group. It is not another bipartisan committee to debate and deliberate while more people die. It is not a nonbinding resolution.

It is comprehensive legislation that would have all of our troops home safely, out of Iraq, and contractors out of Iraq within 6 months.

It is H.R. 508, the Bring Our Troops Home and Iraq Sovereignty Restoration Act, which I introduced with my colleagues, Congresswomen BARBARA LEE and MAXINE WATERS, earlier this month.

But the real authors of this bill, Mr. Speaker, were the hundreds of thousands of people marching on the Mall this Saturday and the millions more Americans who they represent. By offering H.R. 508, we are giving voice to their will.

Many of the marchers came back to Congress today to share their views in person. They want their elected representatives to know how strongly they oppose the continuing occupation and how strongly they support H.R. 508, which would fully fund a safe military withdrawal.

The President has challenged us to issue a plan. We have, and people gathered on the Mall this weekend showed their support. Enough is enough.

In the name of national security, fiscal sanity and common decency, I ask my colleagues, sign on to H.R. 508 and bring our troops home.

GLOBALIZATION

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if we take a look at the last half century, it is clear that there has been no greater force for positive economic and political change than globalization. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I said globalization.

Greater integration of the world's economies has lifted hundreds of millions of people out of poverty in the developing world, nearly doubled the middle class population in Mexico and expanded our economy into a $13 trillion global leader for greater economic and political freedom.

The benefits of globalization can be seen every single time that a Chinese blogger gets past government censors or a U.S. company trains factory owners in Thailand in worker rights and protections.

So how did the greatest engine of global prosperity become so maligned? How did this poverty fighting, democracy enhancing force get blamed for all of the world's evils, from job losses in Michigan to poor water quality in Guatemala?

In part, Mr. Speaker, this can be explained by the fact that globalization has improved so many aspects of our lives, but it has done so in very subtle ways. As a result, we do not always recognize its benefits.

When you go to the grocery store and find fresh grapes in the dead of winter, you might not know that the fact that they are there and fresh and reasonably priced is that they come from Chile. You just know that you get to enjoy those winter grapes.

When you buy educational software for your second grader, you might not know that it was developed by a small business in Pennsylvania, assembled in Malaysia and serviced by a technical support firm in India. You just know that your daughter is starting to do a better job at reading.

When you buy a new TV because Wal-Mart finally had it at a price you could afford, you might not know that they cut costs by developing and implementing a revolutionary operational structure. You may not know that they source, ship and track goods to and from every corner of the globe by using such innovative practices that they have transformed the entire retail industry. You just know that you get to watch this Sunday in the Super Bowl the Colts and the Bears play away on an amazing screen.

Globalization has impacted us in countless ways, with improvements that range from a better MP3 player to a better job, and together they contribute to a better life.

But, Mr. Speaker, while the improvements to our standard of living often go unnoticed, the challenges that come with change are painfully clear. When a factory closes down, the hardship is very real and very visible. For the individuals who face those tough times, winter grapes and flat-screen TVs seem absolutely meaningless.

□ 1945

When confronted with the difficult challenges change can bring, it is very natural to condemn change itself. But like all hard things in life, it is just not that simple. While one company suffers from competition from China, several others thrive by utilizing low cost, high-quality Chinese goods. A tech company contracts with a call center in India; and as a result of the cost savings, they can afford to hire new programmers here in the United States.

In fact, the numbers overwhelmingly show that globalization has been an enormous net positive for job creation right here at home: over 20 million new jobs since the implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement, including more than 7 million new jobs in the last 3½ years. Unemployment, as we all know, is at a near historic low of 4½ percent.

But, Mr. Speaker, while the benefits have been dispersed to all Americans, there is no denying that there are those who have faced great challenges. So do we try to halt the march of globalization? Let us set aside the question of whether we should deny the tremendous benefits for all in order to try to protect the few.

Let us ask the question, Can we do that? Can we protect an industry from losing jobs? If so, do we protect textile workers or the workers who design, market, and sell apparel? Do we protect manufacturers that make steel products or the manufacturers that use steel products? Maybe we should all buy American. Does that mean that we buy Fords that are made in Canada and assembled with Mexican parts? Or do we buy Toyotas made in Kentucky with American and Japanese parts? Do we buy iPods designed in California, but assembled in China? The fact is, globalization has made old ideas about protectionism absolutely obsolete.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we recognize the leading role that we as a country are facing. I urge my colleagues in a bipartisan way to join in support of this effort.

But like all hard things in life, it's just not that simple. While one company suffers from competition with China, several others thrive by utilizing low-cost, high-quality Chinese goods. A tech company contracts with a call center in India, and as a result of the cost savings, they can afford to hire new programmers. In fact, the numbers overwhelmingly show that globalization has been an enormous net positive for job creation: Over 20 million new jobs since the implementation of NAFTA, including 7 million jobs in the last 3½ years. Unemployment has dropped to 4.5 percent, a near-historic low.

But while the benefits have been dispersed to all Americans, there's no denying that there are those who have faced great challenges. So do we try to halt the march of globalization? Let's set aside the question of whether we should deny the tremendous benefits for all in order to try to protect the few. Let's ask the question of can we?

Can we protect an industry from losing jobs? If so, do we protect textile workers, or the workers who design, market and sell apparel? Do we protect manufacturers that make steel products, or the manufacturers that use steel products? Maybe we should all ''Buy American.'' Does that mean we buy Fords, made in Canada and assembled with Mexican parts? Or do we buy Toyotas, made in Kentucky with American and Japanese parts? Do we buy iPods, designed in California, but assembled in China? The fact is, globalization has made old ideas about protectionism obsolete. Its impact is wide, pervasive and irreversible. We simply do not have the option anymore of withdrawing from the world and denying ourselves the benefits of a global marketplace.

Our only option is to use the prosperity it has brought to help those who are struggling. It doesn't matter why a job is lost. Whether globalization played a part or not, what matters is that workers have the skills they need to find even better jobs than the ones that were lost. If we make a commitment to American competitiveness, including worker competitiveness, we can both enjoy the benefits and address the challenges of a global economy.

What we can't afford to do is demonize the source of our unparalleled prosperity. There's no question individuals will face hardship at times, and that naturally breeds anxiety. But anti-globalization rhetoric that exploits and preys upon the anxieties of working families is cheap, dirty politics. And it is dangerous. It risks the growing standard of living that the world's economic liberalizers are enjoying. I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject the politics of isolationism and continue to pursue the path of greater economic integration in the worldwide marketplace.

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

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

FIREARM TRACING DATA

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, for the last several weeks you have heard me talk about gun violence in this country, and I happen to think there are solutions where we can reduce gun violence.

I would like to talk about firearm tracing data. Firearm tracing data gives law enforcement agencies the ability to retrieve useful data on guns used in crimes. Tracing data will let our police departments locate the gun dealers who sell guns used in crimes. Without this tracing data, local law enforcement will not be able to pursue civil action on suppliers that have been implicated in crimes without asking the ATF's permission first.

It is important that we use tracing data to single out the bad gun owners. One percent of gun owners sell 50 percent of the guns used in crime in this country. That is a staggering number. We can crack down on that 1 percent. We can make our streets and cities safer. The collection of tracing data does not prevent anyone from purchasing a gun. It simply gives law enforcement the tools that they need to solve crimes.

As you can see by this chart, 91 percent of Americans believe that tracing data should be used in some form to help crimes, 91 percent. Why aren't we doing a better job on helping our police officers do their job?

Last week, New York Mayor Bloomberg teamed up with Boston Mayor Menino on this very issue. Together they have formed a bipartisan coalition of more than 120 mayors from across the country. The group has many mayors from the urban as well as the rural areas. These mayors understand the need for tracing data. They understand that Congress has done little to help gun violence and stop gun violence in this country.

They are tired of sitting back as their cities lose more and more citizens to gun violence. By the way, they are also tired of seeing the health care costs on those victims that do survive. This is something that we should be dealing with. It is a health care crisis in this country.

Last week, they held their annual conference here in Washington. They spoke with Members from both sides of the aisle. This is not a Democrat or a Republican issue. It is not a pro-gun or anti-gun issue. It is a pro-law enforcement issue with common sense, and it is supported by an overwhelming majority of Americans.

We must do everything in our power to keep guns out of the hands of those that don't deserve to have a gun. That is why I introduced the NICS Improvement Act. This bill will simply strengthen the States. Right now when the NICS system doesn't have the information in it, how can it basically report out who should not be able to buy a gun?

My NICS bill will be giving the States the money to bring their computers up to speed, so that way when someone is adjudicated in court, whether it is on a felony or on domestic violence, someone who should not be able to get a gun shouldn't be able to get approved through the approved NICS system. This is common sense.

Again, this is a pro-safety issue. It doesn't affect anyone who wants to buy a gun, but it makes this country safer from gun violence.

I know it is a very political issue. Everyone is always saying that you are trying to take away my gun. I have never done that. What I am trying to do is save lives; and I am trying to save, certainly, people from being harmed. Our mayors across this great country understand that.

We can do a better job. Congress needs to start listening to the American people. These statistics show that gun owners, by the way, approve overwhelmingly of being able to trace these guns. We should be able to do it. We can do a better job. Americans should have a safer country.

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

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

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

PERSEVERE AND TRIUMPH OVER OUR FOE

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, 271 years ago, American patriot and champion of human liberty, Thomas Paine, was born. His pamphlet ''Common Sense'' is credited with convincing the people of what was then the 13 colonies to declare themselves independent and committed to representative government and human liberty.

Paine was thus instrumental in bringing about the American Revolution. During that historic life and death struggle with Great Britain, which then was the world's mightiest empire, Paine was called upon by George Washington. At a moment when the tide seemed to be against us, General Washington implored Paine to write something that would bolster the spirits of those Americans supporting the patriots' cause.

Yes, there were naysayers and defeatists in those days too, as well as people who were demoralized by the ongoing conflict that was going badly. Yet, had those before us lost faith and given up, the cause of liberty and independence would have been lost. Thomas Paine, at this dark moment of despair, wrote ''The American Crisis.'' It was read aloud to every soldier in Washington's Continental Army, some listening while standing in the snow, freezing, ill equipped and hungry. Yet, they did not give up. They did not give into pessimism. It made all the difference for them and for us.

Every generation of Americans has to bear the weight of responsibility that comes with a commitment made to human liberty by our forefathers and -mothers 200 years ago. When freedom was in the balance and darkness of defeat loomed, Americans persevered and carried the day in the battle against tyranny and injustice, sometimes at horrendous cost, as in our Civil War when we rid America of the sin of slavery. Yes, at times, it looked as if the Union was lost.

Lincoln had the thankless job of leading this country and keeping it unified, he, and the Union soldiers, steadfast and strong. How our world would be different, our country would be different today had they quit and gone home.

In the 20th century, Americans stepped forward to save the world from the evil onslaught of Japanese militarism and Nazism and then communism. There were always low points when pessimism could have taken hold; and had America retreated, it would be a far more sinister world.

So, too, with the current preeminent threat to our security and freedom and the world's, radical Islam has declared war on our way of life. It is an enemy to the liberty those Americans before us so cherished and sacrificed to protect. We are now at a moment when the people of our country are weary of this conflict, especially as it plays itself out in far-off Iraq, where deadly explosions take the lives of Americans, young Americans, as well as Iraqis.

Let us not fool ourselves. The future of freedom and America's role in the world is in the balance. The future will be determined by what we do. Yes, there is reason for despair. The casualty lists include names of young people from Orange County, my Orange County, heroes such as young Marine Lance Corporal Marcus Glimpse of Huntington Beach, whose funeral I attended last April. Also, there is Corporal Angel Jose Garibay of Costa Mesa, and just this past weekend, the funeral of a 23-year-old second lieutenant from Irvine, Mark J. Daily. They now have joined a very selected band of brothers in heaven who gave their lives for America and for the cause of human freedom. Yes, we are proud, but also we feel a profound sadness at their loss.

Perhaps as we decide now, in this moment, when the bloodshed seems so futile, we should remember an earlier time of crisis, when the future seemed bleak, but our own resolve carried the day and the cause with it of human liberty.

I will read the following excerpt from Thomas Paine's ''The American Crisis,'' when he said: ''These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country; but he who stands by it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly: it is dearness only that gives everything its value. Heaven knows how to put a proper price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated.''

I ask my colleagues and the American people to think about these words and to stand firm for the cause of liberty for which our Founding Fathers have sacrificed so much.

We Americans, made up of every race, religion, and ethnic group have a special role to play in this world. We are the hope and light of all those who would live in freedom and long for justice. So as we face the crisis of our generation, perhaps we should again visit the

words of Thomas Paine who inspired those who came before us to persevere and triumph over a formative foe.

HONORING COACH TONY NAPOLET

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have given many speeches on the floor of the House, but none do I feel so good about as the one I am about to give about my friend and a great man in Warren, Ohio, Coach Tony Napolet.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the recently completed season and the still ongoing career of someone who is an institution in Ohio high school football in the community of Warren and the family of Warren John F. Kennedy High School. It is Coach Tony Napolet.

Overall, Coach Napolet has garnered three top 10 AP rankings, five State semifinal appearances, a winning percentage of 71.6 percent during his time at Warren John F. Kennedy High School and an overall coaching record of 191 wins, 84 losses and three ties. All of the records, all of the statistics and all of the awards, Mr. Speaker, cannot speak to the influential and inspirational man that is Tony Napolet.

Mr. Speaker, in short, he is a legend. He is funny, he is passionate, he is loyal, he cares about his kids, and he is the best. Tony Napolet is every part of what a high school football coach should be. He realizes and has always realized that the role he plays is not just that of a football coach, but as someone who is preparing young men for the next step in their lives, whether that involves football or not.

I had an opportunity as a young man to coach for a season with Coach Napolet at Kennedy, and you think about how you try to define, Mr. Speaker, or pick a couple of points that really describe Coach Napolet, and there are a couple that I think of. One is his faith in God, something that he is not afraid to share with his players, the students at Kennedy, and it is not just the prayer before the game, and it is not just the mass that we go to before the game.

It is when you go to a mass during the week or in the morning and you see Coach Napolet at one of the many churches, Catholic churches, in the City of Warren, where he is actually practicing what he is preaching. I remember him telling the kids to have a relationship with God, to make God your best friend. It is that kind of an example that he sets for his kids.

But there is another one, the St. Henry's Division V State championship game several months ago, that I think really sticks with these kids. And it is the situations that Coach Napolet is in and how he responds to them, because life many times is about how you respond to situations in your life.

The Kennedy team was, unfortunately, down 21–7. Then they got the ball, and then they were down 28–7 towards the end of the game and only a few minutes left, and the Kennedy offense got the ball back, and they ran a flee-flicker. They tried to score.

Regardless of how much time was left in the game, Coach Napolet was teaching these kids that you never give up. You persevere, regardless of what the circumstances are. And those are the lessons that he has taught those young men who have graduated from Kennedy and have played football for the Warren John F. Kennedy Eagles.

So, today, Mr. Speaker, I am not honoring a coach and his distinct record but rather a great man who also happens to be a coach.

Coach Napolet, we love you and you really are the best.

□ 2000

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN LAVELLE

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to someone that lost their life several days ago.

Today, on Staten Island, at St. Peter's Church in St. George, many gathered, family and friends of John Lavelle. He was a State assemblyman from Staten Island and also the Democratic Party leader from Staten Island. His mother, his children and not to mention his colleagues in the State legislature, the Governor, the Attorney General and many members of the City Council, Councilmen Oddo and McMahon; State Senator Andrew Lanza; State Assemblyman Vincent Ignizio; the borough president; and so many others who flocked to the church to honor a good, decent guy.

As I mentioned, he was a leader of the other party; and perhaps, if he had had his way, I wouldn't be here today. But in a way it is a reminder, and John Lavelle to me lived it, that you can disagree and you can feel very passionately about certain things, and, in fact, most often, John and I, we shared the same goals: how to help those who are poor, how to help those who are oppressed.

He was the son of immigrants. The notion that new immigrants to this country make it the great country that it is and they need our help. The fact that he was such a community oriented guy.

Some of the eulogies today emphasized not just his passion, but his son talked about John's grandson and will the community be okay now that his grandfather passed away? He had a beautiful family. Three boys and grandchildren that kept him going and kept him strong.

He was someone who came into office not just for the sake of running. In fact, he spent many years in the private sector and, while in the private sector, paid his dues. He paid his dues at the soup kitchens. He paid his dues at helping those who were poor and oppressed. Politics was his life and his passion, but it wasn't just about politics. In my opinion, John was truly someone who wanted to help others.

And I will bet you right now there are folks gathered back in Jody's Club Forest on Forest Avenue in Staten Island who are raising a beer to John and his life and his memory, as well they should, because as much as he brought to life a passion for politics, he also brought a passion to be around others and to fight hard during the day. Almost like two lawyers in a courtroom, they are fighting it out on behalf of their clients, but when the courtroom door closed, you could get together for a beer and share and swap a story or tell a joke.

The world needs more folks like him. He was someone who wasn't so caught up on style. He was focused more on substance. Indeed, a straight shooter and someone who, although you may disagree with his policies or his point of view, he knew exactly what he meant and where he was coming from.

So we pay tribute because I know sometimes in life, especially in political life, we have a tendency to get caught up in the toxic environment which is created, but I can tell you in Staten Island folks were able to rise above it. And last week alone, while John laid in the ICU, Democratic- and Republican-elected officials as well as so many family members and friends held vigil in the hospital to hope for a recovery that tragically and sadly did not come.

Staten Island was a better place because of John Lavelle. This country was well served by his service. So tonight I pay heed not as a political official here but as a friend of John Lavelle.

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.)

BRING OUR TROOPS HOME NOW

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday I participated in a rally and march here in Washington, DC, on the Mall, organized by United for Peace and Justice. United for Peace and Justice is a coalition of over 1,300 groups from all over this country.

Citizens came from near and far. They came by car and bus and train and plane to urge this President and this Congress to end the war in Iraq. They were young. They were old. They were rich. They were poor. They were

every age, every ethnic group, all religions, all with one message: Bring our troops home now.

There were six Members of Congress who were present there, and we thanked all of the people who attended for caring enough to come to Washington, DC, to spend their money to urge their government to end this war.

Mr. Speaker and Members, this was democracy at work. It was a beautiful day. People were in high spirits. We walked. We sang. We chanted. And we literally said we love this country, we love our soldiers, and we want the best for our people.

We were joined by many veterans. There were several veterans groups there. But the most moving and touching part of this march was the mothers who marched with us, and they had signs. Some of them had signs of their sons who had been killed in Iraq. Some of them brought the message that they had paid a huge sacrifice and they did not wish Americans to continue paying this high price for a war that we should not be in.

This is a war that it is easy to be against, because we were led into this war under false pretenses. There are no weapons of mass destruction. We have been told that we would be greeted with open arms. We were told that we would be seen as the liberators. None of that was true. We are occupiers, and they want us out of Iraq. It is not simply that the Sunnis want us out of Iraq. It is not simply that the Shiites want us out or the Kurds want us out. They all want us out of Iraq.

This was a wonderful weekend because not only did we march and we rallied, but the marchers came to Capitol Hill and they lobbied their legislators. They knocked on their doors. They came from all these towns and hamlets and cities all over America to talk with their legislators. This truly was democracy at work.

And today we filled 1100 Longworth, the Ways and Means room, where we had a forum with 11 book authors who have written about the war in Iraq, what is wrong with it and why we should get out, and did we have a discussion. It was one of the most beautiful discussions with highly intelligent authors who have done research, who have put a lot of work into producing these books. And they shared with us in a very profound way what they knew and why they had decided to take a part of their lives to stop and write about what is wrong with our being in Iraq.

So this was a wonderful weekend. This has been a wonderful time. I keep saying this is democracy at work because this is what the Constitution is all about. It is about participation of the citizens.

The citizens of this country are sick and tired of this war. I don't know why the Members of Congress are allowing the citizens to get way ahead of them. They elect us to come and represent them. They think that we have the resources to know what is going on. We give a lot of money to our intelligence agencies. We should be able to tell the people what is wrong and what is going on in Iraq. But, instead, they are ahead of us; and they are urging us to stop this war.

But, in the final analysis, they know everything about what we are doing. It is not enough to talk the talk. You have got to walk the walk. They know the difference between nuancing and posturing, and they want action.

And they know that we are about to have a resolution over in this House that will disagree with the surge, the escalation that is being advocated by this President. But they also understand that we can't stop that, that the President has already started to resend soldiers. These are not new boots on the ground. These are soldiers that have done their tours, that have been sent back a second and third time, and they say that is not enough.

They will know whether or not we mean business if we are prepared to stop funding this war.

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

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

THE DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, we come to the House tonight to talk about a variety of things, most of which we will deal with taxes and the impact those taxes have on good, hard-working men and women across this country.

But I did want to respond just a little bit to what the previous speaker bragged about. She went through a long litany of good things that happened this weekend, which I certainly agree with everyone's right to do what they did and to express themselves and to come to this Capitol and make those statements.

She did leave out one minor issue, though, and that is that some of the antiwar protestors brought spray paint with them. And they came to this Capitol, this hallowed ground, the center of liberty for the world, which looks to this Capitol building for that; and those folks brought spray paint, and they painted the walls. They spray painted anarchy signs and anarchy slogans on the walls of this Capitol, which I think defacing public property under any circumstance ought to be wrong. That is wrong.

What else is wrong is the fact that the Capitol Hill Police were told to allow that conduct to go on. And there were reports in one of the scandal rags today that the police's reaction to that was that they were disgusted. They were livid about the fact that they were forced to allow these anarchists to deface this public property, this building, which all of us serve in. Most of us serve very proudly here.

So not all of the folks who came this weekend conducted themselves the way that they should have, and there was a problem with that. And, hopefully, we will learn what the responsibility of the Democratic leadership was, what their role was in overriding what the Capitol Hill Police's natural and normal reaction would have been. Where did that come from and who told them not to stop that? We hope that we get some answers to those questions over the next coming days, because it is a serious issue when people are allowed to deface this building.

But let us talk about taxes. As our sign shows here, we are 1,433 days away from a staggeringly large tax increase. The first year I think it will be $250 billion of taxes. In 2011, we will get an immediate bump. The Democrats simply have to do nothing.

In the 109th Congress, Lou Dobbs and others accused us of being a ''do-nothing Congress.'' Well, you can put that label on the coming tax increase, because the Democrats simply have to do nothing over the next 4 years, and that is exactly what is going to happen.

Built into the current law, the current Tax Code has a drop-dead date of December 31, 2010, in which the changes made to the estate tax will expire and the other provisions of the 2001/2003 tax reductions will also expire. So if the Democrats do nothing, then we are 1,433 days away from that major increase. We are only 11 days since the last tax increase by the Democrats. And that was on Thursday a week or so ago where they increased taxes on the oil and gas business in this country, and we have talked about that some as well.

□ 2015

We are going to have several speakers tonight, and the first one that we are going to yield time to is my good colleague, JOHN SULLIVAN from Oklahoma.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend from Texas for doing this tonight, and also my friend, Congressman SHUSTER from Pennsylvania. This is a very important topic, talking about tax relief for America's working families, for America's small business people.

You know, we have seen a great economy recently. It is roaring along. Unemployment benefits are at an all-time low. You know, gross domestic product is up. We are seeing record numbers in our economy right now. That is due in small part, or in large part, because of the tax relief measures instituted by President Bush.

I do not think, you know, tax relief is the only answer to a robust economy

like we have right now, but it is certainly a piece of that puzzle. You know, other countries have used tax relief as an economic tool to get out of economic slow times. And America has done the same. It has been very important that we have done it.

You mentioned too, Congressman CONAWAY, about the oil and gas tax. You know, oil and gas keeps this economy going. People do not realize, especially people from producing States how vital that is to our economy.

There are so many byproducts from oil and gas. Taxing them is ridiculous. We need to spur domestic production here in the United States and become less reliant on foreign oil, not more reliant upon foreign oil.

Taxing the people that produce that, which is really not only the large oil, Big Oil like the Democrats like to say, but small producers out there, independent producers, small mom and pop independent producers that produce 90 percent of the domestic oil and gas in this country. It is absolutely wrong.

You know, people pay a lot in taxes. We pay too much in taxes. You know, government needs taxes for vital government services like the war, vital infrastructure needs. It is very have important that we have taxes for that. But I think that government has gotten too big, and we have taxed too much.

If you think about it, if you look at your Federal tax, State tax, city tax, Congressman, we are taxed a lot. You get up in the morning, you take a shower, the alarm clock wakes you up, if it is an electric alarm clock, you pay taxes on electricity to get you up.

If you take a shower, you pay taxes on the water, soap and shampoo. If you eat breakfast, you pay tax on the cereal you eat. You go to work, if you drive there, you pay the motor fuel tax, tire disposal fee, tag tax.

You go to work, you have income tax or self-employment tax. You go home have dinner, taxed on that. And we are talking, Congressman CONAWAY, you can go home, kiss your wife, you are taxed on that too, that is not free either, you have got a marriage penalty tax too.

So we pay a lot in taxes in this country. And, you know, the people that are counting on these things, if we allow the Democrats to raise taxes like they want to do, and in essence that is what they are doing if they do not continue these vital tax decreases, is they are hurting the American people, they are hurting small business.

Now, 85 percent of the people that work in this economy right now are employed or work or own a small to medium-sized business. And those people, one of the things they talk about is providing health insurance to their employees, and they have been able to do it because of the tax relief, the money that they have saved because of that.

And if their taxes go up, they are not only going to have to probably lay some people off, but they are not going to be able to provide the kind of health insurance that they want to provide for their employees. They have to make tough decisions right now, and it is wrong.

I remember Congressman SHUSTER and I, we were in the back of the Chamber when we were first elected, and the Democrats were talking about tax cuts. And they said, Bill and I heard them say that some of them were in a group and they said, if we allow people to keep that money, they might not spend it the right way.

Who are they to say that? It is their money. I mean, it is your money; it is not their money. The money that we take from, that we confiscate from taxpayers is not the politicians' money, it is not the Washington, DC people's money. It is the people's money, and they know best what to do with their own money.

And what they are going to do, if you allow a family to keep more of what they earn, they are not going to go bury it in the yard; they can if they want. But they are probably going to go out and buy other things that are taxed. It is going to stimulate the economy. That is what taxes really do. There is a dynamic economic effect of tax relief.

If you allow that money to bounce around the economy several times, it is going to find its way back to Washington anyway. But several people get to touch that dollar before it gets here. It spins around the economy. There is a dynamic economic effect to that. When you take money out of Washington, DC, it helps people, it helps the economy, it bounces around. It is going to find its way back anyway. And tax relief does work.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned a couple of things that I would like to flush out. You mentioned the phrase ''Big Oil.'' It is used as a pejorative, of course. But under the Democrats' H.R. 6 they passed 11 days ago, Big Oil is defined as any C corporation exploring for oil and gas, any C corp. That includes ExxonMobil, all the way down to the smallest C corp, and that is tax phrase, for those out there that might be listening. But it is any C corp that has now got a tax rate that went from 32 to 35 percent, if this H.R. 6 sees the light of day from the Senate, and with the President signing it. So Big Oil includes a lot of folks, hardworking men and women who try to make a living in the oil business.

When I ran for Congress 3 years ago, I ran under the idea that being a CPA, being a business man, that that viewpoint was underrepresented in Congress. I did not have any empirical data to substantiate that, but it seemed to be the case. And once I got here, though, I had discovered that there are an awful lot of our colleagues who really do not understand how hard it is to make money, that finding a product that you can sell to somebody else, and having bought or built that product for less than what you sell it for, and all of those kinds of things that go into making money is hard to do.

There are an awful lot of our colleagues who simply do not appreciate how hard that really is. So when they talk about tax increases or taking money away from hardworking folks, they do not understand the impact that that has.

One of the other things you mentioned, and you and I share districts where oil and gas are a major piece of the business, is how rugged and resilient and self-reliant these oil and gas guys are. We hit them with a tax increase 11 days ago. One of the things we talked about in the lead up to the debate to try to convince our colleagues on our side of the aisle and the other side of the aisle that this was not really a good idea is this idea that if you reduce the amount of money that is going into increases in domestic production, then you will lower domestic production.

I think everybody agrees on that we ought to be less dependent on foreign oil and foreign natural gas. That phrase rolls off every tongue in this Chamber. The truth of the matter is from where we are today to that point is a decade-long journey. And that decade-long journey is going to be driven with cars and trains and airplanes using fossil fuels.

So to the extent that we can increase domestic production, it seems to me logical that that would reduce the amount of foreign crude that we would have to import. And while it is difficult to exactly understand what the impact will be on those oil and gas C corporations with this tax increase they got 11 days ago, logic will tell you, if you spend less money in the exploration for crude oil and natural gas domestically, you will get less of it. That is just the mechanics. I think that is a pretty easy thing to say.

I appreciate my colleague coming here tonight from Oklahoma, sharing with us his thoughts on tax increases. I would now like to recognize my colleague from Pennsylvania who is actually the moving force behind these weekly hours. It is my pleasure this week to replacing him here in the well, but BILL SHUSTER from Pennsylvania has got some thoughts.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Texas for taking control of the time. I have got a bad wheel, but I did not want to miss this. I think it is so important.

I want to start off by just echoing your sentiments about what happened here in the capital this week. I mean, a bunch of anarchists, they pushed forward on the Capitol Police, as you said, and the Capitol Hill Police let them come through and deface the United States Capitol.

And I heard that they were saying, that they were chanting it was their

right to. But they have no right to deface the United States Capitol. This belongs to all of the Americans. And nobody has a right to do what they had to. I really want to know, and I hope there is an investigation, there should be an investigation to find out why the Capitol Hill Police did not resist them, and you know the party that is in the majority needs to answer, needs to stand up and be held accountable, because they are in charge, they are the ones that are giving the instructions to the Capitol Hill Police.

I want to know if the majority party said, we do not want you to confront them; let them do whatever they want to do. Because it is outrageous. And all Americans that are watching tonight, I do not know how widely it has been reported. I have heard a few reports. But, you know, it should have made top news that a group of anarchists spray painted their symbols on the Capitol. I heard the report was that there was no incident. Well, there should have been an incident. There should have been an extreme incident of resistance by the Capitol Hill Police to not allow someone to deface what I consider, this is the crown of America, this is the people's House and nobody should ever be allowed to do that. So I am outraged by it.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, my sense from being around for a little better than 2 years now is that the reaction that was forced upon the Capitol Hill Police went against their nature. Their nature is to protect, not only to protect you and I and any other lawabiding citizen on these grounds, which is their job, but to protect these grounds as well. So it is inconceivable to me that our Capitol Hill Police, whose natural, normal reaction would be to stand back and let those spraypainters have at it, at the walls of this Capitol building. They had to have gotten some instructions from somewhere. And given the comments reflected in the paper today, that is clearly the case. They were told to stand down and not protect this building as is their nature and their love.

These folks love their job and do a great job at it. And so I agree with my colleague.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, some of them have given their lives up to protect this building and Members of Congress. I agree with you, I cannot imagine that they did not get orders to stand down from the highest level.

Once again, the party in the majority runs this place. They need to be held accountable. They need to stand up and say what they did do, what they did not do. But in the future, if there are going to be, I am certain there will be, as there has been throughout our history, protests throughout the capital, and people have a right, absolutely have a right to protest, but they do not have a right to do it violently; they do not have a right to deface property that belongs to all of the taxpayers. So the questions need to be asked and we need to have answers from the majority party.

Back again to why, the main reason we are here tonight, is to talk about the 1,433 days from now, if the majority, the Democrats in Congress, do not act over the next 4 years, or 1,433 days, we are going to see an over-$200 billion tax increase on Americans, on the American family, on small businesses.

And that is going to significantly hurt this economy. And you just have to look at the facts. Over the last 4 years, 7.2 million jobs were created in this country because of those tax cuts. Just in December, 167,000 jobs were created. The unemployment rate at 4.5 percent, the lowest average it has been in five decades.

If we do not extend them, if we do not do what is responsible, then money, real dollars are going to come out of the American people's pocket. A family of four, making in the $40,000 range, they are going to see a tax increase of about $2,000.

Now, to some in this body, $2,000 may not seem like a lot of money, but it is to a hardworking American family. $2,000 is a nice down payment on a new car, $2,000 will buy you a new washer and a dryer. $2,000 helps you put your son or daughter or yourself through college or to get educated or trained on something.

So I hope that the American people that are watching tonight, whether you are Republican, you are a Democrat, there are lessons for us all through history, recent history, on why tax cuts work, why they are a good thing for the economy, why Americans should be allowed to keep their hard-earned dollars. You have to go back to the 1960s.

President Kennedy, he cut taxes. What did he see? The economy came on strong. Revenues to the Federal Government increased dramatically. We saw that in 1980. And today we are seeing it at record levels. As the gentleman from Oklahoma pointed out, there are a lot of things in this economy that are happening because of those tax cuts, and we need to make sure that they continue.

It is startling to me. Although, I watched and was obviously very keenly aware of what the Democrats were saying during the last campaign. And the first thing that they basically said, when you listen to the incoming chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, he basically told the American people that he did not see one of those tax cuts that really had merit and that everything was on the table. So the American people should not be surprised when they see these tax cuts.

And just 11 days ago was the first Democratic tax increase. They changed the rules of the House to make it a simple majority. When we put it in place as the majority party, it had to be three-fifths of votes to increase taxes. They made it a simple majority, because they knew how difficult it is going to be to get a majority in this House to raise taxes on the American people.

□ 2030

So, once again, if we don't stand up and fight, and I hope my Democratic colleagues who aren't here tonight, the Blue Dogs who come down and talk about fiscal responsibilities, if they don't join with us to fight these tax cuts, they are going to take part in this huge tax increase that is going to occur on the American people. So I appreciate the gentleman tonight hosting this hour.

Mr. CONAWAY. Let me make a comment if I could on something that you had said. You talked about what hardworking Americans do with the money that they earn and keep; and you went through a litany of things that they buy, washers and dryers, cars and all these kinds of stuff. If you think about it, though, everything that they bought is made by somebody; and that person made a living making whatever it is they made.

Then there is also a good string of, for lack of a better phrase, middlemen in between that product being made and it being sold to the American consumer, which is the ultimate driver of this economy. You have got truck drivers and warehousemen and storage handlers and retailers and a long list of people who take that finished product from wherever it is made, even if it is made overseas, from wherever it is made, and they get it all the way to that retailer's shelf, where an American consumer takes that money that he or she earned themselves and they go buy that product.

That starts the cycle all over again that has built a growing economy that is now in its fourth year of growth; and if you look at the CBO estimates that the Budget Committee will talk about tomorrow, that growth is expected to continue over the next 10 years.

Now, 10 years is about as far as we project anything. And like I said, I am a CPA, and I have been dealing with projections for a long time. Quite frankly, years 5 on through 10 are just mathematical exercises. I mean, who knows whether or not those are going to be correct or not? The 2007 estimate is pretty good. The 2008 estimate is pretty good. But, beyond that, it gets a little fuzzy as to the accuracy of those projections. But, nonetheless, those projections show an improving economy.

Not only that, but the Federal Reserve as well shows an improving economy; and that is because people are out buying things, furnishing homes, buying cars, all the kinds of things the American consumer does to continue to drive this economy.

The Federal Government, the best thing we can do is get out of the way. And one of the best things we can get out of the way of are tax increases, and there is a big one coming.

You know there is a phrase out there, if a violent jihadist threatens your life, you probably ought to take him serious. Well, I think the same thing applies to tax increases. If somebody

threatens you with a tax increase, then I think you ought to take them serious. And we are 1,433 days away from a significant tax increase.

I now want to go to my good colleague from Kentucky. GEOFF and I are in the same class. The 109th Congress was our first time here. And Geoff has got a big family, which in and of itself contributes to the economy, we appreciate that, of your part of Kentucky as well the rest of the United States. So, GEOFF, share with us tonight what your thoughts are on taxes and the American people working.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Just as a former small business owner, one of the things that I would like to point out, that 88 percent of new job opportunities are created by small business owners. They are created by land developers, by construction companies, by small machining and tooling companies, small fabrication businesses, distribution businesses, professional services businesses, financial services. The glue that holds the institutions in our communities together, the framework of members of the National Federation of Independent Businesses, of our local Chambers of Commerce that serve that valuable function of communicating an agenda that focuses on growth, that strengthens our Nation for the long run.

And I think that one of the things that I would like to highlight tonight, again, is this theme that when people voted in November, much perception nationally was focused on a view that national security situation was driven by emotion. But the reality is that in that election, short of making significant strategic changes in the leadership of this Congress, America voted to increase taxes on every working family in America by at least $2,000 a year.

One of the things that I have told folks for many, many years is we don't need to raise taxes. We need to create taxpayers. Government does not create jobs, and government itself does not create wealth or a nest egg for families of America to build for the future. What government can do, however, is set a framework for achievement, a framework where people can pursue opportunity.

The Constitution tells that the government is to provide for the common defense and to promote the general welfare. What are some of the ways that we can promote that general welfare? One of the key ways to promote the general welfare is to allow people to keep more of what they earn because they will invest it in a way that focuses on the needs of their family. They will invest it in immediate needs, in consumer goods that have a ripple effect of creating jobs. They will invest in future and retirement plans for themselves and set aside money to grow for college. All of this is fueling the economy, and keeping this in the private sector is very critical.

Some of the things that the tax cuts did were allow people to keep more of what they earn. We eliminated the marriage penalty. We increased the child tax credit from $500 to $1,000. That meant, in the case of my family, nearly $3,000 that was left to reinvest in the lives of our children and their education to save for their future. It makes a very, very big difference. When we look at the marriage penalty, it put a significant impact on working families. And, again, I come back to the fact that the average family in America is facing a $2,000 per year income tax increase.

But there is another side of this from a small business standpoint of job creation. I would like to highlight one man whose small business benefited in the manufacturing world, creating jobs in his community, impacted the local economy because of pro-growth policies that were continued in the last Congress, allowing not only individuals and families but also small business owners to keep more of what they earn, to be able to invest that, to write down debt and to prepare to compete in the future.

We are a global economy. It is critical for us to be able to allow people to invest for the future. Remember, we don't need to raise taxes. We need to create taxpayers.

Robert Prybutok of Newark, Delaware, owns a company called Polymer Technologies. Because of the tax cuts that were enacted, he was able to hire 10 new employees in 2003 and 2004. He had approximately 72 employees in January of 2003 and now has about 90 employees.

His business continues to grow and with it the need to buy new equipment. By utilizing the expensing provisions of the tax cuts, he was able to purchase two new pieces of equipment, increase his productivity, thus increasing the security of those jobs of his company; and it saved him about $125,000 that would have been lost in cost. This is money that can be invested in the future.

Without the ability to expense his equipment, he would have been hard pressed to purchase that equipment in the first place. He needed to grow his business and pay the taxes that he owed.

And I think the one thing that I keep in mind from my experience walking the shop floors of many, many businesses during the era of the Clinton administration where these breaks were not in place for America's manufacturing companies. People made decisions based on the structured Tax Code. They withheld making needed investment in competitive productivity improvements, needed investments in the professional education of their employees because they were uncertain of what the future held. Had the tax expensing provisions been in place, they could have made those investments more easily.

And I think it is important to keep in mind that it allows a business to invest in the future to create more taxpayers. I think that this ability to expense equipment, this ability to make investments that are going to be job-creating investments, maybe a short-term deferral of tax payments to the Federal Government, actually will increase revenues.

How have we seen that? We have seen it over and over again. As taxes are cut, more money goes into the investment economy, more jobs are created, more taxpayers are created, and tax revenues are an all-time high right now in the Federal Government.

I think there are countless stories that we can share of successes on a small scale in small business which is really the opportunity to live the American dream. The vast majority of jobs in this country, nearly 90 percent, 88 percent are created by small business owners. They are not created by large corporations.

There is so much of a focus on the class warfare rhetoric that goes on in the Chamber that misses the point where the majority of the Americans work. And the majority of Americans work in small business. That is why we need to reduce the burden on those small businesses, create incentives so they can create jobs and create taxpayers to promote the future for their employees.

With that, I would like to yield back to the gentleman from Texas to share more of his perspective on this matter.

Mr. CONAWAY. I appreciate my colleague from Kentucky joining us tonight to have this conversation among the several of us.

I served on the Chamber of Commerce board in Midland for a number of years, and one of the things that the chamber looks at is the impact that payroll has on a community. There is a difference of opinion among folks on the chambers as to what this number ought to be, but there is a guess as to how many times that payroll turns over in a community. In other words, when the payroll is made, it is spent on local goods and services, and that person then turns around and spends it on local goods and services, and the range is, for most economic development guys, is between four times to seven times. Depending on the number you want to brag on, it will be somewhere in that range.

So the payroll that gets created that my colleague from Kentucky was talking about a while ago where these small businesses add employees turns over several times within the community and creates additional jobs, additional opportunities and additional prosperity for those folks.

It is interesting, I had a conversation this afternoon with my staff, and we are all anxiously awaiting the continuing resolution from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Chairman OBEY of the Appropriations Committee posted on his Web site this afternoon that they did in fact file the continuing resolution. And my staff called, and we went to the Web site. They said it was

filed. And me and my staff did. Of course, nothing is there.

So my staff called over there and asked and they got kind of a runaround. So I said, well, I will just call. So I called, and I said, hi, this is Congressman MIKE CONAWAY, and I would like to see a copy of the continuing resolution that has been filed.

And the lady said, well, it has not been filed.

I said, well, I am looking at a Web site for the Appropriations Committee, and it says they have filed.

She said, well, I know. I am not sure why that is up there, but.

I said, well, am I getting the runaround here? Is it really up there or not?

She said, no, that is a mistake. It hasn't been filed.

So, anyway, we are all awaiting the continuing resolution.

In the meantime, we are all trying to guess at what might happen. And over at the Social Security Administration they are concerned about furloughing employees because the continuing resolution that they thought might be in place will fund them at lower levels than they have been expecting and so that they are going to have to lay off employees.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield on that point for a moment?

Not only does it affect employees in the Social Security Administration who process checks for our senior citizens, it also affects our ability to fight against Islamic radicalism, fight against terrorist groups.

I flew in today with members of the FBI Southern Ohio office out of Cincinnati coming in for some business here in Washington, and they shared their concern over the lack of a continuing resolution. Was the money going to be there to fund their operations? And, right now, one of the things that our national security apparatus, because of this Democratic Congress, is having to cut positions, not just a few positions but nearly 3,000 positions because of the lack of funds to do their job which we had provided for them.

When we talk about the issues related to bringing this continuing resolution, there was a clear statement that was made about the desire to work harder. Well, last week, 2 days, we were done by 2 p.m. This week, I am reading the schedule, and it says, tomorrow, Tuesday, we will be out around 2 p.m. Wednesday, no rule yet on the continuing resolution, but likely we will be out at 2 p.m.

I don't know how many nights we worked long, long hours in this Chamber, long, long hours in committee to get the people's work done. And now we have Federal law enforcement.

I got a call today from an aviation unit in the Army that is now very concerned about its receipt of dollars. And we are inside the 48-hour window, have no language on what this bill is. They are limiting debate to 2 hours, which I think is a very powerful statement of the direction in which they choose to take legislation, that not only did we have a tax increase 11 days ago but spending is going to be without accountability.

I intend to vote against this resolution if this resolution will not disclose the information that is necessary for us to do our job. Because, ultimately, they are going to create some real problems leading up to the foundation for this tax increase in 1,433 days.

Mr. CONAWAY. And my good colleague has added to the list of folks that are going to be impacted by this reduced cash flow to these agencies. Think about that for a second. That is what we are talking about, over at the Social Security Administration, at the FBI and other places that GEOFF has talked about. It simply reduced cash flow to those agencies; and, because there is a reduction in cash flow, they are reducing mission, they are laying people off, they are doing less service. The Social Security folks won't have as many people to service all those callers out there.

That is exactly what happens in small businesses when we reduce their cash flow by tax increases. Because money that would otherwise go into making payrolls and paying benefits and adding folks to the payrolls is now coming into these Federal Government's coffers being spent in ways that, for the most part, I suspect they are good, but there is an awful lot of waste in there. And, clearly, our taxpayers out there can spend their own dollars better than we can on their behalf.

□ 2045

Now, subsequent to my conversation with my staffer, we have gotten a rumor. And again in the minority we get to whine all the time. It is just going to be our job over the next 2 years, just to be very good whiners. It is not in our nature, it is very unlike us to do it, so we will probably do it very poorly. But we don't know what is going on over there. It has been days and days and days. These folks knew they had the reins of this thing starting January 4; they knew that on November 8. And we have had now over 2 months that they knew that this was going to be the circumstance, that they were going to be dealing with the continuing resolution, and we have no resolution to the continuing resolution. And I am sure there are good reasons on their side of the aisle for why they have not been able to make these decisions, but surely these decisions are not going to involve some of the draconian nonsense that many of our agencies are worried about, and they are worried about it because they don't have the facts. Most folks deal real well with facts. What we don't deal well with is uncertainty, innuendoes, and rumors.

So I would encourage our folks on the other side of the aisle to get that CR done if you are going to do it. If not, then let's start bringing appropriations bills to the floor. There is nothing wrong with that. That is a nice way to do it. We should be legitimately criticized because we didn't get it done under our watch, but that same criticism now applies to the folks in charge. It doesn't matter, just get on or off the pot, as they say. Bring a CR to the floor, show us what it is; if you are hiding stuff, give us a second to try to find that out. Or let's go at it from the appropriations standpoint and bring those to the floor one at a time, as we should have.

Mr. SHUSTER. Would the gentleman yield for a second?

Mr. CONAWAY. Sure.

Mr. SHUSTER. I don't know if this is accurate or not, but I have heard people talking that the CR is going to come to the floor and it is going to look like an omnibus bill. And you know, an omnibus is like a Christmas tree; they hang everything on it that they want to get through. But that is the rumors that are swirling around here, that it is not just going to be just a CR, it is going to be an omnibus. And that is going to be bad for spending, and they are not living up to their word.

Mr. CONAWAY. I have also heard they are going to wipe out all the earmarks. It will be their definition of an earmark, and it will be interesting to see which earmarks really get zeroed out and which ones don't and how they parse that definition between the two in order to keep the ones they want and peel out the ones that they think are wasteful spending, and it will be interesting where those earmarks impact and which districts are the ones that really get peeled out.

Mr. SHUSTER. Kind of like their definition of openness.

Mr. CONAWAY. Exactly. And transparency.

Mr. SHUSTER. Openness and participatory, and transparency. And here we have passed several bills, and having gone through the committee nobody has seen them until they show up on the floor.

Mr. CONAWAY. It is not likely that this continuing resolution will go through committee either. It is just going to get dropped on us like a laser-guided bomb, rushed straight to the floor, not going to go through committee, not going to have the openness and the transparency and the 48 hours and all the kinds of things that our good colleagues on the other side of the aisle promised in October.

Promises in October are hard to keep in January, and we are seeing it, and we will continue to try to point that out without seeming as whiny as it sounds, I suspect, to my colleagues and my constituents in west Texas. But that is going to be part of our role over the next 2 years, is to be the loyal opposition, to try to do so in a respectful manner as we point out promises made and promises broken by folks on the other side of the aisle.

Does my colleague from Kentucky have some other thoughts?

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. One of the things that I would like to share as we come back to this issue of tax policy, again, I come back to my time walking the shop floor, and for me the one thing, you hear a lot of stories and a lot of perspectives, but for me it always came back to show me the numbers. Let's take a look at the truth, what reality is, and be able to make our decisions from there. Here is the truth about the impact on creating jobs for working families, good jobs, jobs where there would be opportunities for health care, to fund their children's education, looking to the future.

In less than 3 years, because of this policy of allowing people and allowing and incentivizing small businesses to keep more of what they have earned, the U.S. economy has grown by $2.2 trillion. Let's put that in perspective for a moment. That is larger than the entire Chinese economy. That is the growth of the United States.

There is a lot of concern about international trade in this global economy. Just in 3 years, our increase in economic growth is bigger than the size of the entire economy of our largest international competitor. It is much larger than the total economic size of India, Mexico, Ireland, and Belgium. And I think the issue here at the end of the day is being able to allow people to keep more of what they earned, to create taxpayers, not raise taxes, because the proof is in the numbers. The proof is in changing opportunities. Yes, we are going through a time of economic adjustment, but at the same time record job creation as our economy adapts to the 21st century to compete effectively, and that is the future that our kids are going to have.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank you.

Let's go to another colleague of ours from Georgia. Dr. PHIL GINGREY is an OB/GYN doctor, a provider of professional services for most of his career. And while all of us have great respect for physicians, at their core they run small businesses and maybe big businesses. But at its core the practice of medicine has to be a business, because he and his colleagues have to make money, they have to be able to pay their payrolls, they have to be able to buy the supplies for their offices, and all of those employees and provide benefits and all the things that they do. So in addition to providing I suspect outstanding professional care over a long, long period of time, and maybe he will share with us the number of babies he helped deliver, he is also a businessman. And in my book, that is a good two hats that he has worn over these years. So let's hear tonight from Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank my colleague from Texas for yielding, and I am proud to be here tonight with the Countdown Crew to talk about an issue which typically you would think or you hear said many times that our physician colleagues across this country are not real good business men and women. But as my colleague, the CPA from Texas, just pointed out, they better darn well become good business men and women.

Mr. CONAWAY. If the gentleman would yield for a second. I suspect that comment is made about their other business decisions. Running their practices, they are great business persons; but maybe in the oil business, they may not be as good.

Mr. GINGREY. I appreciate the carve-out, but it probably specifically applies to the gentleman, the peach from Georgia.

But in any regard, the main point that I would like to make, and maybe my colleagues, the gentleman from Kentucky and my good friend from the Keystone State Mr. SHUSTER from Pennsylvania, have already mentioned this, but if Congress takes no action, and that is what the Countdown Crew is talking about in these 1,433 days leading up to January 1, I think, 2011. But in 2007, in fact I think this has already occurred, but we can do something about it because tax day, April 15, is, thank goodness, 3 months away. But taxpayers in States with no income tax will not be allowed to deduct their sales taxes from Federal income tax if we don't make a change. And we are talking about Representative CONAWAY's great State of Texas, a highly populated State. We are talking about the great State of Florida. We are talking about Tennessee and other States. And this is significant, because citizens in those States pay no income tax, no State income tax, but pay huge sales tax to fund their State government, and that will go away if we don't do something about it.

In 2007, I think the gentleman from Kentucky mentioned this, the exemption for the alternative minimum tax will decrease from the current $42,500 to $33,750 for a single filer, and from $62,500 to $45,000 for a married couple.

In 2009, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, the standard deduction for couples as a percentage of the standard deduction for a single individual decreases from 200 percent to 174 percent, further discouraging couples from entering into the great sacrament of matrimony.

And in 2010, the section 179, Small Business Expensing Cap, will decrease from $100,000 to $25,000.

I heard my colleague from Kentucky, Representative DAVIS, talk about this just a minute ago; and he made the comment that most of the jobs in this country, and that would include those 7 million new jobs that have occurred since 2003, in fact more new jobs than the European Union and Japan combined, most of those 7 million new jobs are created by small business men and women. And this section 179 which allows them to write off $100,000 in the first year for capital improvement, buying a new piece of equipment, indeed, expanding the size of their operation so they can hire new people, if it goes down to $25,000, you are going to see, just like a stand-alone increase in the minimum wage, you are going to see jobs lost, and all of a sudden that 7 million number is going to start trickling down.

It has been mentioned that the child tax credit will decrease from $1,000 to $500.

And listen to this, my colleagues: on marginal rates, if this has not already been mentioned, and even if it has, it probably deserves repeating, the 35 percent bracket will increase to 39.6 percent; the 33 percent bracket, 36 percent; 28 percent bracket, 31 percent; 25 percent, up to 28 percent; and, worst of all is the 10 percent bracket will increase to 15 percent. And not to mention capital gains going back up to 20 percent. Dividends, again, double taxation on dividend. All of these things are going to really hurt this economy.

And while maybe under our majority leadership there are a lot of areas in which we could have done better, I truly believe, and I think my colleagues here tonight would agree, we could hardly have done better than the 2001 and 2003 tax cut package, many of which I just enumerated, including finally trying to get rid of the double taxation of the death tax, the estate tax. This is what Republicans have done. This is what this President has done. And this has resulted in 7 million new jobs.

Instead of an estimated cost to the revenue of $1.3 trillion over 10 years because you made these cuts, guess what: within 2 years we have run the revenue, I think, and my colleague from Texas knows these numbers better than I do, but something like $275 billion more revenue because of the tax cuts.

I have said this a number of times on this floor, and maybe the folks at home watching on C–SPAN know this, but in 1960 Democratic President Kennedy cut taxes, revenue went up drastically; in 1980, President Reagan, Republican President, did the same thing and the revenue went up. And of course that is the case that we have here today.

Unemployment rate across the country, 4.6 percent. In my State, where we have actually, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, we have actually lost a lot of jobs here recently because both General Motors and Ford have shut down plants that have been in Georgia for a long time, but our unemployment rate is just barely above 5.1 percent, and we are growing jobs in other areas, small businesses primarily as I said earlier.

So to be here tonight to talk about this, talk with the Countdown Crew why this is so critical, because we know the Democratic majority has already said it. But this issue of PAYGO that they have put in the rules package, it is an absolute farce. It doesn't even look like the PAYGO provision that the then-ranking member on the Budget Committee, Mr. SPRATT from South Carolina, that what he proposed was that there would be no point of order waiver allowed; and yet in this

new rules package that they proffered in the first week of the 110th, they allow that. So that at any point if PAYGO is violated, then they can simply in their Rules Committee waive that point of order. Or if they don't want to appear hypocritical and they don't waive the point of order, then whatever is done on the Senate side and comes back as a conference committee, they waive all points of order. So to have a really meaningful PAYGO provision, then it needs to have the force of law.

And I will conclude by pointing out the double standard here. What the Democrats would consider a tax cut and the expiration of these tax cuts as something that has to be offset, but they would not consider the extension of a program that expires, that has a sunset. Let's say as an example, and I think this is a great program and I hope we continue it and maybe even make it better, but as an example of the hypocrisy of PAYGO, take something like the SCHIP program which was authorized 10 years ago and we spend about $5 billion a year on that program. It is scheduled to sunset in June, I think, of 2007, this year. And I am sure it will be reauthorized, but that additional spending will be outside of PAYGO rules.

But yet when we have these tax cuts that expire, if we, the Republican minority now, want to continue those great tax cuts for the reasons that the Countdown Crew has enumerated here tonight, then that would be considered a new tax cut and would have to be offset. It is so hypocritical, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues. I think it needs to be said over and over again, and I want to come become and join my colleagues as often as we can to talk about this, because American people need to understand.

With that, I yield back to my colleague.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank my colleague.

Let me make three points really quick and then we will go to closing comments because we have about 12 minutes left. But you mentioned the sales tax deduction. Just to help our many colleagues that have joined us tonight to listen to this great debate in the Chamber with us, let me explain to them what the impact is.

It is a matter of equity, because States that have income taxes, those income taxes that you pay in the State reduce your for Federal tax purposes. So you get to deduct those State income taxes.

□ 2100

So you get to deduct those State income taxes. States without an income tax, unless we put this provision back in, those taxpayers in effect subsidize the rest of the United States' taxpayers because there are inequitable circumstances. So being able to deduct sales taxes means that the taxpayers in Texas are on a more equal footing with taxpayers in States that have an income tax.

You mentioned the marriage penalty being a detriment to getting married. I don't know if that is the case. I do know there is a calculable tax toll for making the decision to get married. That may not dissuade couples from getting married, but it might. There is a tax toll, and all of us agree that strong families are the core of the institution that is America. And to the extent we discourage strong families, shame on us.

Finally on the 179, by dropping that deduction from $100,000 to $25,000, what happens there is the only businesses that pay money are businesses making money. You have to have taxable income in order to make money. If we have reduced the deduction by $75,000, the company has to pay tax, and let's assume a 35 percent tax rate, on that $75,000. So you take the $75,000 in profit, less the $26,500 that you pay in taxes and that net, $48,000, is all they have got left to pay dividends or reinvest in their business as opposed to the $26,250 that they could have reinvested in the equipment. So these are meaningful hits and meaningful tax policy that we ought to continue.

I yield to Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. When you talk about creating strong families, I comment on our good friends and neighbors back in Kentucky, Mike and Vonna Drake. They typify Americans living that dream of being able to pursue their own opportunity. Mike works as a pilot; Vonna is a nurse. Their children are friends with my family. I have watched their kids grow up through the years.

These policies that seem so arcane, reading about them in the news or some of the shrill rhetoric that we hear during political campaigns, have a real impact on their flexibility and ability to invest in their children's future, let alone decisions that they might make regarding their futures and careers.

In 1,443 days, my neighbors are going to have a $2,000 tax increase. They have two children. The $500 per child tax credit that was increased to $1,000, recognizing the cost of raising a family, the cost of investment in all of the needs of our children, and not simply food and clothing, but education and activities to grow them and develop character and to strengthen them for the future. That will revert by $500 per child.

Now they will have an additional $1,000 just on that alone. Because they are married, they attend church, they are committed to their faith, they are a great example of a family in our neighborhood and community, just based on the fact that they chose the course to get married, their taxes are going to be increased or they are going to have a tax penalty of 12 percent.

To your point, we need to encourage policies that will empower and strengthen families and will create taxpayers, and that will pass on that work ethnic to the next generation that made the Drakes a successful, value-adding American family. Not only do they serve their community now in their church, Vonna serves as a nurse, Mike is an aviator in the Army. He went in out of high school, got himself educated and pursued a professional career in aviation. He is a valuable member of our community.

And we need thousands and thousands of families across our districts because they are the ones who bear the burden. They are the ones who make the investment, as President Clinton likes to say. And I think of all of the dollars lost by investing in areas where it was going to create no future and create no value.

At the end of the day, unless we bring about fundamental changes in accountability, in 1,443 days this economy is going to be hurt. My friends and neighbors are going to be hurt. Small business job creation opportunities are going to be hurt because of keeping people from having that opportunity to invest and to build a future for themselves.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, and I turn to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for some closing words.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to relate two stories that I came across concerning these tax cuts.

Jim Tracy from Shelbyville, Tennessee, who is the owner of a small insurance agency, he said because of the tax cuts, he was able to use the $7,200 that he would have otherwise spent on taxes, and he bought seven new computers for his business and he hired a fourth employee. That is just one of many.

There is another story here. Kenneth Leupp of Archbold Refuse Service in Archbold, Ohio, he says, ''The tax cuts, changes in depreciation schedules and increases in dollar amount we can expense off are very welcome changes. We have made purchases we wouldn't have made under the old laws. We've saved money on taxes, increased efficiency, lowered maintenance costs, and helped stimulate the economy.''

Those are just two of thousands and thousands of experiences out there because of these tax cuts. Our purpose here tonight, although I may be repeating myself, I know that people watching C–SPAN tune in and out, but I just want to remind them that in 1,443 days, it is the countdown to the Democratic tax increase. All they have to do is run the clock out. They don't even have to act on them.

So on January 1, 2011, there will be a $200 billion tax increase to the American people. The death tax will expire, capitol gains tax, tax on dividends will expire in January of 2009. A record number of Americans are invested in the stock market with mutual funds and retirement funds. The child tax credit will be cut in half over the next couple of years. The marriage penalty will be back in place, and low-income

taxpayers will go from a 10 percent tax bracket to a 15 percent tax bracket if we don't act.

The American people need to be aware of this. And in less than 4 years, if they don't communicate to their Members of Congress that they want to see these tax cuts extended, their voices need to be heard.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania who is the chairman of the Countdown Crew where we come in weekly and talk about tax policy.

There is nothing magical about tax policy. There is nothing sacred about it. There are various terms and provisions. We ought to be about trying to find an efficient tax collection scheme that allows for voluntary compliance, a scheme that is easy to comply with and costs the least amount of money possible to comply with, but raises the minimum amount of money needed to fund the Federal Government.

The policy we have in place is incredibly complicated. I am a CPA, and I have spent 32-plus years in business, both complying with the tax law and trying to help other folks comply with the tax law. It is unnecessarily complicated, but it is the one we have got. The provisions we have, as has been mentioned tonight, the current rate on capital gains tax, the current rate on interest, the 179 deduction, the various marginal tax rates, all of those, while there is nothing cast in concrete or stone about that, nevertheless if you look at the results we have had since they were implemented in 2001 and 2003, this economy has grown with those tax policies in place.

Could the economy have grown with other tax policies in place? Certainly, but that would be a guess as to whether or not that happened. The truth is we know these were in place and we know what happened with respect to the economy since they have been in place, since they brought us out of the recession of 2000–2001.

GEOFF mentioned his taxpayer that he talks about. The guy I think about when we talk about raising taxes is a fellow working morning tour for a drilling rig company, probably the derrick man. He probably has the most exciting job on a drilling rig. Most drilling rigs of any substance have 15 to 30-foot substructure from the ground to the floor of the rig, and then they have a mast on top of that of something in excess of 100 feet. And the derrick man's job is to stand at about 90-plus feet above the substructure, so he is 120 feet in the air, and works. It is hard work. It is physically demanding and dangerous work. He is making good money. He works 8 hours and if he is lucky some weeks he gets overtime.

That is how he feeds his, and I say ''he,'' most of them are men, that is how he feeds his family. When we talk about raising taxes on individuals, I don't think about Bill Gates or Warren Buffett. I think about that guy working morning tour, for example, for Parker Drilling, or Patterson Drilling which is based in Snyder, Texas, who comes to work at 11 at night and works until 7 in the morning, and gets in a car with the other four guys on the crew and they drive home and he sleeps during the day. That is how he feeds his family. That work is 7 days a week for the most part. It is a hard job.

That is who I think about when we talk about raising taxes.

So we will be coming back here again next week on the first night back to highlight again. We will have peeled off another 7 days that we have before the automatic tax increase. We have a good colleague who gets all over us about mandatory spending. Well, this is a mandatory tax increase headed our direction, as our colleague from Pennsylvania said, if we simply run out the clock.

It will have been 18 days at that point in time since the last tax increase. We are not aware of any tax increases on the floor this week. But hang onto your wallet. Given the way so far our colleagues have run the shop, you don't get a lot of heads up on this stuff. It just comes to the floor. They could have something up their sleeve as part of the CR that would raise taxes and do all kinds of things. And I don't want to taunt them, but again not going through committee and doing regular order leads to the kind of blindsided unexpectedness where that can happen.

It has been 11 days since the first tax increase, and others are on the way.

I want to thank my colleagues from Pennsylvania, Georgia and Kentucky, and also from Oklahoma, for helping us out tonight.

REVOLUTIONIZING AMERICA'S ENERGY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to continue the effort to revolutionize American energy. We had the first breakthrough here just about a week and a half ago where the U.S. House of Representatives took the first step in the clean energy revolution.

I think it was long overdue, and I think it is going to be much enjoyed by Americans, because what we did about a week and a half ago was take the first step toward freeing ourselves from the shackles of oil and gas and in fact starting down the road toward clean energy with a high-tech clean energy future.

The way we did that, we reeled back in $14 billion of giveaways to the oil and gas industry, the most profitable industry in the history of the solar system, that had been given under the previous Congress; and we put that money for Americans to use to develop a clean energy future that can depend upon Midwestern farmers rather than Middle Eastern sheiks.

This really was a first step on a long road toward a clean energy future for America. It was a very, very important first step.

This evening I wanted to share with my colleagues some folks I have met whose lives are intertwined with that clean energy future.

We call the clean energy future the new Apollo Project because we believe we need a new high-tech energy future for this country every bit as bold and revolutionary and visionary as John Kennedy's original Apollo Project when he stood behind me in 1961 and said America was going to place a man on the Moon and bring him back safely in 10 years, and that happened.

We believe that we need that same spirit, that same idea that our genius, our innovation and inventiveness in America can create new technologies to provide us new energy.

The people I wanted to talk about tonight are all people I have met in the last month and are people who I believe exhibit why we need the new Apollo energy project and why it was a good idea for Congress to have created this clean energy fund, take money out of oil and gas and put it into clean energy. I would like to talk about some of those folks.

The first two people I want to talk about are exhibits A and B as to why we need a new clean energy future.

One is President Note of the Marshall Islands who is a gracious fellow. I met him on Bainbridge Island awhile back.

□ 2115

When I talked to him, he told me about the plight of his Nation, the Marshall Islands in the southern Pacific, very, very low atolls. They are essentially coral reefs, and they are just a few feet above sea level. What the President of the Marshall Islands told me is that his Nation is now threatened by sea level rises associated with global warming, together with the coral reefs that can be occasioned by acidification in the ocean and increasing water temperature, again because of global warming and carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.

What President Note told me is that, for the last year or so, they have had to take emergency provisions to keep the sea from encroaching where they live, essentially. They are now starting to have active consideration of where folks will have to go after they leave the Marshall Islands when the seas swallow the Marshall Islands or make them uninhabitable.

Another problem they are having is the storms are increasing in severity as well.

So here we have the President of a nation state who was in Seattle this weekend pleading for us to take measures to stop global warming to try to preserve his nation. I thought this

could be the first nation really destroyed by environmental catastrophe associated with an energy policy that is polluting the atmosphere with so much carbon dioxide.

President Note was pretty convincing that as an act of humanity we should not allow his nation to drown, and to me it was sort of a common-sense, human thing to do, to ask me to talk to my colleagues about what we could do about that, and so I am here tonight.

The second person I want to talk about is the director of relocation for a town called Shishmareff, which is a town on the northern coast of Alaska. This is a town that has been there for 4,000 years in some village system or otherwise. For 4,000 years, people have enjoyed living there, but now they are being swallowed by the sea. The Arctic Ocean is essentially intruding into the town.

If you go and google Shishmareff, Alaska, you will see pictures of the houses simply falling down into the ocean. For a combination of reasons, the tundra is melting underneath their houses, and the ocean is intruding because an ice barrier that formerly protected their village has melted. So they are both having the tundra melt underneath them and the storm waves coming in and washing away the town.

About 3 weeks ago, the town voted to move 13 miles, move the whole town, kit and caboodle, to the mainland. They are now on a coastal barrier island, and this will be the first town, Shishmareff, Alaska, the first town that falls victim to global warming in the United States, the first American town.

I cannot be thinking that that is something to be proud of, that we have an energy policy that allows the oil and gas industry and others to put untold amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. It is actually destroying an American town.

I think we ought to rally to the idea that we do not allow American towns to be swallowed by a problem. We have got to solve the problem.

So there are two people, the President of the Marshall Islands and the leader of Shishmareff, Alaska, both of whom are having their communities literally being swallowed up and having to move at some point because we have an energy policy that is fit for the 19th century, not the 21st century.

That is the bad news, but now I want to shift to some people I have met who have given me a huge amount of confidence that we can deal with this problem. Because I think if you spend time talking to the scientists and the inventors and innovators, as I have during the last year, you would be convinced that Americans, the country that had people who invented the light bulb, the jet airplane, went to the moon, perfected the Internet and mapped the human genome, are capable of creating a new energy future that will not allow the destruction of other American towns. The reason I believe that is because I know these people. I just want to share some of the people I have met in the last month.

Last Friday, I met people from a company called General Compression, and these are scientists who have invented a way to make a compressor about 80 percent more efficient which does not sound too thrilling, I suppose, until you think what it can do. Because what they can do with this compressor is put it on the top of a wind turbine and use the wind turbine that blows in the wind to compress air and then take that air and can pump it down into subterranean caverns and keep stored air under high pressure that then can be vented and used like a big battery. When you vent this compressed air, it can drive a turbine and generate electricity.

Now, the upshot of all this technology is it means that we can take wind turbines and essentially connect them to a giant battery in the form of compressed air to store that energy. This is very, very important in the effort to have clean energy because now we can make wind turbines part of the grid. We can have energy that wind turbines create. We can have access to it even when the wind does not blow. Wind does not always blow, except here in the House of Representatives, of course.

So this, for the first time, when this technology is perfected, and it is not perfect yet, will be able to perhaps double the revenues that can be generated from wind turbines, a clean energy source that does not emit one pound of carbon dioxide when we generate that electricity.

So here is a tremendous breakthrough that could make radical changes in our energy policy by perhaps doubling the efficacy, at least the revenue generation of wind turbine farms. We have had a bunch of them go up in the State of Washington. We have the largest wind turbine farm in North America in the State of Washington, which is already as cheap as any other type of energy that we have. So there is one company.

The second company, the day before I had in my office a company called A123 Battery. It is a company in Massachusetts, scientists who have spun off of MIT, largely; and A123 Battery company is a company that has developed a lithium ion battery which has tremendous capacity essentially for storing electricity. They have now signed an agreement with General Motors in an effort to provide the battery for the Volt, the first plug-in hybrid that GM has announced they would like to build in several years.

A123 Battery company, it is exciting because their technology, once it becomes commercialized, once it becomes packaged in a reliable source that we can make sure we can put in our car, will allow us to have plug-in hybrids, a car that we can take home at night, plug into a garage outlet, next day drive it up to 40 miles on electricity. And over 60 percent of our trips are under 40 miles a day, but if you want to go over 40 miles a day, then you have an auxiliary internal combustion engine that will burn either gasoline or ethanol that can take you the rest of the mileage as far as you want to drive.

So it is a plug-in, flex-fuel hybrid vehicle. Plug-in meaning you plug in at night, flex-fuel meaning runs on a gasoline or ethanol, and hybrid means it has electric and internal combustion engine.

So this company now has sort of answered the $64,000 question of how we are going to have enough battery capacity; and all they need to do, as they explained to me, is to mount some engineering. The science is there. Now they need the engineering.

This is very exciting to think that in 5, maybe 6, 7 years, we will be able to have an electrical driven car, by and large, that we can distribute energy over the electrical system.

Think about when you put those two companies I just talked about, put those two companies together. General Compression, which can perhaps double the efficacy of the wind turbine, that can generate electricity that goes out over the wires to your garage, that you plug in your car at night and drive off and get 40 miles on electricity and unlimited mileage on your gas or ethanol, a clean system, with zero carbon dioxide emissions. There is some pretty good news, and they are not the only one.

Now maybe we will not have wind turbine-driven electricity. Maybe we will have clean coal. You know, most of the energy is from coal, from electricity right now in the United States, and it is very dirty, huge gigatons of carbon dioxide which are responsible for global warming, but there may be a way we can burn it cleanly.

We can put it through a combined cycle process that can take the carbon dioxide out of the stream. We turn the coal into hydrogen. We burn the hydrogen in a gas turbine, and that generates electricity. But we have got to have some place to put the carbon dioxide so it does not get in the atmosphere. We basically sequester it, and we pump it under high pressure into the ground, and it stays there for hundreds of years, but it takes a lot of energy to compress that CO_2. For every two coal-fired plants, you have to have one just for the energy to suppress this CO_2.

But a company I talked to yesterday called RAMGEN in Tacoma, Washington, RAMGEN has a nascent technology using a very sophisticated technology to increase the efficiency of compressors by very significant amounts, which would allow us to compress this carbon dioxide and use much less electricity to do it.

So here we have a situation where we have these three companies I just talked about that may mean we would be able to have affordable, clean coal

electricity to go into our electrical grid to power our plug-ins; and, if not that, then we have wind turbine technology to power our plug-ins with a battery that works.

That is a beautifully elegant system that can keep the Shishmareff towns and the Marshall Islands that are being swallowed by the sea and keep us having cars that do not have to drive on oil from the Middle East. That is a pretty nice system. So there is a lot of great news out there, because there is a lot of great innovation out there.

But the question is, what can we here in Congress do to accelerate that rate and that pace of innovation, and this is the third thing I would like to address tonight. We have talked about the problem. We have talked about the people who are solving it, innovation, but we have a role here, too, to help accelerate that rate of innovation.

I would like tonight to talk about some of the things, not all of the things, but some of the things we can do here in Congress.

First, what we can do is try to accelerate the rate of the commercialization of this plug-in hybrid battery. It is still going to take some engineering to make sure the battery is put in sequence in a crash-worthy system.

We can pass a bill I introduced last week with some colleagues called the grid plug-in hybrid vehicle bill that will use some of this $14 billion that we have set aside for research that will help this industrial application get off the ground. It would also provide incentives for consumers to buy these products so we can help increase the demand for them; and, of course, we know once we increase demand, the cost of these goes down, the more we have on the road.

The bill would also create a Federal testing ground. We have several of these now that help prove the concept of these—that prove these concepts work, and we would build on that by providing another test facility to certify the safety and reliability of these systems.

So here is one bill that can help speed this transition to an electrical driven car, and we are very close to doing it. It may happen without Federal action, later rather than sooner, but we cannot wait. We cannot wait because of our dependence on foreign oil, and we cannot wait as the scientific panel will come out with its report this Friday again noting the danger we face as a country as a result of global warming.

So that is one thing we can do, pass this plug-in, flex-fuel hybrid vehicle bill.

Secondly, what we can do is make it easier for people to generate their own electricity. You know, photovoltaic energy where you put solar cells on your roof is becoming close to being market-driven. There are some very, very exciting things going on in photovoltaic energy right now.

A company in California called NanoSolar is producing 450 megawatts of thin cell solar cells which they hope will decrease the cost of photovoltaic cells dramatically, another company called MiaSole. But we want to make it easier for you. If you want to put it on your roof, when you generate more electricity, you are feeding it back into the grid, to basically—to sell electricity you grow at your home, homegrown electricity back to the utility company.

□ 2130

We want to make sure that you can get paid for that. So we have another bill called the net metering bill. Net metering basically means that you net on your meter what you used from the utility against what you produce and sell back to the utility.

This bill would create a right for you as a consumer, under certain rules that were set up, to sell your electricity back to your utility, make sure you can hook up, have a Federal standard to do that. That is the key to being able to get to what we call a distributed generation system, where we can have generators all around the country, including on our rooftops and our businesses and our homes, not just in large coal plants and large hydroelectric dams.

This is a pretty simple thing to do. It has been blocked now for 4 years in Congress. We are hoping that it can get through this year, a simple thing to do.

Third, we have got to increase our research and development in all of these high-tech energy fields. I just mentioned several of them. There are many others, wave power. We now have the first wave power plant that has been proposed off the coast of Oregon, 50 megawatts, with buoys that bob up and down underneath the surface that can generate very considerable electricity. There is enough electricity that could be generated off a 10-by-10 square mile area off the coast of California that, if the buoys can be shown to survive ocean conditions, can have all the electricity California could use. It is pretty amazing.

Now, there are hurdles to show that these buoys can survive in the wave power, but we need to do more in the wave conditions. We need to do more R&D on this. We need more R on the clean coal. We need more R&D on the solar thermal, which we are having great success with lately.

The reason we know this is because when we compare this to other major challenges, we are really pathetic. We are pathetic when it comes to doing R&D and energy right now.

You know, this challenge we have is at least as visionary as going to the Moon, but it affects our planet rather than the Moon. Yet we are spending one-seventh of what was spent and invested in the new Apollo Project, one-seventh per year what we spent on getting to the Moon.

That is a sad commentary on our failure to act with dispatch when it comes to energy. We would not have gotten to the Moon, probably ever, had we had such a skimpy, weak, pathetic amount of research into this basic science. We have all this explosion of information going on between nanotechnology and biofuels, which we haven't even yet talked about tonight. We have got to ramp up that Federal R&D. That is the third thing we need to do.

Fourth, we need to have major steps forward to advance our biofuels potential in this country. We have enormous potential in this country for biofuels. I have read the last few days some articles and newspapers by pundits who get to say anything they want. They don't ever have to run for election, so it doesn't matter what it is, really, I suppose.

But these pundits have suggested that biofuels could not play an important part of our role, and those people are not talking to the scientists who recognize the breakthrough technology that we are on the cusp of enjoying in this country to dramatically increase the productivity of biofuels. Now, we know we are already producing very significant sums of ethanol and some biodiesel in this country. We know that that can increase.

But what folks don't understand is that these biofuels, we are ready to take giant leaps forward to leapfrog the corn ethanol that we now use, and corn ethanol right now is what we might think of as the first-generation biofuel. It is kind of like the Wright brothers' flier. It works, you can fly, but it is just a start. We are going to enjoy succeeding generations of biofuels.

The first one that we will have will be cellulosic ethanol. Cellulosic ethanol is a fancy term that basically means instead of just using the seed of a plant to distill ethanol, you use the whole plant. You don't just use a kernel of the corn. You use everything, what they call the corn stover that grows above the ground. You mash it up, and you put an enzyme in it to break down the carbohydrates in the cell, then you distill the carbohydrates and you make ethanol.

When we do this, we will increase the productivity of the Midwestern farmer by a factor of two or three, not 5 or 10 percent, but by a factor of two or three. We will generate two or three times as much energy and money per acre as we are generating right now. This technology is ready for the first commercial plant, which should be in Idaho, a company called Iogen, that is ready as soon as they get a loan guarantee from Uncle Sam so they can build the first commercial plant to do this.

When we do this, we will be able to have a very significant amount of our transportation fueled by domestically produced biofuel. This is not me just saying this. This is the Department of Energy that has done extensive analyses of this, Department of Agriculture, a whole suite of agronomists

who have looked at it, who have basically concluded that in 25 years we can have 25 to 30 percent of our transportation fuels fueled by this, by this stream of domestically produced ethanol.

That is just a beginning. That is a second generation. A third generation could include algae. Algae has the capability of producing 50 times as much at least per acre as even the second generation of biofuels.

There is at least one company that has at least one commercial application of that technology now, basically to make diesel fuel out of algae. That is the kind of thing we need to invest in, and that is what we need to start doing.

Last, I want to mention something that is pivotal to driving these technologies, and that is the technologies that I have talked about tonight all operate under an enormous competitive disadvantage. They have to compete with other industries that have a huge subsidy that they don't get, and that's the subsidy that the fossil fuel industry has because they get to put their carbon dioxide, their pollution, in the atmosphere for free.

Now, you think about that. If a coal-fired utility right now can put its garbage, its pollution, its carbon dioxide, its pollutant that is damaging the Earth's atmosphere, that is damaging the atmosphere by the megaton and not pay a dime for it, in unlimited amounts, now, compared to what you do and what we do when we go to our county garbage dump with a pickup full of stuff out of our garden, goodness knows what we have got in the back of our basements, we have to pay money to dump our stuff in a limited space, because there is only a limited space in a garbage dump.

But utilities that put all this pollution in our atmosphere, which has limited carrying capacity for carbon dioxide, get to do it for free for as much as they want. That is a huge subsidy of those industries.

If you are a small company in California building solar cells or ocean-powered technology or wind turbines, or if you are a farmer in Ohio that is going to build cellulosic ethanol and sell it, you don't get that subsidy. It is an unfair subsidy, and it needs to stop.

The U.S. Congress needs to stand up on our hind legs and pass a cap and trade system to cap, to limit, to put a ceiling on the amount of carbon dioxide that can go in our atmosphere from these polluting industries. When we have that cap, when we limit the amount of carbon dioxide that can be put in, two things are going to happen.

We are going to protect our atmosphere for our grandchildren; and, second, we are going to give a boost to these new businesses that are really ready to start producing these products to become commercially available for the clean energy future of this country. That is a big two-fer, a clean, healthy environment and an energetic economy.

All of the things I have talked about tonight will help produce both things. This is a situation where we are going to have the cleanest policy in congressional history and the most robust economy in American history once we develop these new technologies, because we need to be the country that fulfills our destiny as being the inventors of the world.

You know, China is going to need this technology. They are building one dirty coal-fired plant a week, and they are going to need clean energy technology. We should be the one selling it to them.

Here is a great way to restore the imbalance of trade between us and China. One of these companies, the director of Ramgen, this company that may be able to do this clean coal technology, was going to China today, and here is a perfect example of how we can start to fix this terrible trade imbalance we have when we can be the sellers to the world to this clean energy technology.

So, in summary, there is some good news and bad news here tonight. The bad news is we have some fellow Americans whose talent is being destroyed by global warming in Shishmareff, Alaska.

We have a fellow citizen in the world, the Marshall Islands, whose country is being devoured by global warming. That is the bad news.

But the good news is we have a great combination of innovators, inventors, business people that are ready to tackle this problem and create these new technological solutions to this problem. One day we will be driving clean cars. We will have cleaner homes with better efficiency. We are going to lick this problem of global warming at the same time we are going to grow the U.S. economy.

That is a message that this Congress, I am proud to say, is now sending for the first time. We have broken the chains of the oil and gas industry. We have broken the chains of the 19th century, and we have entered a new century of clean energy technology.

I will look forward to more successes so we can help Americans continue to invent. It really is the American destiny to pass the new Apollo energy project and do just what John F. Kennedy did, take this country to a new vision.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to address the House once again. I just have come to the floor on behalf of the 30-something Working Group. As you know, and as the Members know, we work daily and weekly on issues that are facing the American people and also to not only inform Members of Congress but also allow the American people to get a closer glimpse of what is happening here in the Capitol dome and what is not happening here under the dome.

I am proud to report that there were a couple of days, we only worked 3 days last week, or 4, to allow the minority party to have their retreat. During that time, Speaker PELOSI and a number of other chairmen traveled to Iraq and Afghanistan to visit our troops and also our commanders in the field.

I can share with you that the trip will be talked about a little further by the Speaker tomorrow, but it is very, very important because it is the number one thing that is facing the Nation right now, and that is war in Iraq and also in Afghanistan.

Last week we spoke or talked here on the floor about the importance of the President's State of the Union, what was said and what was not said. There was some level of focus on the fact that Katrina was not mentioned not one time during the President's State of the Union, with me being from a hurricane State and representing a district that is constantly hit by hurricanes and natural disasters, just being one season away. Katrina, noted as one of the worst natural disasters of our time and one of the worst responses by this Federal Government, did not receive even a mention from the President of the United States.

I can say that there are several Members here in Congress that continue to be concerned about Katrina and the area of housing and follow-through and preparedness on behalf of our first emergency responders, or that they have the tools to respond, but making sure that FEMA has the proper oversight to be able to carry out the tasks needed in the event of a natural disaster or terrorist attack.

One other thing I think is important to be able to identify is veterans were not pointed out in this State of the Union. Looking at Katrina and the State of the Union, we must come to grips with there are two hard realities. One, if we have a natural disaster or a planned terrorist attack that takes place in this country, is the Federal Government ready to respond, especially on behalf of the executive branch? That question is still left unanswered.

At the same time, when we start looking at issues of veterans, looking at our troops, our men and women coming home, what will be the state of affairs on behalf of those veterans?

I am saying all of this to line up the debate that is going to take place after this week when we pass the continuing resolution that will be on the floor on Wednesday of this week, of what is going to happen the following week after that when the President sends his budget to Congress.

It is important within that budget to embrace some of the values of the American people and even legislation that we have filed in the 110th Congress and also that was filed in the 109th Congress.

□ 2145

I think it is important, also, to outline the fact that Americans continue to disapprove of the direction that the President is heading in dealing with the troop escalation in Iraq. I will be looking forward to hearing more about the Speaker's trip not only tomorrow in her press conference but also when she shares not only with the Democratic Caucus but with this House of Representatives.

And to see after the State of the Union, the President's polling numbers drop even to another low. What I understand from some reports, as low as 30, 28 percent. I know the President is not going to win a popularity contest, but I think it is important to be able to follow the will and desire of the American people and on behalf of the Congress.

Also, I took the opportunity today, Mr. Speaker, before coming to the floor, to take a look at what congressional leaders are saying, not just on the Democratic side of the aisle but even on the Republican side of the aisle, and there is a great debate that is going on. I pull here the Congressional Daily AM, which pretty much any staffer or Member of Congress involved in the process here in Washington, D.C., can pick it up and find out what is going on throughout the whole week; and on a number of the issues that are going to face the President, some of his strongest supporters here in Congress are disagreeing with him at this point. I think this could only boil down to Members of Congress using common sense and standing up on behalf of their constituents, either it be an entire State, if you are a Senator, or Member of Congress that represents a district. I think it is important that we exercise those values.

There will be an up-or-down vote on how the Senate feels about the troop escalation in Iraq; and I believe, reading here, that the Democratic leader, Mr. REID, has said that that vote will be taken and that there will be a number of Republicans that are going to have to take that vote because there are going to be 21 seats to defend in the Senate in the 2008 elections.

Now, saying that, Mr. Speaker and Members, this is not about politics. This is about standing up on behalf of the American people. I think Senator WEBB said it best, Mr. Speaker and Members, that if the President doesn't want to lead us in the right direction, then we need to show him the way, something along those lines. And I think it is important on behalf of the men and women that are in harm's way now and the fact that we have oversight as the legislative body in this three-branch government that we exercise our rights in this.

I want to read just a little bit here, continue from page 1 over to page 2: ''Warner's opposition to sending more troops was a heavy blow to the White House and administrative officials that hoped that the former Senate Armed Services chairman, one-time Navy Secretary would help convince colleagues to support the plan.'' I think it is important that the Senator and past chairman of that committee stand up on behalf of the American people in what is right, and I commend that on a bipartisan basis.

I think the American people and Members here in the House know exactly where Democrats stand on this issue of making sure that we bring about the kind of oversight but at the same time not just standing by and saying, well, the President is Commander in Chief; and he is making all the decisions.

I see my good friend, Congressman MURPHY, is here.

If this was left up to politics, then we would just stand back and allow the President to continue to do what he is doing, and then we could have Ground Hog Day all over again, as we had in November, Democrats continuing to gain power because of the lack of leadership on behalf of the Republican leadership to stand up to the President of the United States.

But this is not about politics. This is about protecting the American people. This is about making sure that their will and desires are represented here in the people's House, in the U.S. House of Representatives, and I am pretty sure in the Senate.

And I am hoping that Democrats and Republicans will come together. As you know, Mr. Speaker and Members, here in the 30–Something Working Group, we embrace bipartisanship. We encourage bipartisanship. And the good thing about serving in an elected body is when you are right and you are on the side of the people, then you will return back to this body. If you are wrong, I used to play football down at Florida A&M, and we used to say the blind leading the blind and the two shall fall in the ditch.

So I think it is important that if we know that the American people are looking for a new direction versus the same direction that the President was taking in the 109th and 108th Congress, the wrong direction as it relates to Iraq, then that is a decision that every Member of Congress has to make.

Mr. MURPHY, I am so happy that you are able to join us right now. I was just talking a little bit about what we finished off on last week. I talked about the fact that the Speaker was in theater, two theaters, in Iraq and also in Afghanistan. She just returned. She will be having a press conference tomorrow to talk about that a little more. The fact that on Wednesday we will be debating the continuing resolution and will be here on the floor. We will have a follow-up.

The President's budget will be handed down, I think, February 5, and some of the things which were not mentioned in the State of the Union, Hurricane Katrina and the victims of Hurricane Katrina and those Gulf States and also veterans that were left out of the State of the Union speech, which is going to be the next major wave that this country is going to be facing. How we are going to deal with the influx of new veterans coming into the system? And you pretty much heard the rest when you joined us.

But, welcome, and I yield to you.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you for yielding, Mr. MEEK.

You talked about our commitment, failed commitment, over the past several years of Republican rule in this House to our veterans, and I think of what message we send, Mr. Speaker and Members, to the young men and women who are coming back to this country who have fought for us in a war that they are beginning to understand, I think, has been so badly mismanaged and a war in which this Congress has so miserably overseen for the past 3, 4 years. But I also think about what message it sends to prospective young men and women who may want to join our Armed Forces, because we are so lucky in this country to have an all-volunteer military, and it is a blessing for each and every one of us who lives under this blanket of freedom that our volunteer military provides.

The message that we are sending them today, Mr. MEEK and Mr. Speaker, is that, one, when we send them into battle, we are not going to do it in a way that protects them with the armor and equipment that they need, that we are not prepared to send them into a conflict that we have planned for in advance for success.

But, even given all that, that when they come back to this country, unconscionably, we are not going to make sure that they have the health care that they need, that they won't wait in lines for procedures that they need, that they won't have to pay exorbitant amounts of money out of pocket for the drugs that they need to treat the injuries that they suffered on behalf of this Nation.

So for me, Mr. Speaker and Members, the issue of veterans really ties it all together for us because it talks about the values that we have as a Nation to those who have served. It talks about the misguided policies of this administration and the peril that we have put these young men and women in.

As 30–Somethings that get to stand here and as a very new member of this group, we all have friends and cousins and brothers and sisters who are fighting there, and we hear the stories firsthand from our generation or those just a few years younger than us as they come back, and the stories only get worse. We give credit to those who served, and we should give them the benefit of their service when they return here.

And I think you are very right, Mr. MEEK, to point out that that was a very noticeable absence from the President's speech, to give credit to them not just in words, not just in Veterans Day and Memorial Day ceremonies, but in the acts and in the funding that this

body is charged to provide for those men and women both when they are abroad serving for this country and here at home. And having watched the 30–Somethings do work on this floor, I know what great advocates you have been for those men and women who have served for us, Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. MURPHY, I can tell you right now that a number of those issues that we have been talking about over the last couple of 30–Something hours that we have had here on the floor, and we thank the Democratic leadership for allowing us to have this, this is a very pivotal time. And I always share with the Members, even though we come to the capital, Mr. Speaker, from our districts on a weekly basis, work together here on this highly secured complex, the sun rises and sets every day in this beautiful capital city as we look over the capital Mall, and sometimes we take the very freedom that others have provided for granted and the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to lead.

I think when historians start to look at this time when there are two wars going on, when you have millions of Americans without health care, when you have Gulf States that are there that feel that they have been forgotten, when you have veterans in the heartland of America and urban America still sharing some of the same wounds of a lack of leadership on behalf of the Congress, when you have veterans that are waiting 3 months to see the ophthalmologist, and when you have veterans clinics, VA hospitals and clinics, some clinics that are only open twice a month with a staff that rotates between that region that serves those veterans, people will look back and say, what happened in the 109th Congress or what happened in 110th Congress? Who stood up? Who stood up on behalf of the American people?

I have a great deal of respect for the President and the Commander in Chief, because he is the President and Commander in Chief, period. That is where it is. I am an American. I am not an enlisted man, but I am a Member of Congress, and I feel that the office deserves the respect.

I also believe that the American people deserve, Mr. MURPHY, the same level of respect or greater. And the great thing about our democracy, like I said, we celebrate the very freedom that others have provided us. Some of those paid the ultimate sacrifice for that to happen. Some are sitting in wheelchairs right now. Some are forever mentally wounded or injured by the whole experience in providing the kind of freedom that they provided for us. Some of us take for granted that we have veterans, some that are going into VA hospitals that are sitting there practically all day for mental health counseling. Some are not eligible. Some are still fighting for full benefits. And over the years, I know of some of my constituents all the way from the Korean War who are still fighting for full benefits to be granted by the Veterans Administration, seeing these individuals in the state that they are in now, under years of a Congress that has not paid attention.

And just a little history lesson here, I will just share with you, the chairman, I believe, in the 109th, the 108th Congress, the Republican chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee went against the Republican leadership saying, I believe this is what we should do on behalf of the veterans. I believe that they deserve it. And he was removed as chairman of that committee.

Those days are gone now. We are in control. We are going to stand up on their behalf.

I am just saying I don't want to point out the fact that the President did not mention anything about veterans, just that it is a bad thing. It is a bad thing. I think he should have mentioned it, especially at a time of war. But I want to make sure those veterans know, Mr. Speaker, that we are not going to leave them behind, that we are not going to let their memory kind of fade off, their contributions fade off into the sunset because the President did not prioritize enough to even put two words together to thank our veterans, or just ''veterans,'' period, just one word. Because he left that out of his speech doesn't necessarily mean that this House of Representatives is going to leave those veterans behind. So that is the reason why we mentioned it. That is the reason why we raise up the Katrina victims and those families that are still living through the nightmare.

And, Mr. MURPHY, we are not even focusing on the whole family experience. I mean, think of those families of veterans that are out there. And the reason why I am mentioning the whole mental piece is because, when I traveled to Iraq, I can tell you I used to be a State trooper. I have seen some things in my 5 years being with the Florida Highway Patrol. I am pretty sure in one tour in Iraq, a young man or young woman or a middle-aged gentleman or what have you, when you see that kind of activity, it is going to affect you. You are going to need the kind of the assistance that this country should provide because you volunteered, taking your words, to fight on behalf of this country. So it is very, very important.

And those families that are having to live with those family members that are trying to wrestle with those issues, some of those issues don't make the local news, but they live it. Children are subjected to it, and many of our veterans need counseling when they come back.

□ 2200

And that is one of the hidden issues that is in this whole issue as we start talking about not leaving our veterans behind. We have plans to do that. We started this discussion just talking about the President's budget, about making sure that this is reflected in the President's budget.

Before I yield back to you in like 30 seconds, the President is going to go to Illinois tomorrow, and he is going to be in New York after that, visiting, pushing his economic plan. I can tell you right now, I wish I had an envelope, but I remember Johnnie Carson used to hold an envelope to his head and say a word, and I would say make tax breaks permanent for the superwealthy.

You know, I am pretty sure that is somewhere in that envelope. Even though we are going to go around, we are going to go to Caterpillar in Illinois and talk about trade and how the economy works, and then he is going to go over to New York and talk a little bit about the economy and how strong, this, that and the other. But in the end game, it is going to be about protecting the very individuals that have been rewarded and protected at a time of war, to make it permanent, so that the middle class will not have the benefits that they need.

So we highlight these things as a forecast of saying that there is some room for the American people, everyday Joe and Sue, and those individuals that are punching in and punching out every day, for those individuals that are trying to make it to the next level that there is something there to assist them.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, Mr. MEEK was right on. The new class that was sent here to Washington was sent here to make sure that this place is returned to that hard-working family that you are talking about.

You know, we know the statistics, the terrible statistics of the number of military families that are on food stamps, the number of military families, ex-military families that have to come to the government for some assistance just to get by every day. I mean, these are amongst the legions of families across this country that are scraping to get by every day.

We have a growing economy. You know the story, Mr. MEEK. We have a growing economy. Production is up. GDP is up. And wages are flat. Wages for regular, ordinary Americans are going nowhere while wages for CEOs and the folks at the very top of that economic scale are doing very well.

And none of us begrudge folks that have done well in business making a dollar. I mean, that is the genius of our American economy. But what it does is it leaves all of those people behind while a very few at the top are well off.

Here is where we come in, I think. I think we come in in that our job, not necessarily to completely level that playing field, but our job certainly is not to exacerbate the differences that already exist. And when President Bush goes to Illinois, if he spends a little time moving away from the motorcade and the Secret Service lines, he will find a society there in which there are deep divisions between those folks in the middle that are just trying to cling on to that middle class, and the folks that are doing very well.

Our job, you know frankly, is to not make that situation worse. And the tax breaks that this previous Congress gave away to a lot of those oil companies, to the deals that they cut with the drug companies to give them record profits off this health care system, have left a lot of people behind, have left millions of hardworking Americans struggling, producing more, working harder than ever, and not seeing a return for their dollar.

You know the costs of this war. I have heard you talk about it on this floor. But we are spending $8 billion a month in Iraq right now. And we need to start having a conversation about how we spend that money here in the United States of America, and how we use that money to retrain workers that have been laid off due to the globalization of our economy.

We need to talk about how to spend that money to get kids an education that they deserve, to get them out of school in 4 years, rather than what is all too often happening, that it takes 6, 8, 10 years for some students to get degrees. That is where we need to be investing.

That is the right thing for our economy. That is the right thing for our kids. And ultimately it is the right thing for our men and women that are fighting overseas. So I appreciate the focus that we are going to hopefully be able to add to the President's visit, to make sure that when he goes out there into the world that he sees all of America, that he does not just see the folks that have been the beneficiaries of the largesse of government in this Congress for all too long, the oil companies, the drug companies, the Fortune 500s, that he sees the rest of the folks that are struggling.

Now, he is going to get an opportunity, as you know, Mr. Speaker and Members, to do right by those folks, because hopefully we are going to get to his desk an increase in the minimum wage, we are going to get to his desk a decrease in the student loan rate. We are going to put on his desk for his signature a repeal of those massive tax breaks to the oil companies.

He is going to have a choice then, and I hope he listens to what happened on election day. I hope he listens to the legions of folks who sent us here, some of us for the first time and others back for another tour of duty in this Chamber. I hope that he listens to the folks that are asking this government to start sticking up for people that have had very little voice, very little voice except for some people standing here late at night trying to shed light on what has been really happening in this country, Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. MURPHY, that is an outstanding segue to even talk about what has passed this floor already. You mentioned many of those measures. Eighty percent of the American people, overwhelmingly, Mr. Speaker, feel that the first 100 hours here in the U.S. House of Representatives have been very fruitful and have put forth a great surge of support and hope on behalf of everyday working Americans.

Speaking of the minimum wage, I understand that it is up for consideration in the Senate next week, hopefully next Tuesday. I know there are some discussions an $8 billion possible cost for tax breaks for businesses within that. I know that there will be some sort of discussion between the finance Chair in the Senate and Mr. RANGEL over here in the House, Mr. Speaker, from Ways and Means.

We are going to continue to have hearings on the economy. We are going to talk about globalization tomorrow in the committee, I believe at 10 a.m., over in the Longworth Building. We are going to the effects of it, how does it deal with the American worker, how do we benefit here. And that is going to be a great discussion for us to continue to have, especially with the President moving around and speaking to different groups about trade.

I think it is also important as we start to look at this issue of the minimum wage that we keep at the forefront. So I want to make sure that the Members stay engaged; I want to make sure that the American people stay engaged and informed on what is happening.

I think another issue that is coming up and I mentioned it a little earlier, on Wednesday, we are going to be dealing with the continuing resolution. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, some of the things that were mentioned in the State of the Union, it is interesting what we have already incorporated into the House.

Democrats led the way in making sure that we adopt pay-as-we-go rules. Democrats led the way by saying that there will be no earmarks in this continuing resolution that will come to the floor on Wednesday. And we talk about earmarks. And we are bringing about earmark reform.

But earmarks in some areas, especially when you look at the bad situation that the country is in right now, this does not go away. I mean, we are continuing to hold this chart up. I just want to make sure that the American people and Members understand that we had very little to do with the situation of the $1.05 trillion that has been borrowed from foreign nations, and more than has been borrowed over 224 years with 42 Presidents and a number of Congresses in between, of $1.01 trillion.

We did not just get there. We got there by giving unaffordable tax breaks that we could not afford to the superwealthy, giving away tax breaks to individuals who did not ask for it. So that just does not go away.

There is a lot of work between making sure that we are able to do what this Democratic Congress has done in balancing the budget and taking us into surpluses versus what the Republican Congress has done in taking us backwards.

Mr. Speaker and Mr. MURPHY, we are joined by my good friend from Ohio (Mr. RYAN). Mr. RYAN, we have been talking about a number of issues surrounding not only the Speaker's visit to Iraq and Afghanistan with some other Democratic leaders and also chairmen, but also talking about the issue of the veterans not being mentioned in the State of the Union, nor the Gulf States. But we said we are not going to leave them behind. So we gave an update on the minimum wage. We are happy to hear from you, sir.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I had an interesting weekend, and I am glad to be with you and our new friend from Connecticut. I had a very interesting weekend because everyone in Niles, Ohio, in the Mahoney Valley, was talking about the first 100 hours. So I found it very interesting that so many people were actually paying attention to what was going on here.

I think a lot of it had to do with Speaker PELOSI and the first woman Speaker being here. But there was a genuine excitement that things had changed in Washington, D.C. and I am sure you felt it in Miami. I know you were there. I talked to you last night. You were there. And I am sure they felt it up in New England.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You gave a couple of speeches over the weekend.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I did, yeah. I actually spoke at the Akron Press Club, which I felt was very important. And then I spoke at Our Lady of Mt. Carmel grade school, my old Catholic grade school. And we had a little alumni affair there.

It was interesting, because there were so many people talking about what had happened down here, the historic nature of the changes. And when you look and you think about all of the political promises that we have probably all heard in our careers at one point or another about, we are going to do this, we are going to do that, and you hear people say that.

But for Speaker PELOSI and the majority here to lead and run campaigns all over the country and make those assertions and make these promises and then to come within the first 100 legislative hours and actually deliver on these issues is impressive. And I think it tries to restore some of that credibility that has been lost, I think, over the past couple of years.

So we immediately stabilized a lot of families. I mean, it is not implemented yet, but our goal: minimum wage, cut student loan interest rates in half and help negotiate down the cost of prescription drugs. And then open up two new sectors of the economy by repealing the corporate welfare and investing that in alternative energy sources, which will lead to more research from the private sector, investment by the private sector, and try to open up this new alternative energy sector of our economy, and then the stem cell research bill, which will allow us in the health care industry to open up and do

further research to move the economy forward.

So we are trying to do some compassionate stuff, some progressive stuff, but at the same time stabilize. It has been interesting. It has been fun to go back home. Mr. MEEK, as you remember the last couple of years, you would have to go back home, and you are talking to your constituents, and there is not a whole lot to say.

You know, we were often talking about what we were trying to prevent from happening, or motions to recommit or amendments we offered for PAYGO in all of those committees and Charlie Stenholm and Dennis Moore who offered all of those provisions to try to balance the budget by implementing PAYGO. Well, we implemented PAYGO from the House side.

I think it is very important that we were able to actually go out and do that. So I am excited about what is happening here.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would just say, it is funny because there was kind of a low bar set. And I at some levels am pleased that I was not in the same shoes that Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK were, that I did not have to go back to my constituency for the last several years and answer for what has happened here, because the answer is, not much.

You know, folks out there were struggling with these energy prices just going through the roof. Health care was becoming harder and harder to find, good health care at least. People were crying out for work on immigration. People were trying to get help bringing up their wages to a liveable wage, and they were not hearing anything. I mean, it was deafening silence from down here.

So I do not have as much comparative experience as you, Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK, do. But walking around the district in Connecticut for the past several weekends it has been euphoric. And I used that word the last time I was down here with you.

It is really this sort of sense that, oh, my gosh, our government is working again. Our government is back to work again; and it used to be that that is what happened. It used to be that there would be a problem, you would go to your legislator, they would come down here and they would do something about it.

And people have come to expect inertia. That is what sort of was just the run of the mill down here in Washington, that you have a problem and then you have to wait about 5, 10 years, in order to get something to happen.

I felt the same thing, Mr. RYAN, that people you know, it is too bad frankly that people have come to be surprised by the fact that there could be immediate action. Because that is what they should get from their government, and they are getting it now.

□ 2215

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And it is exciting because it is just starting, Mr. MURPHY. It is just starting.

And when you meet with the Speaker and you see the intensity in her eyes and the focus about this was really just the beginning and we are not here to say, well, we did our first hundred hours and we are done. We are going to chalk it up and we are done. This is about continuing to move forward. We have got to reauthorize No Child Left Behind.

And when you talk to Chairman MILLER, who is the Chair of that committee, you see the look in his eyes about an opportunity to change the face of education in this country, to finally put some resources back behind No Child Left Behind to where it actually will work.

And when you look and you see, and I know, you know, Senator KENNEDY is talking about putting money in there to help school districts figure out how they can possibly extend the school day and extend the school year so that we can make sure that our kids are on par with kids from Korea and some of these other countries where they go an extra couple, 3 weeks a year more than us, which equals another year or two over the course of a 12-year education cycle. These are the kind of things that we want to implement here.

And if it wasn't for the, and we got into this, too, a lot back home. You know, a lot of people had an almost unrealistic expectation that we came in, we can come in now, Mr. MURPHY, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and wave a magic wand and all of a sudden there is a lot of money here. Well, we have got a lot of making up to do because of the irresponsible fiscal inadequacies and inability of the Republicans to actually balance the budget. So we have got to go up and clean that mess up. We have got to figure out how to extract ourselves from this morass we are in in Iraq and then finally make the investments that we want to make.

So we have got a lot going on here, Mr. MEEK, and we are very excited about the proposition that we have in the future. When you look at the opportunities that we really have in this country, I think they are great. But it is about focusing on the human capital in the United States of America, Mr. MURPHY, and making sure that we make the kind of investments into the health care, education in the United states and the stem cells and the alternative energy are going to put us on a strong path to move forward.

And I would be happy to yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I will just key off of an important word there and that is investments. You know, how you balance the budget into the future is to make sure that you are doing the right things now to make sure that our economy is humming 10 years and 20 years from now. So when you talk about this investing in renewable and alternative energy sources, I mean, that is going to be our export. That is going to be what America can renew its economy around, is our ability to be the producer of all these new energy technologies.

When you talk about investing in education, making sure that kids are educated so that America, which right now grows as an economy because we have the best-trained, best-educated work force in the country, continues to be that beacon of economic development due to our work force. Those are the type of investments that have been long cast aside but now we are going to start making again so that we make sure that you know when we are long gone from here that we have left an economy and we have left a budget that makes sense.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

It was interesting, because one of our friends from the other side gave a 5-minute speech about the values of free trade. I think pretty much everything he said I agree with, and I voted against almost probably every trade agreement that has come before this Congress since I have been here. And I agreed with everything he said. We are trading. It creates value. It invests in our countries. We all understand all that.

The problem is that we are not making the investments into the United States that will help us grow new sectors of the economy that will replenish the jobs that we may be losing.

Now, people in Youngstown, Ohio, obviously, don't like to lose their jobs. But if there was a job there that they could get trained and go into and make the same kind of living and have the same stability for their family and provide for education and health care for their own family, they would be fine with it. So you can't have free trade and then not invest in the stem cell research. You can't have free trade and then not invest in the alternative energy research to help stimulate the economy and create new sectors that will ultimately yield employment for our folks in our communities.

Be happy to yield to Madam Chair of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you to my good friend from Youngstown, Ohio.

You know, your comments sort of bring to mind that our good friends on the other side of the aisle want to have their cake and eat it, too. They were the ones responsible for putting us in this situation where we have to adopt a continuing resolution that is essentially continuation funding that in order to put a finger in the dike and make sure that things don't get any worse and that we can begin the process for the 2008 budget and getting our fiscal house in order. It was them that only were able to pass two out of all of the spending bills that were in their hopper. It was them that left us this mess.

And now, you know, you will see over the next couple of days, Mr. MURPHY, our good friends on the other side of

the aisle actually stand up and criticize their own budget, which is what the CR is. They will try to put our colleagues on our side of the aisle who were just elected, who, you know, campaigned against fiscal irresponsibility in a box and make it seem like somehow this continuing resolution is what we crafted when we are in a situation where it is shut down the government or pass the simplest, most effective way of getting us across the finish line so that we can move on and really address the concerns that we talked about during our 30–Something hours in the 109th Congress, which was that we are in the worst financial shape that we have been in in decades, that we have a foreign debt that is more combined than any of the 42 previous presidents combined.

And yet they will try to have their cake and eat it, too, criticize us on their budget that we are going to have to continue but, at the same time, not claim responsibility for it. It is really going to be shocking.

So it is something that I think it is important that we talk about and that we lay out there. Because, you know, this process, the appropriations process is one of the most inside baseball, nitty-gritty, intricate things that we do, and there are Members that have been here for years, and I am just, as a new member of the Appropriations Committee, you know, even though I am chairing a subcommittee, I still have a significant learning curve. So explaining it to the people that we represent, while they are watching it all unfold on TV, is really somewhat difficult. So it is critical that people understand that.

I actually talked to some of our colleagues on the floor tonight when we were talking about the CR and, you know, all lamenting that we are not able to craft a bill that we would all love to support with the increases that the veterans deserve and the increases that are deserving in education, that are critical in terms of education and health care and health and human services and housing. I mean, those are all programs that Democrats have campaigned on and fought for. But because we have colleagues that spent like drunken sailors, that had no regard for the fiscal house that we are now charged with putting back in order, we find ourselves having to cinch the belt as tight as possible just so that we can get through and start making things right.

I think each of our colleagues, particularly the freshmen like you, Mr. MURPHY, are going to have an important task of going back to your constituents and explaining that we have got to be responsible here first. Give us an opportunity to get through the mess that we were left and then we can really show you what we can do.

Be happy to yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Just for brief comments, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I think you are right. I think the American people, this process may be mystifying to them at some level, but they didn't send us here to just bring back the world. They understood that things needed to be put in order. They understood that there were going to have to be some difficult decisions made here; and, quite frankly, I think they realized that a lot of the decisions that were being made here over the past 12 years, in particular over the last few years, unfortunately, when this government decided to give, they were giving to the wrong people. And, in fact, they found the means to give out some favors, to give out some money. They just happened to be giving it to the people that didn't need anything more.

So we can start making those different decisions. But, before we do that, it is going to take a little while to sweep up the shop room floor. And that is what we are doing now.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

What I think is an important point here is that we could have come in and not passed the pay as you go. We could have done the irresponsible thing. And everyone says, well, the Democrats are controlled by all these interest groups. Well, we could have been irresponsible and said this interest group is going to get this and this one is going to get that, and we will borrow the money from China, as Mr. MEEK had the chart up, and we would pay everybody back.

I am telling you, Madam Speaker, she is great. We are doing the right thing. We could have done the easy thing, and we could have paid everybody back and made increases that were irresponsible because we would have continued down the charts where we are borrowing the money from China, paying the interest. They are taking that money, investing it back in their economy, buying submarines and everything else. But we did the right thing. So we have got to take the hit now, but the long-term economic interest of the country is going to be much better off.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. What we talked about night after night here and what our colleagues and our leadership have all talked about, we have all been singing off the same song sheet, that we have to make sure that we handle the Federal budget just like folks struggle in America to handle their household budget every single day, not to spend more than you take in.

There are families all across America, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MEEK, Mr. RYAN, that have to make really difficult decisions. Would they like to go and buy a new wardrobe for their children? Would they like to get the car completely overhauled? Definitely important and certainly would improve their quality of life, but they can't make those decisions if the money is not coming in in order to cover those expenses.

So at a certain point, if you don't stop the bleeding, if you don't make those fiscally difficult decisions, then it just gets worse.

We could have been, you know, we could have played right into their hands, which is, I am sure, what they expected us to do, which was what they always accused us of being tax-and-spend liberals and that we were going to just give away the store and that we were going to satisfy every interest group that is in the column of supporters that we have.

But, instead, what we did is we stuck to our principles. We stuck to what we talked about was important to the American people, not spending more than you take in and particularly not caving to what would be politically expedient, which was the tax cuts, as you referred to, Mr. MURPHY, for people who don't need them.

Because what they like to conveniently leave out is that they only count, you know, there are only certain things that they count in the ledger. They only count the things in the ledger that are actually things you can put down as I spent this much money on this particular program. But they fail to actually account for the tax cuts that pull money out off the ledger, which makes it so that there is not that revenue available to fund the needs, and that adds to the deficit itself.

They also don't include Social Security and Medicare when it comes to the whole appropriation process. All of that is off budget. They don't like to count the supplemental bills that they pass. All of that is off budget.

So it is just, you know, we are going to get back to being up front and honest with the American people in our budgeting process, and we are going to get our fiscal house in order.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And if we get an opportunity as we go through the oversight of the war, oversight of FEMA contracts, there are millions and millions and millions, if not billions, of dollars that have been wasted through the war, the contracting, the Halliburtons. You know, story after story we hear off the record, that is all going to come out through the hearings. You know, if Halliburton has a truck and the tire goes out, they just get rid of the truck and they buy a whole new one. Well, that is at the taxpayers' expense. And there are stories after stories after stories of these kinds of things happening.

So part of what we are doing is we are making the tough decisions today, the responsible decisions today, get into the oversight, find out where the waste is; and I really hope that we continue to push Mr. TANNER and Mr. CARDOZA's bill that says we audit the whole government, because this government is clearly incapable of functioning in the 21st century economy.

If we are going to have the resources that we need, Mr. MEEK, to invest in education, to invest in the health care, to invest into those things that are important, that are going to yield benefits, business incubators and research and development and stem cells like we

did with the corporate welfare to repeal some of that, that was easier to do than getting to the nuts and bolts execution of government, but it is going to be a lot of hard work over the next few years to figure out where we are wasting money, what programs aren't working.

Now we may have and be in agreement that the principle of a program is what we all agree on, end poverty, provide health care for kids, whatever the case may be. But the actual execution of that program may not be yielding the kind of results that we want or at the level we want.

There is still too much poverty. There are still too many kids out there that don't have health care. There are still too many kids that qualify for S–CHIP that aren't signed up for it. So, you know, over the course of the next year or two, as we go through the oversight hearings, we are going to be able to determine what programs work, which don't and which ones we need to fix. That is difficult to do.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We are going to be the Congress.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We are going to be the Congress. That is right. We are going to be the Congress.

□ 2230

And, you know, it is not government is the problem, government is wrong, government is your enemy; it is going to be, wait a minute. This is something that is supposed to work and we are going to make it work.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I see Mr. MEEK is ready to jump in here. But we are going to be the Congress and exercise our role, our accountability, our oversight, and be the legislative branch instead of the administration lap dog. Because that is what this body was for the last 6 years certainly. When President Clinton was in office, it was the opposite. It was, let's see what we can do to torture the administration and make it impossible for them to get what they wanted done and wanted to accomplish.

Then, of course, President Bush comes into office and it is like they all lost their hands. They lost their hands, they checked their brains at the Chamber door, and it was whatever this administration wanted.

And there is a new leadership in this institution and 32 new Members, all of whom came here to step up to the plate and ask the difficult questions and exercise this body's constitutional role, constitutional authority granted to us by the Founding Fathers, which hopefully at some point our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will remember as well.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I think it is important, and Mr. MURPHY and Mr. RYAN, that everybody understand the reason we are here. We are going to play the legislative role. We talked about the lights being turned on in some of these committee rooms. And I was sitting here kind of looking through a few things, and I grabbed this February 5 edition of Time magazine, and it talked about, Madam Speaker, this upcoming Time I just received it in the mail, only 648 days until the election, why so many candidates are jumping in so early. And it talks about this being the most open Presidential race since 1928.

There is some interesting comments in here and obviously editorials, but I think that you see so many people getting involved because they see a vacuum here, a vacuum of the fact that things are not happening the way that it should happen. And Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ alluded to the fact that, being lap dogs, we sometimes say here on the 30-something Working Group rubberstamp Congress, what have you, of the 109th Congress. We don't want to be that.

I ran into one of my Republican colleagues in the tunnel walking from the Cannon building over to the House today for a vote and I asked how is a certain piece of legislation. And she responded, well, you know, I have a post office bill. I am not going to belittle, I have done a post office bill before; it is good to identify outstanding Americans. But I just want to make sure that people understand, even here we have what we call suspension bills. Those are bills that we all agree on but it has to be passed by the Congress, Madam Speaker.

But what is happening now that has not been happening, I go back to, I alluded to this earlier, reading is fundamental. We know that some people here in Washington, D.C. don't bother to read newspapers, things of that nature; but we will leave that for another day. Congress Daily A.M., National Journal. And I just want to read what is going to happen tomorrow; today is Monday, what is going to happen on Tuesday. I can tell you, usually this would not be printed in this Congressional Daily Weekly because committees didn't meet. The Foreign Affairs Committee only had one hearing on Iraq in the 109th Congress; thus far, Mr. LANTOS has had five hearings, and we are not even past the first month of the new Congress. This is still January.

Let's see what is happening tomorrow. Armed Services Committee is going to have a hearing on Afghanistan security and stability. Armed Services is going to also have a subcommittee hearing on military personnel. The Budget Committee will meet on the economic outlook of the country in full committee hearing. Education and Labor on generic discrimination of workers. That is happening. That is a subcommittee hearing that is taking place. Energy and Commerce will also have a hearing on the National Laboratory Security, Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee. Oversight Government Affairs and Reform Committee is going to have a climate change politics hearing; that is a full committee hearing. Science and Technology, Fuels, Infrastructures, Research and Development. That is a subcommittee on Energy. Transportation and Infrastructure, Coast Guard deepwater system, going to have a subcommittee. That is the Coast Guard and Maritime Subcommittee hearing that will take place. Transportation Infrastructure, Railroads, Pipelines, Hazardous Materials, that is a subcommittee hearing that is going to take place. Ways and Means, trade and globalization at 10:00 tomorrow, full committee hearing. Ways and Means once again, subcommittee will be meeting.

I just wanted to point that out, Madam Speaker. If we were in the 109th Congress and the 108th Congress, we wouldn't even be here right now, Monday. We wouldn't even be here on a Monday. People are paying our salary to legislate and to bring about the kind of oversight.

I just want to point that out, because Mr. RYAN spoke a little earlier of the fact that we are actually doing, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, what we told the American people we would do, Mr. MURPHY, and that is lead. Six in 2006. Oh, it is a big dog and pony. It is not. We are giving the American people exactly what we told them we would do, which is accountability. And that is a paradigm shift for politicians here in Washington, D.C. I yield to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, and it is. The other day I walked into the Chamber, Mr. MURPHY, from that end of the room, and I noticed that there is a really huge, huge dictionary on the Republican's side of the Chamber which, quite honestly, it doesn't appear has gotten that much use on their side of the aisle, because words like accountability and oversight and checks and balances, and the things that have been with us through American history, maybe they tore the pages out that had those definitions or maybe they just chose to ignore them or just skipped over those pages when they were using it because, obviously we have a dictionary on the floor for a reason, but now, Mr. MEEK, just in great detail went over the number of different hearings that we will be engaging in to exercise the oversight and the accountability that the American people badly are seeking that has just been nonexistent.

And, Mr. MEEK, I want to touch just quickly on one particular bit of oversight that we are going to be engaging in on Wednesday. I have the privilege of sitting on the House Judiciary Committee, and we will be holding our first hearing of the 110th Congress on Presidential signing statements. Now, that is something that we really haven't had a chance to talk about too much on the floor during 30-something, but I would like to explore it down the road a little bit, especially after we hold this hearing.

Most of the American people, I think, don't realize that what this President

has done, and other Presidents, many Presidents have exercised this option, the constitutionality of which I think is somewhat troubling. But this President has used Presidential signing statements more than any other Presidents combined. He has added more than 700 signing statements to legislation that we have adopted in both Houses of Congress. And what he does is he adds a note essentially to the bottom of the bill or to the margin of the bill next to a section that he doesn't agree with and he says: ''I either reserve the right to not enforce this section or to interpret this section in this way.'' I mean, literally taking authority for the executive branch that I believe the Founding Fathers didn't envision. I mean, he did that with the PATRIOT Act, he did that with a number of significant pieces of legislation, Mr. MEEK, and it is really, really troubling.

The executive branch in the Constitution does not have the right to interpret legislation. That is not their job. It is the Judiciary's responsibility to interpret legislation; it is the administration's job to execute what is laid before them by the Congress. Now, he certainly has the right to veto legislation that he doesn't agree with, but he doesn't have a line item veto; he doesn't have a line item veto in the budget, and he can't X out a portion of a bill that he doesn't like. And we are going to be holding a hearing on Wednesday, and we will have the Department of Justice representatives there to question very carefully where they think they get this legislative authority, and reassert Congress's role in oversight in this one area and in many others, as you detailed.

I guess we are in the wrapping-it-up stage, because that is when the Web site chart comes out. I will be happy to yield to our good friend and freshman colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And the guilt is deep inside me that I am stealing Mr. RYAN's thunder for twice in a row here.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman would yield, life is about letting go.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Moving on.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You have got to move on. And you are the guy.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I am glad I can help you with that cathartic experience.

WWW.speaker.gov/30something is where you can find information on a lot of things we have talked about here. I am here to work, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and I know there are about 40 other first termers who are here to do the same thing.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Actually, not to be the teacher exercising oversight over the freshman, but probably give out our e-mail address, too, so people know where they can contact us.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. The e-mail address is 30SomethingDems@mail.house.gov. So I like nothing more than to be the student in this relationship, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I am with you and the 40-something new Members of Congress.

Madam Speaker, it was an honor to come before the House once again. I want to thank the Democratic leadership for allowing us to have the hour, and we yield back the balance of our time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPPS). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2302

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPPS) at 11 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. EDWARDS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of medical reasons.

Mr. GUTIERREZ (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of district business.

Mr. MCDERMOTT (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of official business.

Mr. BACHUS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness in the family.

Mr. HASTERT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week.

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:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today, January 30 and 31.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, January 30 and 31.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today, January 30 and 31.

Mr. ROHRABACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOSSELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 188. An act to provide a new effective date for the applicability of certain provisions of law to Public Law 105–331.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Kareen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reports that on January 25, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 475. To revise the composition of the House of Representatives Page Board to equalize the number of members representing the majority and minority parties and to include a member representing the parents of pages and a member representing former pages, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 30, 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:

464. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Arizona; Miami Sulfur Dioxide State Implementation Plan and Request for Redesignation to Attainment; Correction of Boundry of Miami Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area [EPA-R09-OAR-2006-0580; FRL-8270-3] received January 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

465. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; El Paso County Carbon Monoxide Redesignation to Attainment, and Approval of Maintenance Plan

[EPA-R06-OAR-2006-0396; FRL-8272-5] received January 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

466. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources: Other Solid Waste Incineration Units: Reconsideration [EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0156; FRL-8272-2] (RIN: 2060-AN91) received January 19, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

467. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorage Regulations; Camden, Maine, Penobscot Bay [CGD01-06-084] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

468. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorage Regulations; Sabine Pass Channel, Sabine Pass, TX [CGD08-06-026] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received Janaury 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

469. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the state of the Union; (H. Doc. No.110-1); to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. House Concurrent Resolution 34. Resolution honoring the life of Percy Lavon Julian, a pioneer in the field of organic chemistry research and development and the first and only African American chemist to be inducted into the National Academy of Sciences (Rept. 110–4). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. House Resolution 59. Resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week, and for other purposes (Rept. 110–5). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GILLMOR (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GOODE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. FALLIN, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. HODES, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 698. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to establish industrial bank holding company regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. AKIN (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. PITTS, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SALI, Mr. BAKER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. RENZI, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 699. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the jurisdiction of Federal courts over certain cases and controversies involving the Pledge of Allegiance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H.R. 700. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to extend the pilot program for alternative water source projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ISSA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. REYES, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 701. A bill to amend the impact aid program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve the delivery of payments under the program to local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 702. A bill to authorize any alien who has been issued a valid machine-readable biometric border crossing identification card to be temporarily admitted into the United States upon successfully completing a background check; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 703. A bill to authorize the Department of Energy to oversee certain safety, security, and health functions of the National Nuclear Security Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 704. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reduce from age 57 to age 55 the age after which the remarriage of the surviving spouse of a deceased veteran shall not result in termination of dependency and indemnity compensation otherwise payable to that surviving spouse; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 705. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of George Henry White; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LEE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FARR, Mr. STARK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. BACA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. SOLIS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 706. A bill to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2777 Logan Avenue in San Diego, California, as the ''Cesar E. Chavez Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 707. A bill to establish the Mountaintown National Scenic Area in the Chattahoochee National Forest, Georgia, and to designate additional National Forest System land in the State of Georgia as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 708. A bill to amend United States trade laws to address more effectively import crises, and for other purposes; 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 Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 709. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restrict totalization agreements between the United States and other countries to providing for appropriate exchange of social security taxes or contributions between the parties to such agreements, and to prohibit crediting of individuals under such title with earnings from employment or self-employment in the United States performed while such individuals are not citizens, nationals, or lawful permanent residents of the United States and are not authorized by law to be employed in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORWOOD (for himself and Mr. INSLEE):

H.R. 710. A bill to amend the National Organ Transplant Act to clarify that kidney paired donation does not involve the transfer of a human organ for valuable consideration; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 711. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that participants in the Troops to Teachers program may teach at a range of eligible schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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. SKELTON (for himself and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 712. A bill to amend the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 to correct an error in the enrollment of the law that resulted in the omission of two Army construction and land acquisition projects authorized in the conference report (House Report 109-702), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself and Mr. REYNOLDS):

H.R. 713. A bill to establish the Niagara Falls National Heritage Area in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. COSTA, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. HILL, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SHULER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. ROSS):

H.R. 714. A bill to establish reporting requirements relating to funds made available for military operations in Iraq or the reconstruction of Iraq, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. WOOLSEY (for herself, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. WATT, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. REYES, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COOPER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 715. A bill to provide funding for programs at the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences regarding breast cancer in younger women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 716. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Santa Rosa Urban Water Reuse Plan; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 717. A bill to encourage partnerships between community colleges and four-year colleges and universities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.J. Res. 20. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. STARK, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution declaring that it is the policy of the United States not to establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq and not to exercise United States control of the oil resources of Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign 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. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. WATSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. WEINER, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. PORTER):

H. Res. 102. A resolution condemning the assassination of human rights advocate and outspoken defender of freedom of the press, Turkish-Armenian journalist Hrant Dink on January 19, 2007; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REGULA:

H. Res. 103. A resolution congratulating the Mount Union College Purple Raiders for winning the 2006 NCAA Division III Football National Championship; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SPACE, Mr. HOBSON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio):

H. Res. 104. A resolution honoring and recognizing the life and accomplishments of the late Tom Mooney, president of the Ohio Federation of Teachers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

1. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Resolution No. 6 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to create a federal catastrophe fund; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 16 commending and memorializing the Congress of the United States for passing the Domenici-Landrieu Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 providing for sharing of federal offshore oil and gas revenue with Louisiana for coastal protection and restoration, and congratulating the members of the Louisiana congressional delegation upon their successful efforts in the passage of this legislations; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 23 memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt the Constitution Restoration Act, to limit the jurisdiction of the federal courts and preserve the right to the states and to the people to acknowledge God and resolve the issue of improper judicial intervention in matters relating to the acknowledgment of God, all as authorized by Article III, Section 2, of the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 13 memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize Louisiana to lease closed interstate rest areas to private entities in order to provide services and products helpful or desira ble to interstate travelers; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 11: Ms. GIFFORDS.

H.R. 23: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 42: Ms. KILPATRICK and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 43: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 44: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. CARSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 45: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 65: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 100: Mr. HARE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 137: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 156: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 169: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 172: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 180: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 191: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 237: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 241: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 251: Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 269: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 271: Mr. POE.

H.R. 312: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 321: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 328: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. WATSON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. HARE.

H.R. 333: Mr. GOODE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 346: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

H.R. 352: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 358: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 362: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 363: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 365: Mr. HILL, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HARE, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. SPACE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TIAHRT, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. ELLSWORTH.

H.R. 402: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 403: Mr. HALL of New York and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 406: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 413: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 418: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 419: Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 423: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. POE.

H.R. 446: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 455: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 457: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 460: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 464: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 493: Mr. WU, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BERRY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HARE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 502: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 509: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 511: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RENZI, Mr. CUBIN, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 518: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 521: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. BUYER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. LORETTA SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 526: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 545: Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. BACA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. RENZI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BOREN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WU, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. BONO, Ms. HERSETH, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 547: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. GIFFORDS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 551: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 556: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 566: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 569: Mr. EHLERS and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 582: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 590: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 592: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 608: Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 620: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FARR, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 627: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 632: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 633: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 636: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 649: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 650: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 651: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 652: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 661: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 676: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WATERS, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 677: Mr. STARK, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 684: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 692: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. POE.

H.R. 695: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HODES, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. SUTTON.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. VISCLOSKY and Mr. OLVER.

H.J. Res. 15: Mr. WU and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H. Con. Res. 5: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HARE, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. HERSETH, and Mr. BACA.

H. Con. Res. 7: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. DOGGETT.

H. Con. Res. 9: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Con. Res. 20: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 24: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H. Con. Res. 26: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. ELLISON.

H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. FATTAH.

H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 41: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H. Res. 59: Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H. Res. 64: Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 67: Mr. MCNULTY and Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 69: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. PENCE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WAMP, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. POE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. FOXX, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BONNER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WATT, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 79: Mr. KUHL of New York and Mr. ORTIZ.

H. Res. 87: Mr. WICKER, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. UPTON.

H. Res. 90: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LEE, Mr. HILL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HOLT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. PENCE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Res. 94: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 101: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. ISRAEL.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. DAVID R. OBEY

H.J. Res. 20, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *110th* CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 2007 *No. 17*

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable HARRY REID, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, eternal and unchangeable, before whom the generations rise and pass away, guide the Members of this body so that all they say and decide will be according to Your will.

Take command of their thoughts today. Provide them with words to speak that will bring unity. Give them clarity for the hard choices they face and strength for the stresses of leadership. Help them hear the cries of those in our world who struggle with pain, loss, fear, confusion, limitations, and loneliness.

Give our Senators the vision and willingness to see and do Your will. We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable MARK PRYOR, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PRYOR). The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, January 29, 2007.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MARK PRYOR, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PRYOR thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senate will be in a period for the transaction of morning business until 3:30 p.m. today. Senator DORGAN will be recognized for up to 45 minutes and Senator SPECTER for up to 30 minutes. We will resume H.R. 2 at 3:30 p.m. for debate only until 5:30 p.m. During this time, Senator SESSIONS will be recognized for an hour at 4 p.m. As a reminder to Members, cloture has been filed on the substitute amendment to H.R. 2. and the bill itself. Therefore, Members have until 3 p.m. today to file any additional first-degree amendments.

Currently, there are 23 amendments pending. I am told that the vast majority of these amendments, after initial review by the Parliamentarians, will be ruled not germane or arguably not germane. The cloture vote on the substitute amendment will occur prior to the conference luncheons tomorrow at 12 noon.

Mr. President, if I may say a few words in addition, today we are going to, hopefully, have a debate that will be meaningful to the American people on minimum wage. This debate will be completed tomorrow in many respects, with a cloture vote on the substitute occurring tomorrow. The other debate we may get to this week is that dealing with Iraq. Both are issues past Congresses have neglected and both are areas where Democrats and Republicans must work together to move America forward.

MINIMUM WAGE

It has been 10 years since the minimum wage was last raised. During that period of time, the cost of food has risen 23 percent, the cost of health care almost 45 percent, the cost of housing about 30 percent, the cost of gas 135 percent, and that is as of today. Of course, as we know, in the past, it has been much more than that. Congressional pay has risen during that period of time by $30,000 per year per Member of Congress. But the minimum wage has stayed the same, $5.15.

Today, a full-time minimum wage worker earns $10,700 a year, working 40 hours a week. That is $6,000 below the Federal poverty line for a family of three. This is wrong. It doesn't speak well of our country. At its heart, this debate is about fairness.

In America, we believe—I think we should believe—a person working full time should be able to live a life that is not in poverty. A mother, a father who works hard and plays by the rules should be able to feed, clothe, and raise their children. Isn't it better that we have people who are engaged in work rather than welfare? The answer is yes.

Mr. President, $7.25 might not seem like a lot of money in Washington, but it would mean almost $4,500 more a year for the Nation's working poor. That is enough money for a family of 3 to buy 15 months of groceries, 19 months for their utility bills, 8 months of rent, 2 years of health care, 20 months of childcare, and even 30 months of college tuition at some schools.

Tomorrow we will have a cloture vote on the minimum wage, and I sure hope this will be a good bipartisan vote on cloture, so we can complete this legislation quickly.

Senators have had time to offer amendments. As I said Friday, when is enough enough? After 10 years, it is

time to stop talking about this issue and finally give working Americans an overdue raise.

IRAQ

When the Senate completes its work on the minimum wage—whether it is tomorrow, the next day, next day, the next day or next week—we are going to move to Iraq, and that is a debate regarding the proposed plan by the President to escalate the conflict. We owe it to our troops who serve bravely to have a real debate about the way forward in that war.

We are approaching 3,100 dead American soldiers. I was watching the Lehrer ''NewsHour.'' They show, in silence, pictures of the soldiers who have died in Iraq. They do it every few days. I watched this Friday and was struck by the number of women in this most recent reporting of deaths who are pictured there, who have been killed. They were not combat troops. They were doing activities important to the cause, such as driving vehicles. It is hard to determine what is combat and what is not combat. A helicopter went down and women were in that helicopter. A helicopter went down yesterday. I don't know who was in it, but we know two Americans were killed. So we have to have a debate about the way forward in the war in Iraq.

In Washington, we hear a lot of rhetoric about how the upcoming congressional debate emboldens our enemies. To quote a headline that appeared in a lot of newspapers, this particular one was the Las Vegas Sun newspaper, it said: Those who peddle such deceitful, political talking points ''need a lesson in civics.''

As Mr. WARNER, the gentleman Senator from Virginia, has said in this debate, Senators are ''trying to exercise the fundamental responsibilities of our democracy.''

Critics of the war also need a lesson in history. If history has taught us anything, it is that our country is strongest when all three branches of Government function. Our country is strongest when this legislative branch is more than a rubberstamp. And, finally, our country is strongest when we have real, meaningful debate on issues of consequence on behalf of the American people.

There is no issue greater in consequence than what is going on in Iraq. To suggest that the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, a former Secretary of the Navy, a former marine, Senator JOHN WARNER, or highly decorated Vietnam veteran CHUCK HAGEL, who on the battlefields of Vietnam saved his own brother's life, would take any action to undermine our troops and embolden the enemy—of course not—to suggest such is beneath any administration official or Member of Congress, even though they both tried it. I think they should reexamine what they have said. It is dangerous rhetoric, motivated more by politics than events in Iraq.

These two men are examples of this not emboldening the enemy but our doing, as the legislative branch of Government, what we are obligated to do: to talk about this conflict in Iraq.

We are in a hole in Iraq. Escalating the war is deepening that hole. We need to find a way out of that hole. Our troops, most of all, need our help. They need a policy that is worthy of their heroic sacrifices. They don't need hollow speeches or inflammatory rhetoric. They don't need a rubberstamp. They need someone to ask the tough questions. They need a legislative branch that will finally exercise its constitutional responsibilities.

I, for one, am glad we have finally arrived at this point where Congress is exercising its power. We arrived here because the American people demanded we exercise our power.

In his State of the Union Address, the President asked Members of Congress to give escalation a chance. But the truth is, escalation is the same failed President Bush policy that has already run out of chances. The President has escalated the war before, only to see the same results: increasing chaos, innumerable costs, and a civil war that is spinning out of control.

Is there a war in Iraq that is civil in nature? Of course. A marketplace where people came to buy pets, to sell pets was blown to smithereens, snakes crawling away from their cages. Children taking tests were hit with a mortar round over the weekend. And 600 insurgents were gathered in an orchard where a battle that took 15 hours ensued over the weekend. Is there a civil war? Of course, there is a civil war. Is there chaos in Iraq? Of course, there is chaos in Iraq.

The President knows how the American people feel. Generals Abizaid and Casey, when asked whether this escalation would be a good idea, told the President ''no.'' They were relieved of duty. Prime Minister Maliki, speaking face to face with the President, said: Mr. President, get American troops out of Baghdad. That is what the democratically elected Prime Minister of Iraq told the President of the United States. The Iraq Study Group has so told the President. And now we are going to have a bipartisan vote that will tell the President the same.

There is no military solution in Iraq; there are only political solutions in Iraq. With the vote, which will eventually come, we will give the President another chance to listen, listen to the generals, listen to the Iraq Study Group, listen to the American people, and listen to a bipartisan Congress.

The stunning part of this is the people of Iraq don't want us there. Polls show that 70 percent of the Iraqis believe Iraq would be better off if we were out of there. So it is another chance to listen and change course. That is what we hope will be the outcome of our debate. That will be the right result for the Nation, for our strategic interests, and for the troops.

We will work with my distinguished friend, the Republican leader, to try to have something that is more understandable. The way things now stand, if cloture is invoked tomorrow, this matter can be played out, as I understand the procedures here, until about 1 o'clock Friday morning and, if necessary, we will do that. But hopefully we can agree on a way to proceed through this without those many votes and arrive at a point where we can come to some agreement as to how we should proceed in a reasonable, logical way, so everyone has their opportunity to express views on Iraq. We have a number of competing legislative matters we can vote on. It would seem to me very likely it will take 60 votes to pass anything, but at least if we set up a responsible way to go forward, I think it would be more meaningful to the body and to the American people.

I know my friend, the Republican leader, will work with me. We will try to do the best we can for the body itself; otherwise, we will work through the rules of the Senate, which will get us there but maybe not as quickly and as conveniently.

RECOGNITION OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader.

REPUBLICAN COOPERATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Let me say to my good friend, the majority leader, I think we should be able to work our way through some negotiations on the Iraq matter that will allow us to consider a variety of proposals that may be forthcoming. With regard to the advisability of doing any resolution at all, I think the Washington Post basically had it right last week when they said they found it curious that we would confirm General Petraeus overwhelmingly, which we did Friday, 81 to nothing, and then turn around and pass a resolution saying his mission, in our judgment, has no chance of succeeding.

I hope at the end of the day such a resolution will not be approved. Having said that, I do think this is the last opportunity for the Iraqis to get it right. They need to understand that even those of us who are strong supporters of the President believe this is it. This is their chance to demonstrate that they can function in this effort to quiet the capital city of Baghdad so it can become a place in which political compromise can in fact occur. It is very difficult for that to happen when there are daily car bombings.

With regard to the minimum wage, let me indicate, Republicans made a pledge at the start of this session to cooperate and that is exactly what we have done. We passed one strong bill and we are about to pass another by keeping that pledge. Two weeks ago some of our colleagues on the other side started to dispute our commitment to cooperation over the ethics and lobbying bill. One of my good

friends on the other side said Republicans hated the bill and decided to kill it. Another said our effort to make the bill better through the amendment process was ''one of the worst stunts he had seen in 25 years as a legislator.'' What made those observations particularly absurd is that on that same day, the very same day those quotes were made, the bill passed 96 to 2.

Last week, many of our colleagues on the other side were reviving their charges of noncooperation after we took up the minimum wage bill. One said Republicans don't tend to vote for a minimum wage increase. Another said we were putting up obstacles to the bill so we wouldn't have to act on it.

We passed a good ethics and lobby reform bill and we are going to pass a good minimum wage increase bill because of Republican support and because Republicans insisted on a bipartisan package for both ethics and lobbying. That is the reason we saw an overwhelming vote at the end, support on both sides of the aisle. It is only because Republicans insisted on a bipartisan package for the minimum wage bill that I expect at some point in the near future we will see a similar vote on that. We pledged cooperation, and cooperation is exactly what we are offering in these early days of this Congress.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to a period for the transaction for morning business until 3:30 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. DORGAN, in control of 45 minutes and the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SPECTER, in control of 30 minutes.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, Senator DORGAN and I have arranged to switch times. He graciously consented to that. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for the 30-minute special order that was already announced and that Senator DORGAN be recognized for 45 minutes when my time is concluded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TELEVISING OF SUPREME COURT PROCEEDINGS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to comment about S. 344, which provides for the televising of Supreme Court proceedings. This bill is cosponsored by Senator GRASSLEY, Senator DURBIN, Senator SCHUMER, Senator FEINGOLD, and, with unanimous consent Senator CORNYN—a bipartisan representation. It is identical with legislation introduced in the last Congress after having been voted out of committee, and was voted out of committee on a 12-to-6 vote. It was previously introduced in 2005. It had a hearing on November 9 of 2005 and was reported out of committee on March 30 of 2006.

The essential provision is to require televising proceedings at the Supreme Court of the United States unless the Court determines on an individual basis that there would be an inappropriate occasion and a violation of the due process rights of the parties.

The thrust of this legislation is to bring public attention and understanding of how the Supreme Court of the United States functions, because it is the ultimate decisionmaker on so many—virtually all of the cutting edge questions of our day. The Supreme Court of the United States made the decision in Bush v. Gore, essentially deciding who would be President of the United States. The Supreme Court decides cases on the death penalty, as to who will die.

It decides by 5-to-4 decisions so many vital cases, including partial-birth or late-term abortion, deciding who will live. It decides the question of who will be elected, controlling the constitutional decision on campaign contributions. It decides the constitutionality—again, and all of the cases I mentioned are 5 to 4—on school prayer, on school vouchers, on whether the Ten Commandments may be publicly displayed, on whether affirmative action will be permitted, on whether eminent domain will be allowed—the taking of private property for governmental purposes. The Supreme Court of the United States decides the power of the President as illustrated by Hamdan v. Rumsfeld—that the President does not have a blank check and that the President is not a monarch.

The Supreme Court of the United States, again in a series of 5-to-4 decisions, has decided what is the power of Congress, declaring in U.S. v. Morrison the legislation to protect women against violence unconstitutional because the Court questioned our ''method of reasoning,'' raising a fundamental question as to where is the superiority of the Court's method of reasoning over that of the Congress. But that kind of decision, simply stated, is not understood.

Or the Supreme Court of the United States dealing with the Americans With Disabilities Act, making two decisions which are indistinguishable, upholding the statute on a paraplegic crawling into the courthouse in Tennessee and striking down the constitutionality of the statute when dealing with employment discrimination. They did so on a manufactured test of congruence and proportionality, which is literally picked out of thin air.

Under our Constitution, I respect the standing of the Supreme Court of the United States to be the final arbiter and to make the final decisions. But it is, I think, fundamental that the Court's work, the Court's operation ought to be more broadly understood. That can be achieved by television. Just as these proceedings are televised on C–SPAN, just as the House of Representatives is televised on C–SPAN, so, too, could the Supreme Court be televised on an offer made by C–SPAN to have a separate channel for Supreme Court oral arguments. There are many opportunities for the Court to receive this kind of coverage, to inform the American people about what is going on so that the American people can participate in a meaningful way as to whether the Court is functioning as a super-legislature—which it ought not to do, that being entrusted to the Congress and State legislatures, with the Court's responsibility being to interpret the law.

It should be noted that the individual Justices of the Supreme Court have already been extensively televised. Chief Justice Roberts and Justice Stevens were on ''Prime Time'' on ABC TV. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg was on CBS with Mike Wallace. Justice Breyer was on ''FOX News'' Sunday. Justice Scalia and Justice Breyer had an extensive debate last December, which is available for viewing on the Web—and in television archives. So there has been very extensive participation by Court members, which totally undercuts one of the arguments, that the notoriety would imperil the security of Supreme Court Justices.

It is also worth noting that a number of the Justices have stated support for televising the Supreme Court. For example, Justice Stevens, in an article by Henry Weinstein on July 14, 1989, said he supported cameras in the Supreme Court and told the annual Ninth Circuit Judicial Conference at about the same time that, ''In my view, it is worth a try.''

Justice Stevens has been quoted recently stating his favorable disposition to televising the Supreme Court.

Justice Breyer, during his confirmation hearings in 1994, indicated support for televising Supreme Court proceedings. He has since equivocated, but has also noted that it would be a wonderful teaching device.

In a December 13, 2006 article by David Pereira, Justice Scalia said he favored cameras in the Supreme Court to show the public that a majority of the caseload involves dull stuff.

In December of 2000, an article by Marjorie Cohn noted Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's support of camera coverage, so long as it is gavel to gavel—which can be arranged.

Justice Alito, in his Senate confirmation hearings last year, said that as a member of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals he voted to admit cameras. He added that it would be presumptuous of him to state a final position until he

had consulted with his colleagues, if confirmed. But at a minimum, he promised to keep an open mind, noting that he had favored television in the Third Circuit Court of Appeals.

Justice Kennedy, according to a September 10, 1990, article by James Rubin, told a group of visiting high school students that cameras in the Court were ''inevitable,'' as he put it. He has since equivocated, stating that if any of his colleagues raise serious objections, he would be reluctant to see the Supreme Court televised. Chief Justice Roberts said in his confirmation hearings that he would keep an open mind. Justice Thomas has opposed cameras. Justice David Souter has opposed televising the Supreme Court. Justice Souter has been the most outspoken opponent of televising the Supreme Court, saying if cameras rolled into the Supreme Court, they would roll over his—as he put it—over his dead body—a rather colorful statement. But there has been, as noted, considerable sentiment by quite a number of the Justices as to their personal views expressing favorable disposition toward televising the Supreme Court.

The question inevitably arises as to whether Congress has the authority to require televising Supreme Court proceedings, and I submit there is ample authority on Congress's generalized control over administrative matters in the Court. For example, it is the Congress which decides how many Justices there will be on the Court. It is remembered that President Roosevelt, in the mid to late 1930s, proposed a so-called ''packing of the Court'' plan to raise the number to 15. But that is a congressional judgment. The Congress decides when the Supreme Court will begin its term: on the first Monday of every October. The Congress decides what number will constitute a quorum of the Supreme Court: six. The Congress of the United States has instituted timelines that are required to be observed by the Supreme Court when determining timeliness in habeas corpus cases. So there is ample authority for the proposition that televising the Supreme Court would be constitutional.

There is an article which is due for publication in May 2007 by Associate Professor Bruce Peabody of the political science department of Fairleigh Dickinson University, and in that article, Professor Peabody makes a strong analysis that congressional action to televise the Supreme Court would be constitutional. Also, in that article Professor Peabody refers at length to the legislation which I introduced in 2005 and says that it would be constitutional and observes that:

> A case could be made for reform giving rise to more wide-ranging and creative thinking of the role and status of the judiciary if the Supreme Court was, in fact, televised.

He further notes that:

> Televising the Supreme Court could stimulate a more general discussion about whether other reforms of the court might be in order.

He notes that:

> The so-called Specter bill would be meaningful in giving wider play to a set of conversations that have long been coursing through the academy about the relationship between the court and the Congress.

The Supreme Court itself, in the 1980 decision in Richmond Newspapers v. Virginia, implicitly recognized, perhaps even sanctioned, televising the Court because in that case, the Supreme Court noted that a public trial belongs not only to the accused but to the public and the press as well; and that people acquire information on Court proceedings chiefly through the print and electronic media. But we know as a factual matter that the electronic media, television, is the basic way of best informing the public about what the Supreme Court does.

There was enormous public interest in the case of Bush v. Gore argued in the Supreme Court in December of 2000 after the challenge had been made to the calculation of the electoral votes from the State of Florida and whether the so-called chads suggested or showed that Vice President Gore was the rightful claimant for those electoral votes or whether then-Governor Bush was the rightful claimant.

The streets in front of the Supreme Court chambers across the green from the Senate Chamber were filled with television trucks. At that time, Senator BIDEN and I wrote to Chief Justice Rehnquist urging that the proceedings be televised and got back a prompt reply in the negative.

But at least on that day the Supreme Court did release an audiotape when the proceedings were over, and the Supreme Court has made available virtually contemporaneous audio tapes since. But I suggest the audio tapes do not fill the bill. They do not have the audience. They do not have the impact. They do not convey the forcefulness that televising the Supreme Court would.

There has been considerable commentary lately about the Court's workload and the Court's caseload. Chief Justice Roberts, for example, noted that the Justices:

> Hear about half the number of cases they did 25 years ago.

And, he remarked that from his vantage point, outside the Court:

> They could contribute more to the clarity and uniformity of the law by taking more cases.

They have a very light backlog. In the 2005 term, only 87 cases were argued and 69 signed opinions were issued, which is a decrease from prior years. They have left many of the splits in the circuits undecided. Former Senator DeWine, when serving on the Judiciary Committee, asked Justice Alito about the unresolved authority at the circuit level. Now Justice Alito characterized that as ''undesirable.'' But that happens because of the limited number of cases which the Supreme Court takes.

There has also been concern, as noted in an article by Stuart Taylor and Ben Wittes captioned, ''Of Clerks And Perks,'' that the four clerks per Justice constitute an undesirable allocation of resources, and the Taylor-Wittes article cites the Justice's extensive extracurricular traveling, speaking, and writing, in addition to their summer recesses and the vastly reduced docket as evidence that something needs to be done to spur the Court into taking more cases.

If the Court were to be televised, there would be more focus on what the Court is doing. That focus can be given without television, but once the Supreme Court becomes the center of attraction, the center of attention, articles such as that written by Taylor and Wittes would have much more currency.

The commentators have also raised a question about the pooling of the applications for certiorari. There were, in the 2005 term, some 8,521 filers. Most of those are petitions for certiorari. That is the fancy Latin word for whether the Court will grant process to hear the case from the lower courts. As we see, the Court acts on a very small number of those cases. Only 87 cases were argued that year in a term when more than 8,500 filings were recorded, most of those constituting cases which could have been heard. And, the Supreme Court has adopted a practice of the so-called ''cert pool,'' a process used by eight of the nine Justices. Only Justice Stevens maintains a practice of reviewing the cert petitions himself on an individual basis, of course, assisted by his clerks. But when the Court is charged with the responsibility of deciding which cases to hear, it is my view that it is very problematic and, in my judgment, inappropriate for the Justices not to be giving individualized attention, at least through their clerks, and not having a cert pool where eight of the Justices have delegated the job of deciding which cases are sufficiently important to hear to a pool.

We do not know the inner workings of the pool, but I believe it is fair and safe to infer that the judgments are made by clerks. Precisely what the level of reference and what the level of consultation with the Justices is we do not know, but when an application is made to the Supreme Court of the United States to hear a case, it is my view that there ought to be individualized consideration.

That also appeared to be the view of now Chief Justice John Roberts, who said in a 1997 speech, according to a September 20, 2000, article in the Legal Times by reporter Tony Mauro where then-private practitioner John Roberts said he ''found the pool disquieting, in that it made clerks a bit too significant in determining the Court's docket.''

I would suggest that is an understatement, to give that kind of power to the clerks and, beyond that, to give that kind of power to the clerks in a pool, where the individual Justices do

not even make the delegation to their own clerks with whatever review they would then utilize but make that a delegation to a cert pool.

There have been many scholarly statements about the desirability of having greater oversight on what happens in the Supreme Court. Chief Justice William Howard Taft, who was the 10th Supreme Court Chief Justice and the 27th President of the United States, said that review and public scrutiny was the best way to keep the judges on their toes. And Justice Felix Frankfurter said that he longed for the day when the Supreme Court would receive as much attention as the World Series because the status of the Supreme Court depended upon its reputation with the people.

These are the exact words of Chief Justice William Howard Taft:

Nothing tends more to render judges careful in their decision and anxiously solicitous to do exact justice than the consciousness that every act of theirs is subject to the intelligent scrutiny of their fellow men and to candid criticism.

Justice Felix Frankfurter's exact words were:

If the news media would cover the Supreme Court as thoroughly as it did the World Series, it would be very important since ''public confidence in the judiciary hinges on the public perception of it.''

We have a continuing dialogue and a continuing discussion as to the role of the Supreme Court in our society. We have the cutting edge questions consistently coming to the Court. We have them deciding the issues of who will live, who will die, what will be the status of prayer in the schools, what will be the status of our election laws, and through the vagaries of due process of law and equal protection, there are many standards which the Court can adopt.

I was candidly surprised, in reviewing the recent Supreme Court decisions for the confirmation hearings on Chief Justice Roberts and Justice Alito, to find how far the Court had gone in striking down the power of Congress. It was 11 years between the confirmation proceeding on Justice Breyer and the confirmation proceeding on Chief Justice Roberts. With our workload here, it is not possible, even with responsibilities on the Judiciary Committee, even with responsibilities as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, to keep up with the Supreme Court opinions.

When I read United States v. Morrison, where the Supreme Court struck down the legislation protecting women against violence on a 5-to-4 decision because Chief Justice Rehnquist questioned our ''method of reasoning,'' I wondered what kind of a transformation there was when you leave the Senate Chamber, where our columns are aligned exactly with the Supreme Court columns across the green, what kind of a transformation there was with method of reasoning that there is such superior status when going to the Court. Certainly I have noted no complaint about Senators' method of reasoning when we confirm Supreme Court Justices.

Then we picked up the Americans with Disabilities Act. We had two cases—one involving Alabama which involved employment discrimination and one involving Tennessee which involved access by a paraplegic to the courtroom—dealing with exactly the same records. In the Alabama case, the Supreme Court declared 5 to 4 that the act of Congress was unconstitutional. In the Tennessee case, exactly on the same record, they decided the act was constitutional. What standard did they use? They adopted a standard on a 1997 Supreme Court decision in a case called Boerne. In that case, the Supreme Court decided they would render a constitutional judgment in a context where Congress had legislated under article V of the 14th amendment to preserve due process of law where the challenge was made by the State that the States were immune under the 11th amendment. The Supreme Court decided it would impose a test of whether the statute was ''congruent and proportional.'' This standard had never been heard in jurisprudence before that time, ''congruent and proportional.'' I defy anyone to say what those words mean in a standard which can be applied in a way which can be predicted by lawyers and understood by State legislators and understood by clients.

In a dissenting opinion, Justice Scalia chastised the Court for being, in effect, the taskmaster of the Congress, to see if the Congress had done its homework, whereas in prior cases the adequacy of the record was determined by a substantial record and the Court would defer to the judgment of Congress, which established, through lengthy hearings and proceedings, a very extensive record. In talking to my colleagues, those decisions by the Supreme Court undercutting congressional power were not known.

Then we have the Supreme Court being the final arbiter on what happens on Executive power, what happens at Guantanamo, what is the responsibility of the President of the United States on military commissions, what is the responsibility under the Geneva Conventions. Here again, I respect the Supreme Court's decisions, respect their role as the final arbiter, but say that there ought to be an understanding by the public. It may be that there will never be a case which has more impact on the working of Government than the decision as to whether the Florida electoral votes would be counted for George Bush or for Albert Gore in the famous case of Bush v. Gore.

A prior version of this legislation came out of committee last year on a bipartisan 12-to-6 vote. It has very substantial cosponsorship. I urge my colleagues to consider it carefully. I urge the distinguished majority leader to look for a spot to bring such legislation to the Senate.

There is companion legislation which Senator GRASSLEY is offering which gives the courts—the Supreme Court, courts of appeals, trial courts—the discretion to have television. My legislation, S. 344, is more targeted. It has a requirement as to the Supreme Court televising its proceedings unless there is some due-process violation which is considered on a case-by-case basis.

When the article comes out by Professor Bruce Peabody in the University of Notre Dame Law Journal, I commend it to everyone's attention. I have advance text, have cited some of Professor Peabody's conclusions on his decision that the legislation has very important public policy benefits and, as he analyzes it, is constitutional.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the written statement be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as if recited, and I ask that prior to the introduction of that prepared statement, my statement appear, that the comments I have made up until now have been a summary of that more extensive statement, an extemporaneous summary, and the full statement follows. Sometimes people reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD wonder why there is so much repetition, and I think a word of explanation that the initial statement is a summary and the formal statement is added would explain why the repetition exists.

I ask all of this explanation be printed in the RECORD. Finally, I ask that Senator CORNYN be included as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WEBB). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR SPECTER'S TALKING POINTS UPON INTRODUCTION OF S. 344, A BILL TO PERMIT THE TELEVISING OF SUPREME COURT PROCEEDINGS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, once again I seek recognition to introduce legislation that will give the public greater access to our Supreme Court. This bill requires the high Court to permit television coverage of its open sessions unless it decides by a majority vote of the Justices that allowing such coverage in a particular case would violate the due process rights of one or more of the parties involved in the matter.

The purpose of this legislation is to open the Supreme Court doors so that more Americans can see the process by which the Court reaches critical decisions that affect this country and all Americans. The Supreme Court makes pronouncements on Constitutional and Federal law that have a direct impact on the rights and lives of all of us. Televising the Court's oral arguments will enhance the public's understanding of the issues and the impact of, and reasons for, the Court's decisions.

I believe that now is the right time for this legislation. In his 2006 Year-End Report on the Federal Judiciary, Chief Justice Roberts noted that ''The total number of cases filed in the Supreme Court increased from 7,496 filings in the 2004 Term to 8,521 filings in the 2005 Term—an increase of 13.7 percent.'' Despite this increase in petitions, during the 2005 Term, only 87 cases were argued, and 69

signed opinions were issued. These 69 signed opinions compares to 74 opinions in the 2004 Term.

A recent article by law professor Jeffrey Rosen in The Atlantic Monthly points out that ''Fifty-four percent of the decisions in the first year of the Roberts Court were unanimous'' and ''the Court issued more consecutive unanimous opinions than at any other time in recent history.'' I commend the Supreme Court and Chief Justice Roberts for what appears to be an increase in consensus, as reflected in the unanimity in these cases.

But I am concerned about the steady decline each year in the number of Supreme Court full opinions; the number of cases decided by the slimmest majority of five justices; and the number of opinions that have multiple dissents and concurrences that lead to more confusion than clarity in the law. I believe that permitting cameras into oral arguments is one way to shed light on the nature of the work of the Supreme Court and to improve public awareness of the Court's workload, the Court's institutional prerogatives, and even judicial personalities. The public wants to know: Who are these judges and how do they do what they do?

A January 7, 2007 article by Robert Barnes in the Washington Post observes that ''After decades of decline in its caseload, the [Supreme] Court is once again on track to take its fewest number of cases in modern history.'' The article notes that during his confirmation proceedings, Chief Justice Roberts observed that the justices ''hear about half the number of cases they did 25 years ago'' and he remarked that from his vantage point outside the court, ''they could contribute more to the clarity and uniformity of the law by taking more cases.'' Similarly, during his confirmation hearings and in response to questions from Senator DeWine, Justice Alito described unresolved splits of authority at the circuit court level as ''undesirable.''

The Barnes article posits six possible reasons for the Court's waning docket: (1) 1988 legislation passed at the Court's request that limits the Court's mandatory review docket (2) the change in justices over the past couple of decades, (3) a decrease in splits among the circuits due to an increasingly homogenous appellate judiciary appointed by Republican administrations, (4) a decrease in appeals by the Federal government as a result of more government wins in the lower courts, (5) the ''cert pool'' process used by eight of the nine Justices, which relies upon law clerks to recommend which cases are ''cert-worthy;'' and (6) the possibility that justices on a closely divided court are hesitant to grant certiorari if they think their view will not prevail in the ultimate outcome of a case. I have no particular view on the merits of these possible explanations but they do make me increasingly curious about the Court and its workload.

In a September 2005 article in The Atlantic Monthly, Stuart Taylor, Jr. suggests, ''As our Supreme Court justices have become remote from the real world, they've also become more reluctant to do real work—especially the sort of quotidian chores done by prior justices to ensure the smooth functioning of the judicial system. The Court's overall productivity—as measured by the number of full, signed decisions—has fallen by almost half since 1985. Clerks draft almost all the opinions and perform almost all the screening that leads to the dismissal without comment of 99 percent of all petitions for review. Many of the cases dismissed are the sort that could be used to wring clear perversities and inefficiencies out of our litigation system—especially out of commercial and personal-injury litigation.'' Mr. Taylor concludes the article by exclaiming, ''Quietly our Supreme Court has become a sort of aristocracy—unable or unwilling to clearly see the workings, glitches, and peculiarities of the justice system over which it presides from such great altitude.''

Mr. Taylor's frustration with the Supreme Court may have reached its zenith when, in July of 2006, he coauthored an article with Benn Wittes entitled, ''Of Clerks and Perks.'' In this piece the authors suggest that ''an exasperated Congress'' should ''fire'' the Court's clerks by reducing the budget for clerks from four (4) per justice to one (1). Mr. Taylor and Mr. Wittes cite the justices' extracurricular traveling, speaking and writing, in addition to their summer recesses and vastly reduced docket as evidence that something needs to be done to spur the Court into taking up more cases. According to the authors, terminating ¾ of the clerks would end the justices' ''debilitating reliance on twentysomething law-school graduates'' and ''shorten their tenure by forcing them to do their own work, making their jobs harder and inducing them to retire before power corrupts absolutely or decrepitude sets in.''

I do not necessarily agree with Mr. Taylor or Mr. Wittes about what ails the Supreme Court. I do, however, strongly agree with their observation that ''Any competent justice should be able to handle more than the current average of about nine majority opinions a year. And those who don't want to work hard ought to resign in favor of people who do.''

Shortly after Taylor and Wittes issued their acerbic diatribe against the Court for its failure to grant certiorari in more cases, a September 20, 2006 article by Legal Times reporter Tony Mauro observed that eight of the nine sitting justices, including the recently confirmed Chief Justice Roberts and Justice Alito, would continue to participate in the Supreme Court's law clerk cert-pool. Mauro describes the cert-pool as an ''arrangement, devised in 1972, [that] radically changed what happens when a petition for review or certiorari comes in to the court. Instead of being reviewed separately by nine clerks and/or nine justices, it is scrutinized for the pool, presumably in greater depth, by one clerk, who then writes a memo for all the justices in the pool.'' Mr. Mauro goes on to remind us that in a 1997 speech John Roberts gave while in private practice, ''he found the pool 'disquieting' in that it made clerks 'a bit too significant' in determining the court's docket.''

A December 7, 2006 article by Linda Greenhouse observed that ''The Court has taken about 40 percent fewer cases so far this term than last. It now faces noticeable gaps in its calendar for late winter and early spring. The December shortfall is the result of a pipeline empty of cases granted last term and carried over to this one.'' Looking back at last term, Ms. Greenhouse observed, ''The number of cases the court decided with signed opinions last term, 69, was the lowest since 1953 and fewer than half the number the court was deciding as recently as the mid–1980s.'' Ms. Greenhouse goes on to note that 16 of the 69 cases—about 23 percent—were decisions with a split of five to four.

On January 11, 2007, in an article by Brooke Masters and Patti Waldmeir, the Financial Times tells how ''For years, the court declined to hear many cases that most profoundly affected corporate America.'' Ms. Masters and Ms. Waldmeir note that 44 percent of the Supreme Court's docket this term includes cases involving business, up from 30 percent in the previous two terms. Nonetheless, they note, ''Far too often . . . Supreme Court rulings cast as much ambiguity as they resolve.'' The authors go on to quote Steve Bokat, general counsel of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce as saying he'd ''rather have a bad decision that's clear than an OK decision that's not.'' According to Bokat, ''Ninety percent of the time, if you get clarity in a decision with a definitive holding, you at least know what your obligations are, and even if you don't like the opinion you are much less likely to get in trouble with litigation.'' Bokat said Chief Justice Roberts ''gets this'' and ''understands the importance of clarity'' yet Bokat notes that ''in order to get that unanimity the decisions tend to be more narrow [and] it doesn't give you much advice on what to do going forward.''

I should also note that recent news articles point out the high Court has become more media friendly—even though the same articles deem the prospect of televised proceedings ''remote.'' A December 25, 2006 article by Mark Sherman observes ''Lately . . . some members of the court have been popping up in unusual places—including network television news programs—and talking about more than just the law.'' Mr. Sherman notes with some irony that then-Chief Justice ''Rehnquist could stroll around the court, unrecognized by tourists. Justice Anthony Kennedy snapped a photograph for visitors who had no idea who he was and Justice John Paul Stevens was once asked to move out of the way by a picture-taking tourist.'' The article suggests that despite the Supreme Court's reticence about cameras in oral arguments, Chief Justice ''Roberts believes its credibility will be enhanced if the justices appear less remote.''

Frankly, I agree with the view that making the justices less remote adds to the credibility of the Supreme Court. I also believe that public understanding may help heal some of the deep division and even cynicism we have in some segments of our society. This is why I'm introducing legislation to permit cameras into oral arguments. As our 27th President and 10th Chief Justice William Howard Taft teaches, ''Nothing tends more to render judges careful in their decision and anxiously solicitous to do exact justice than the consciousness that every act of theirs is to be subject to the intelligent scrutiny of their fellow men, and to their candid criticism . . . . In the case of judges having a life tenure, indeed, their very independence makes the right freely to comment on their decisions of greater importance, because it is the only practical and available instrument in the hands of a free people to keep judges alive to the reasonable demands of those they serve.

For their part, some of the justices have expressed an openness to the idea of allowing a broader audience to see oral arguments.

Chief Justice Roberts, in addition to comments about the court needing to appear less remote, stated at his 2005 confirmation hearing upon being nominated as Chief Justice, ''Well, you know my new best friend, [former] Sen. Thompson assures me that television cameras are nothing to be afraid of. But, I don't have a set view on that.''

Justice Alito, at his Senate Confirmation hearings in 2006, said that as a member of the 3rd Circuit Court of Appeals, he voted to admit cameras, but a majority of his colleagues rejected the idea. In response to a question I posed, Justice Alito said, ''I argued we should do it'' but he went on to qualify his personal belief by saying, ''it would be presumptuous for me to talk about it right now'' with respect to the Supreme Court. Justice Alito pledged he would ''keep an open mind despite the position I took on the circuit court.''

Justice Breyer, during his confirmation hearings in 1994, indicated support for televised Supreme Court proceedings. He has more recently stated, at an event in late

2005, that cameras in the Supreme Court ''would be a wonderful teaching device'' but might become a symbol for lower federal courts and state courts on the advisability of cameras in courtrooms. Justice Breyer noted that ''not one of us wants to take a step that could undermine the court as an institution'' and expressed the hope that ''eventually the answer will become clear . . . .''

Justice Stevens, according to a July 14, 1989 article by Henry Weinstein in the Times Mirror, appears to support cameras and he told the annual 9th Circuit Judicial Conference attendees, ''In my view, it's worth a try.''

Justice Kennedy, according to a September 10, 1990 article by James H. Rubin, told a group of visiting high school students that cameras in the Court were ''inevitable.'' But Justice Kennedy later stated that ''a number of people would want to make us part of the national entertainment network.'' In testimony before the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee in March of 1996, Justice Kennedy pledged, ''as long as any of my colleagues very seriously objects, I shall join with them.''

Justice Thomas, in an October 27, 2006 article by R. Robin McDonald, is quoted as saying, ''I'm not all that enthralled with that idea. I don't see how it helps us do our job. I think it may distract from us doing our job.'' Justice Thomas added that if 80 percent of the appellate process is wrapped up in the briefs, ''How many of the people watching will know what the case is about if they haven't read the briefs?'' Justice Thomas went on to suggest the viewing public would have a ''very shallow'' level of understanding about the case.

On October 10, 2005, Justice Scalia, opposed an earlier version of my bill, stating, ''We don't want to become entertainment . . . . I think there's something sick about making entertainment out of real people's problems. I don't like it in the lower courts, and I don't particularly like it in the Supreme Court.'' Yet a recent December 13, 2006, article by David Perara reports that Justice Scalia favors cameras in the Supreme Court to show the public that a majority of the caseload involves, ''Internal Revenue code, the [Employee Retirement Income Security Act], the bankruptcy code—really dull stuff.''

Justice Ginsburg made a similar observation: ''The problem is the dullness of most [Supreme] Court proceedings.'' This comment was in a December 2000 article by Marjorie Cohen who noted Justice Ginsburg's support of camera coverage so long as it is gavel-to-gavel.

Justice Scalia's, Justice Thomas' and Justice Ginsberg's points are well taken. The public should see that the issues decided by the Court are not simple and not always exciting, but they are, nonetheless, very important.

So I have to disagree with Justice Souter, who appears to be the staunchest opponent of cameras in the Supreme Court and who famously said in 1996, ''I can tell you the day you see a camera come into our courtroom, it is going to roll over my dead body.''

Many years ago, Justice Felix Frankfurter may have anticipated the day when Supreme Court arguments would be televised when he said that he longed for a day when: ''The news media would cover the Supreme Court as thoroughly as it did the World Series, since the public confidence in the judiciary hinges on the public's perception of it, and that perception necessarily hinges on the media's portrayal of the legal system.'' It is hard to justify continuing to exclude cameras from the courtroom of the Nation's highest court. As one legal commentator observes: ''An effective and legitimate way to satisfy America's curiosity about the Supreme Court's holdings, Justices, and modus operandi is to permit broadcast coverage of oral arguments and decision announcements from the courtroom itself.''

In recent years watershed Supreme Court precedents, have been joined by important cases like Hamdi, Rasul and Roper—all cases that affect fundamental individual rights. In Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, 2004, the Court concluded that although Congress authorized the detention of combatants, due process demands that a citizen held in the United States as an enemy combatant be given a meaningful opportunity to contest the factual basis for that detention before a neutral decisionmaker. The Court reaffirmed the Nation's commitment to constitutional principles even during times of war and uncertainty.

Similarly, in Rasul v. Bush, 2004, the Court held that the Federal habeas statute gave district courts jurisdiction to hear challenges of aliens held at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba in the U.S. War on Terrorism. In Roper v. Simmons, a 2005 case, the Court held that executions of individuals who were under 18 years of age at the time of their capital crimes is prohibited by Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments.

Then on June 27, 2005, the high Court issued two rulings regarding the public display of the Ten Commandments. Each opinion was backed by a different coalition of four, with Justice Breyer as the swing vote. The only discernible rule seems to be that the Ten Commandments may be displayed outside a public courthouse (Van Orden v. Perry), but not inside (McCreary County v. American Civil Liberties Union) and may be displayed with other documents, but not alone. In Van Orden v. Perry, the Supreme Court permitted a display of the Ten Commandments to remain on the grounds outside the Texas State Capitol. However, in McCreary County v. ACLU, a bare majority of Supreme Court Justices ruled that two Kentucky counties violated the Establishment Clause by erecting displays of the Ten Commandments indoors for the purpose of advancing religion. While the multiple concurring and dissenting opinions in these cases serve to explain some of the confounding differences in outcomes, it would have been extraordinarily fruitful for the American public to watch the Justices as they grappled with these issues during oral arguments that, presumably, reveal much more of their deliberative processes than mere text.

These are important cases, but does the public understand how the Court grappled with the issues? When so many Americans get their news and information from television, how can we keep them in the dark about how the Court works?

When deciding issues of such great national import, the Supreme Court is rarely unanimous. In fact, a large number of seminal Supreme Court decisions have been reached through a vote of 5–4. Such a close margin reveals that these decisions are far from foregone conclusions distilled from the meaning of the Constitution, reason and the application of legal precedents. On the contrary, these major Supreme Court opinions embody critical decisions reached on the basis of the preferences and views of each individual justice. In a case that is decided by a vote of 5–4, an individual justice has the power by his or her vote to change the law of the land.

5–4 Split Decisions Since the Beginning of the October 2005 Term

Since the beginning of its October 2005 Term when Chief Justice Roberts first began hearing cases, the Supreme Court has issued twelve (12) decisions with a 5–4 split out of a total of 96 decisions—the most recent of which, Osborn v. Haley, was issued few days ago (January 22, 2007). The Court has also issued four (4) decisions with votes of 5–3, with one justice recused. Finally, it has issued a rare 5–2 decision in which Chief Justice Roberts and Justice Alito took no part. In sum, since the beginning of its October 2005 Term, the Supreme Court has issued seventeen (17) decisions establishing the law of the land in which only five (5) justices explicitly concurred. Many these narrow majorities occur in decisions involving the Court's interpretation of our Constitution—a sometimes divisive endeavor on the Court. I will not discuss all 17 of these narrow majority cases, but will describe a few to illustrate my point about the importance of the Court and its decisions in the lives of Americans.

Eighth Amendment, Death Penalty & Aggravating Factors or Mitigating Evidence

The first 5–4 split decision, decided on January 11, 2006, was Brown v. Sanders, which involves the death penalty. In that case the Court held that in death penalty cases, an invalidated sentencing factor will render the sentence unconstitutional by reason of its adding an improper element to the aggravation scale unless one of the other sentencing factors enables the sentencer to give aggravating weight to the same facts and circumstances. The majority opinion was authored by Justice Scalia and joined by Chief Justice Roberts and Justices O'Connor, Kennedy and Thomas. Justice Stevens filed a dissenting opinion in which Justice Souter joined. Similarly, Justice Breyer filed a dissenting opinion in which Justice Ginsburg joined.

Last November the Supreme Court decided Ayers v. Belmontes, a capital murder case in which the Belmontes contended that California law and the trial court's instructions precluded the jury from considering his forward looking mitigation evidence suggesting he could lead a constructive life while incarcerated. In Ayers the Supreme Court found the Ninth Circuit erred in holding that the jury was precluded by jury instructions from considering mitigation evidence. Justice Kennedy authored the majority opinion while Justice Stevens wrote a dissent joined by three other justices.

Other 5–4 split decisions since October 2005 include United States v. Gonzalez-Lopez, concerning whether a defendant's Sixth Amendment right to counsel was violated when a district court refused to grant his paid lawyer permission to represent him based upon some past ethical violation by the lawyer (June 26, 2006); LULAC v. Perry, deciding whether the 2004 Texas redistricting violated provisions of the Voting Rights Act (June 28, 2006); Kansas v. Marsh, concerning the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments in a capital murder case in which the defense argued that a Kansas statute established an unconstitutional presumption in favor of the death sentence when aggravating and mitigating factors were in equipoise (April 25, 2006); Clark v. Arizona, a capital murder case involving the constitutionality of an Arizona Supreme Court precedent governing the admissibility of evidence to support an insanity defense (June 29, 2006); and Garcetti v. Ceballos, a case holding that when public employees make statements pursuant to their official duties they are not speaking as citizens for First Amendment purposes, and the Constitution does not insulate their communications from employer discipline (May 30, 2006).

THE JUSTICES HAVE SPLIT 5–3 FOUR (4) TIMES SINCE OCTOBER 2005

FOURTH AMENDMENT WARRANT REQUIREMENT

In Georgia v. Randolph, (March 22, 2006), a 5–3 majority of the Supreme Court held that a physically present co-occupant's stated refusal to permit a warrantless entry and search rendered the search unreasonable and invalid as to that occupant. Justice Souter authored the majority opinion. Justice Stevens filed a concurring opinion as did Justice Breyer. The Chief Justice authored a dissent joined by Justice Scalia. Moreover, Justice Scalia issued his own dissent as did Justice Thomas. In Randolph, there were six opinions in all from a Court that only has nine justices. One can only imagine the spirited debate and interplay of ideas, facial expressions and gestures that occurred in oral arguments. Audio recordings are simply inadequate to capture all the nuance that only cameras could capture and convey.

ACTUAL INNOCENCE AND HABEAS CORPUS

In House v. Bell, a 5–3 opinion authored by Justice Kennedy (June 12, 2006), the Supreme Court held that because House had made the stringent showing required by the actual innocence exception to judicially-established procedural default rules, he could challenge his conviction even after exhausting his regular appeals. Justice Alito took no part in considering or deciding the House case. It bears noting, however, that if one Justice had been on the other side of this decision it would have resulted in a 4–4 tie and, ultimately, led to affirming the lower court's denial of House's post-conviction habeas petitions due to a procedural default.

MILITARY COMMISSIONS, GENEVA CONVENTIONS AND HABEAS CORPUS

In Hamdan v. Rumsfeld, a 5–3 decision in which Chief Justice Roberts did not participate, the Supreme Court held that Hamdan could challenge his detention and the jurisdiction of the President's military commissions to try him despite the 2005 enactment of the Detainee Treatment Act. A thin majority of the justices held that, although the DTA states that ''no court . . . shall have jurisdiction to hear or consider . . . an application for . . . habeas corpus filed by . . . an alien detained . . . at Guantanamo Bay,'' the President could not establish a military commission to try Hamdan unless Congress granted him the authority through legislation. This case was of great interest and great importance, and was one of a handful of recent cases in which the Supreme Court released audiotapes or oral arguments almost immediately after they occurred. The prompt release of the audiotapes was good, but it would have been far better to allow the public to watch the parties' advocates and the Justices grapple with the jurisdictional, constitutional and merits-related questions that were addressed in that case. With due respect to Justices Scalia and Ginsberg, watching the advocates respond as the Justices pepper them with questions is something that should be seen and heard.

14TH AMENDMENT DUE PROCESS AND NOTICE CONCERNING TAX LIENS ON HOMES

In another 5–3 case, Jones v. Flowers, (April 26, 2006), the Supreme Court considered whether the government must take additional reasonable steps to provide notice before taking the owner's property when notice of a tax sale is mailed to the owner and returned undelivered. The public can readily understand this issue. In an opinion by Chief Justice Roberts, the Court held that where the Arkansas Commissioner of State Lands had mailed Jones a certified letter and it had been returned unclaimed, the Commissioner had to take additional reasonable steps to provide Jones notice. Justices Thomas, Scalia and Kennedy dissented and Justice Alito took no part in the decision.

Not only lawyers who might listen to the audio tapes and read the full opinions, but all citizens could benefit from knowing how the Court grapples with legal issues related to their rights—in one case something as straightforward as the right to own one's home as it may be affected by unclaimed mail—and in another the right of someone who is in prison to be heard by a court. My legislation creates the opportunity for all interested Americans to watch the Court in action in cases like these.

Regardless of one's views concerning the merits of these decisions, the interplay between the government, on the one hand, and the individual on the other is something many Americans want to understand more fully. So, it is with these watershed decisions in mind that I introduce legislation designed to make the Supreme Court less remote. Millions of Americans recently watched the televised confirmation hearings for our two newest Justices. Americans want information, knowledge, and understanding; in short, they want access.

In a democracy, the workings of the government at all levels should be open to public view. With respect to oral arguments, the more openness and the broader opportunity for public observation—the greater will be the public's understanding and trust. As the Supreme Court observed in Press-Enterprise Co. v. Superior Court (1986), ''People in an open society do not demand infallibility from their institutions, but it is difficult for them to accept what they are prohibited from observing.'' It was in this spirit that the House of Representatives opened its deliberations to meaningful public observation by allowing C–SPAN to begin televising debates in the House chamber in 1979. The Senate followed the House's lead in 1986 by voting to allow television coverage of the Senate floor.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND ACTION ON CAMERAS IN THE FEDERAL COURTS

On November 9, 2005, the Judiciary Committee held a hearing to address whether Federal court proceedings should be televised generally and to consider S. 1768, my earlier version of this bill, and S. 829, Senator GRASSLEY's ''Sunshine in the Courtroom Act of 2005.'' During the November 9 hearing, most witnesses spoke favorably of cameras in the courts, particularly at the appellate level. Among the witnesses favorably disposed toward the cameras were Peter Irons, author of May It Please the Court, Seth Berlin, a First Amendment expert at a local firm, Brian Lamb, founder of C–SPAN, Henry Schleif of Court TV Networks, and Barbara Cochran of the Radio-Television News Directors Association and Foundation.

A different view was expressed by Judge Jan DuBois of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, who testified on behalf of the Judicial Conference. Judge DuBois warned of concerns, particularly at the trial level, where witnesses may appear uncomfortable because of cameras, and thus might seem less credible to jurors. I note, however, that these would not be issues in appellate courts, where there are no witnesses or jurors.

The Judiciary Committee considered and passed both bills on March 30, 2006. The Committee vote to report S. 1768 was 12–6, and the bill was placed on the Senate Legislative Calendar. Unfortunately, due to the press of other business neither bill was allotted time on the Senate Floor.

CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY TO LEGISLATE CAMERAS IN THE COURT

In my judgment, Congress, with the concurrence of the President, or overriding his veto, has the authority to require the Supreme Court to televise its proceedings. Such a conclusion is not free from doubt and may be tested in the Supreme Court, which will have the final word. As I see it, there is no constitutional prohibition against this legislation.

Article 3 of the Constitution states that the judicial power of the United States shall be vested ''in one Supreme Court and such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish.'' While the Constitution specifically creates the Supreme Court, it left it to Congress to determine how the Court would operate. For example, it was Congress that fixed the number of justices on the Supreme Court at nine. Likewise, it was Congress that decided that any six of these justices are sufficient to constitute a quorum of the Court. It was Congress that decided that the term of the Court shall commence on the first Monday in October of each year, and it was Congress that determined the procedures to be followed whenever the Chief Justice is unable to perform the duties of his office. Congress also controls more substantive aspects of the Supreme Court. Most importantly, it is Congress that in effect determines the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Although the Constitution itself sets out the appellate jurisdiction of the Court, it provides that such jurisdiction exists ''with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.''

The Supreme Court could permit television through its own rule but has decided not to do so. Congress should be circumspect and even hesitant to impose a rule mandating television coverage of oral arguments and should do so only in the face of compelling public policy reasons. The Supreme Court has such a dominant role in key decision-making functions that its proceedings ought to be better known to the public; and, in the absence of a Court rule, public policy would be best served by enacting legislation requiring the televising of Supreme Court proceedings.

My legislation embodies sound policy and will prove valuable to the public. I urge my colleagues to support this bill. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD and I yield the Floor.

Mr. SPECTER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, by previous order, I am to be recognized; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, for 45 minutes.

VA HEALTH CARE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, on Saturday of this past weekend, I was in Minneapolis, MN, for some meetings. In the Minneapolis Star Tribune newspaper, there was on the front page a story that I read with substantial disappointment and concern. I will relate it to my colleagues.

Kevin Giles for the Minneapolis Star Tribune wrote a story:

This Marine's death came after he served in Iraq.

The subhead is:

When Jonathan Schulze came home from Iraq, he tried to live a normal life, but the war kept that from happening.

The story is a lengthy one about a man who served in Iraq, was a marine, very proud of being a marine, a combat marine. His name was Jonathan Schulze. In Iraq, he carried a heavy machine gun as part of his combat experience. He apparently indicated he had watched about 16 of his unit members and close friends die in some very aggressive fighting in Iraq, described the battles. He was twice wounded, earned two Purple Hearts, came back to this country, was discharged, and had very serious post-traumatic stress disorder, severe psychological problems. He couldn't sleep, reliving the combat during his sleep and then having flashbacks when awake.

On December 14, he went to the VA center in Minneapolis, met with a psychiatrist, according to this news account, and was told that he could be admitted for some treatment in March. This was December. On January 12, a couple of weeks ago, he went to the VA hospital in St. Cloud, according to this account. He told the people at the VA hospital in St. Cloud that he was thinking of committing suicide, thinking of killing himself. His parents were with him at that point. They verify that is what he told the VA hospital in St. Cloud. He was thinking of committing suicide, and he wanted to be admitted as a patient. They told him they could not admit him as a patient.

The next day, he called the VA, called them back, and they told him that he was No. 26 on the waiting list. Four days later, he hung himself. This young man who served his country honorably as a U.S. marine reached out for help. According to his parents, who were there at the time, he went to a VA hospital and said: I need help, I want to be admitted, I am having thoughts of suicide, and he was refused. The next day, he was told he is 26th on the list.

I don't know all of the facts about this. I only know the facts I have read in a newspaper. But the story is nearly unbelievable to me. The newspaper description of the flag-draped coffin of this young marine who earned two Purple Hearts fighting for his country in Iraq contains a sad, sad story of a young marine who should have gotten medical help for serious psychological problems that were the result of his wartime experience.

I am going to ask the inspector general to investigate what happened in this case. What happened that a young man who was a marine veteran with two Purple Hearts turns up at a VA center and says: I am thinking of committing suicide, can you help me, can you admit me, and he is told: No, the list is 26 long in front of you? Something dreadfully wrong happened. The result is a young man is dead. What happened here? Does it happen other places?

We know the heavy toll war imposes on these young men and women who wear America's uniform and who answer this country's call. My colleagues and I have all been to Bethesda and Walter Reed, and have visited the veterans who have lost arms and legs, who have had head injuries, especially, because the body armor these days means that the injuries more often sustained are the loss of an arm or a leg or a brain injury due to the improvised explosive devices. We know about the VA health care system. The VA health care system has been excellent in some respects. It has gotten good reviews. But what has happened here? Are there others who show up at a VA center and say: I need help, only to be told no help is available? I hope that is not the case.

But I am going to ask the Inspector General to investigate this case and find out what happened. Is it happening other places? And what can we do to prevent this from happening again? It is the unbelievable cost of war.

ISSUES OF PRIORITY

IRAQ

Mr. DORGAN. This week or next week we will discuss once again the war in Iraq—a war that has now lasted longer than World War II. President Bush has indicated to the Congress and to the American people he has a new strategy. The new strategy he is proposing is to move an additional 20,000 American troops into Iraq. This morning, the more recent polls suggest the President's approval is at 30 percent. Polls also suggest the American people do not support deepening our country's involvement in Iraq. It is quite clear that the Congress does not support it either.

The decision by the President comes on the heels of the Baker-Hamilton commission that had some of the best minds in this country—Republicans and Democrats, old hands and younger people—who took a look at this, who understand foreign policy, understand military policy, and evaluated what are the potential choices, and decided that the deepening of our country's involvement in Iraq would be the wrong choice.

The blue ribbon commission told the President it would be the wrong choice to deepen our involvement in Iraq. Yet, the President decided that is exactly what he is going to do.

It is important, I think, as we discuss it this week and next week, to understand this Congress will always support the men and women whom we have asked to go to battle for our country. I would not support any effort by anyone to withdraw funds for our troops. If our troops are there, they must have everything they need to complete their mission and finish their jobs. But the fact is, in all of these discussions, I regret to say the President and Vice President do not have all that much credibility. Four years ago they presented to this Congress—much of it in top-secret briefings in this Capitol—intelligence that supposedly buttressed the Administration's request that Congress pass a resolution that would give them the authority to use force against Iraq. It turns out now that much of that intelligence was wrong. Much of it was just fundamentally wrong. Now we know that those who offered the intelligence assessment to Congress knew there were serious doubts about it even as they were offering it to Congress as fact. They are some of the highest officials in our Government. I wish I did not have to say that, but it is the truth.

It was not good intelligence. For example, take the mobile chemical weapons labs that we were told existed for sure. We now understand that was the product of a single source of intelligence, a person named ''Curveball,'' a person who was likely a drunk and a fabricator. On the basis of a single source, whom the Germans, who turned Curveball's information over to our country, thought not to be reliable or likely not to be reliable, we were told by this administration in briefings that this was a case that would justify going to war.

The aluminum tubes. We now understand the aluminum tubes were not for the purpose of reconstituting a nuclear threat. We also understand there are those in the line of—well, I was going to say the chain of command—those at high positions in our Government today who knew there was substantial evidence and disagreement from other parts of our Government who did not believe the aluminum tubes were for the purpose of reconstituting a nuclear effort or nuclear capability in Iraq. Yet, that information was withheld from the Congress, probably and apparently deliberately withheld from the Congress.

Yellowcake from Niger: Again, another case of almost exactly the same thing.

It is the case that the Congress was misled by bad intelligence, and the American people were misled by that same intelligence. That is not me saying that. It is Colonel Wilkerson, who worked 17 years as a top assistant to Colin Powell, the Secretary of State, who made the case at the United Nations. Colonel Wilkerson, who was involved in all that activity, spoke out publicly, and he said it was the ''perpetration of a hoax on the American people.'' That is not me. Those are the words of a top official who was involved, who was there. Yet, no one has had to answer for it, no one.

Hearings. No oversight hearings by the majority party in the last Congress. No one has answered for it.

Now we have a new Iraqi policy, new warnings about more danger in Iraq. But it comes at a time when there is precious little credibility. We now find ourselves in Iraq, longer than we were in the Second World War, in the middle of a civil war. Most of the violence in

Iraq is sectarian violence: Sunnis and Shias killing each other; American soldiers placed in the middle of a civil war.

The fact is, the leader of Iraq is now gone, dead. He was executed. Saddam Hussein does not exist. The Iraqi people were able to elect their own Government. They were able to vote for their own constitution. That is done. That is progress. But now Iraq is in the middle of a civil war. And to deepen America's involvement in the middle of a civil war in Iraq makes little sense to me.

What does make sense to me is to say to the Iraqis: This is your Government, not ours. This belongs to you, not us. And you have a responsibility now to provide for your own security.

Here is what General Abizaid, the head of Central Command, said 2 months ago. He said:

I met every divisional commander, General Casey, the corps commander, General Dempsey, we all talked together. And I said, ''in your professional opinion, if we were to bring in more American troops now, does it add considerably to our ability to achieve success in Iraq?'' And they all said no.

''I met with every divisional commander.'' ''They said no.''

Now, General Abizaid, also in testimony 2 months ago, said:

And the reason [his commanders said no to additional troops] is because we want the Iraqis to do more. It is easy for the Iraqis to rely upon us to do this work. I believe that more American forces prevent the Iraqis from doing more, from taking more responsibility for their own future.

In other words, the Iraqi attitude is: if American troops can do the job, that is fine. Let the American troops do the job. Our responsibility, it seems to me, is to say to the Iraqi people: This is your country, not ours. Security is your responsibility. And if you cannot provide for security, the American soldiers cannot do that for any great length of time. You have to decide whether you want to take your country back.

Now, as the President says, his change in strategy is to move more American troops to Iraq. I want to describe what John Negroponte, the head of our intelligence service, said in open testimony to the Congress 2 weeks ago:

Al-Qaeda is the terrorist organization that poses the greatest threat to U.S. interests, including to the homeland.

That is testimony from the top intelligence chief in our country: Al-Qaida is the greatest terrorist threat to U.S. interests, including to the homeland. Then let me show you what he says beyond that. He says: al-Qaida ''continues to plot attacks against our homeland and other targets with the objective of inflicting mass casualties. And they continue to maintain active connections and relationships that radiate outward from their leaders' secure hideout in Pakistan. . . .''

Understand this is who attacked America: al-Qaida. They described it. They boasted about it. They murdered thousands of Americans. They attacked America on 9/11. Their leadership is now, according to our top intelligence chief, in testimony before this Congress 2 weeks ago, in a ''secure hideout in Pakistan.''

It seems to me if there are 20,000 additional soldiers available, job one for this country is to eliminate the greatest terrorist threat—the greatest terrorist threat—described by the intelligence chief the week before last as al-Qaida. It ''poses the greatest threat to U.S. interests, including to the homeland.'' He also says they are in secure hideaways in Pakistan.

I do not understand for a moment why the greatest priority for us is not to eliminate the most significant terrorist threat to our country and to eliminate the leadership of the organization that boasts about murdering Americans on 9/11. If that were part of the new strategy, I would be here saying: I am for it. But it is not.

There is not, regrettably, an easy answer or a good answer with respect to Iraq. The President described, last fall, prior to the election, false choices. He said the choice is between stay the course and cut and run. That was always a false choice.

We have to find a way to resolve this and be able to bring American troops home. It is just that simple. We have to say to the Iraqi people: This country belongs to you, and you have responsibilities. Meet those responsibilities.

We have responsibilities here at home—plenty of them—and we need to turn inward to meet those responsibilities. That does not mean we should pay no attention to what is going on around the world. But we also need to begin taking care of things here at home.

I was at a meeting in Minneapolis, a listening session with American tribes this weekend. Let me tell you what one fellow stood up and said. He was a tribal chair, a chairman of the tribe. He said: My two daughters are living in rehabilitated trailers that were brought to our reservation from Michigan. They heat those trailers with wooden stoves. The trailers have no plumbing. There is no running water and no indoor toilets. This is in South Dakota. Sound like something in a Third World country? He said: One of my daughters has eight children. The other has three. They live in donated trailers that came from Michigan, with no water and no toilet. And they heat it with a wood stove. Sound like the United States? No, it doesn't to me. It sounds like a Third World country. We have lots of people in this country living on Indian reservations in Third World conditions. We are told there is not enough money to respond to their housing, education, and health care needs. That is wrong.

We are going to have presented to us in a couple weeks another proposal for as much as $120 billion in emergency spending to deal with Iraq and Afghanistan. That will bring to roughly $600 billion what we have provided for the war. But when we have needs here at home, it does not matter whether it is health care needs or housing or perhaps energy needs, the Administration tells us we cannot afford to spend for that.

Well, we have afforded now what is going to be about $600 billion that the President has requested, all on an emergency basis, most of it for the war in Iraq. So we will debate and have great controversy, I assume, in the next couple weeks on the issue of a resolution dealing with Iraq. But controversy is not a stranger to the floor of the Senate.

MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE

Mr. President, we have a provision on the floor of the Senate today that should have been completed long ago dealing with the minimum wage. I mentioned the other day when I was talking about issues that come to the floor of the Senate that butter the bread of big interests, man, they float through here like greased lightning. We do not get it through fast enough, at least in the last Congress. Do you want to give a big tax break to the biggest interests in the country? Be my guest. We get it through here in 1, 2, 3 days.

Do you want to help the people at the bottom of the economic ladder, the people who make the beds in hotel rooms for the minimum wage, the people across the country in convenience stores getting the minimum wage—often working two, three jobs a day, 60 percent of whom are women, one-third of whom are working at the minimum wage for the only income for their family—well, then, you have some trouble because then it is going to get stalled. That does not get through here quickly because that hallway is not clogged with people representing the folks who are making the minimum wage and working two jobs a day.

It is just a fact, and it is a shame. We need to take care of some things here at home, and we need to do so soon. This minimum wage bill is not rocket science, nor should it be heavy lifting for any of us here. It has been 10 years since those who worked at the bottom of the economic ladder have had any adjustment in the minimum wage—10 years.

I mentioned the other day, what about a ''maximum wage''? I am not proposing one. But I can tell you that the head of one of the largest oil companies in our country, when he left his company, was making $150,000 a day in total income. Can you imagine that, $150,000 a day?

Then when he left, the papers reported, in addition to having made $150,000 a day, he got a $400 million parachute on the way out. Anybody standing around here squawking about that? No, no complaints about that. It is the little guy, the person at the bottom. After 10 years, there is great complaint about trying to move a bill through the Senate that would give them some help, lift that minimum wage a bit. We are told: You can't do that without giving corporations a

break. I guess I don't understand the priorities. Some of the suggestions that have been described, expensing for small business, I support that, but it has nothing to do with this bill. We will almost certainly do it in other circumstances. We have done it before. But why should we hold hostage a bill that deals with a whole lot of folks who work hard all day long and for very little money, not $150,000 a day but maybe $44 a day, because of those who have an appetite for additional tax breaks? I don't understand that.

SWEATSHOP ABUSES

My point is, there is so much to do. I wish to talk for a moment about a couple of other items that relate to this. I introduced a bill last week with some of my colleagues to try to stop sweatshop abuses overseas, products made overseas in sweatshop conditions and sent into this country to compete unfairly against American workers.

The fact is, American workers are losing their jobs because there is so much outsourcing to foreign countries. American jobs are being shipped to foreign countries. The very people in this Chamber who are reluctant to increase the minimum wage and are holding us up are the same people who have voted when I have offered four times a simple amendment that says: Let's stop giving large tax breaks to U.S. companies that ship American jobs overseas.

Can you think of anything more pernicious than deciding, let's figure out what we have to do in America; let's give a big, fat tax break to a company that would fire their workers, lock their manufacturing plant, shut the lights off and move the jobs overseas? They move the jobs overseas, manufacture a product in Sri Lanka or Bangladesh and ship it back here and they get a big, fat tax break out of this Congress. That is unbelievable to me. We can't get that repealed. And we can't, on the other edge of the sword, get the minimum wage increased. Boy, that slices the wrong direction. There is something fundamentally wrong with that system.

I introduced legislation called the Decent Working Conditions and Fair Competition Act that sets up a circumstance so that at least if companies are going overseas to find sweatshop conditions, hire a bunch of people who will work for 20 or 30 cents an hour and then produce a product and ship it back here, at least we could try to stop them. There is a lot of dispute about trade and the conditions of employment. I think we could all agree that American workers should not have to compete against the product of prison labor in China. I think we could all agree that if somebody is making socks in a Chinese prison, that is not fair competition for an American worker. So we don't have Chinese prison labor products come into this country. What about the product of sweatshop labor, where people are brought into sweatshops?

I will cite an example: A sweatshop in northern Jordan, airplanes flying in the Chinese and Bangladeshis, with Chinese textiles, being put in sweatshops in northern Jordan to produce products to ship into this country. Some were working 40-hour shifts, not a 40-hour week, 40 hours at a time. Some weren't paid for months. And then when they were paid, they were paid a pittance. Some were beaten.

Do we want that kind of product coming into this country? Is that whom we want American workers to compete with? I don't think so. This legislation is a first baby step toward some sanity in trying to make sure that what we are purchasing on the store shelves in our country is not the product of sweatshop labor overseas. We define what sweatshop labor is, what sweatshop conditions are. We establish a provision by the Federal Trade Commission to enforce, and we also allow American companies who are forced to compete against this unfairness to take action in American courts to seek recompense for the damages.

My hope is Congress will pass this. It is bipartisan. It relates to exactly the same thing we are talking about for people in this country who work on the minimum wage.

Last week, I also introduced a piece of legislation that deals with this building. This is a picture of a little white building on Church Street in the Cayman Islands. It is called the Ugland House. It is five stories. According to some enterprising investigative reporting done by David Evans of Bloomberg, this building is actually home to 12,748 corporations. It doesn't look like it could house 12,748 corporations. It is a five-story stucco building in the Cayman Islands, and it is what lawyers have allowed to become legal fiction so that companies could create a legal address in this little white building. It is their tax haven Cayman Island address so they can avoid paying taxes. Isn't that something? Twelve thousand seven hundred forty-eight companies call this place home. We ought to stop it.

I have introduced legislation to stop it, to say this: When U.S. companies want to set up a subsidiary in a tax-haven country, if they are not doing substantial business activity in that country, then they have created a legal fiction, and it will not be considered legal for us.

They will be taxed as if they never left our country. We can shut this down like that. If this Congress has the will, we can shut down these tax havens in a moment. And we should. Everybody else is paying taxes. It will be April 15th in a couple months. The American people work. They pay taxes and support the Government for the cost of roads and bridges and health care, all the things we do together, the National Institutes of Health, and our national defense. So they pay taxes. It is just that there are some in this country who decide they don't want to participate. They don't want to pay taxes.

Here is a report from the Government Accountability Office. It was done at my request and, I believe, that of Senator LEVIN as well. The report showed the number of large Federal contractors who do business with the Federal Government—that is, they want to benefit from having contracts with the Federal Government—who set up offshore subsidiaries in tax-haven countries to avoid paying U.S. taxes. The very companies that benefit from doing business with the Federal Government in getting contracts are setting up offshore tax haven companies to avoid paying U.S. taxes. That is unbelievable. It ought to stop.

I have introduced legislation—I should call it the Ugland House Act, now that I think about it—that shuts down that opportunity. This bill can shut down in a moment the opportunity for companies to decide they want all the benefits America has to offer them, but they don't want the responsibility of paying taxes. My hope is that this bill, which is cosponsored by Senators LEVIN and FEINGOLD, will be dealt with by the Senate Finance Committee and the full Senate in the days and weeks ahead.

FAST TRACK AUTHORITY

One final point, if I might. We are told this week that the President Bush will be asking the Congress for something called fast-track authority. Although the Constitution provides Congress the right to regulate foreign commerce—it is a constitutional responsibility of the Congress—the Congress has, in the past, given the President something called fast track, which says: Mr. President, you go out and negotiate trade agreements in secret and then you bring them back and we will have an expedited procedure. And we will require that no Senator be allowed to offer any amendments, no matter what you have negotiated.

I don't support fast-track authorization. I didn't support it for President Clinton. I don't support it for this President. This President has had it for 6 years over my objection. He is attempting to now get an extension of it by the end of June 30. I intend—and I am sure a number of my colleagues with whom I have spoken intend—to aggressively resist it. I am for trade and plenty of it. But I am for fair trade. I demand fair trade. This notion of a trade policy that has an $800 billion trade deficit is an unbelievable failure. No one can describe it as a success for this country.

It is time to have a fair debate about trade, what strengthens America and what weakens it, what are the conditions under which we participate in the global economy? We have a right to participate the way we choose. We have been told in recent years that the way to participate in the global economy is to engage in a race to the bottom. If American workers can't compete with somebody making 36 cents an hour, that is tough luck.

I have often told stories about the companies and the stories of struggle

of the last 100 years. But James Fyler died of lead poisoning. He was shot 54 times. I suppose that is lead poisoning. Why was he shot 54 times? Because it was 1914, and James Fyler was radical enough to believe that people who went underground to dig coal should be paid a fair wage and ought to be able to work in a safe workplace. For that, he was shot 54 times. Over a century, going back to the early 1900s, we have created the standards of work. We lifted America. We expanded the middle class. We said: We will put in place fair labor standards, child labor provisions, safe workplace rules. We are going to lift America up. We are going to expand the opportunity for health care. We will have good jobs that pay well. We will give people the right to organize. We did all of that. We created the broadest middle class in the world and an economic engine that is unparalleled.

Now we are told it is a new day. We should compete. If there is a woman named ''Saditia'' in Indonesia making shoes and she makes 21 cents an hour and we can't compete with that, that is tough luck. If we have people in China making 33 cents an hour producing Huffy bicycles that used to be produced here and we can't compete with that, tough luck. If the Radio Flyer little red wagon that used to be produced in Chicago went to China, it was because we can't compete with Chinese workers. If Pennsylvania House furniture left Pennsylvania and they now ship the wood to China and then ship the furniture back, those workers in Pennsylvania should not complain because they couldn't compete with Chinese workers. It doesn't matter to me whether it is Chinese workers or Sri Lanka or Bangladeshi. The fact is, we are seeing a diminished standard in which we are racing to the bottom.

I read in the paper this weekend an op-ed piece. Somebody was asking: What is everybody complaining about? Things are great.

Wages and salaries are the way most people get their income. They are the lowest percentage of gross domestic product since they started keeping score in 1947. We added 5 million people to the poverty rolls in the last 6 years. Everything is great. Probably for some. Maybe the guy who is making $100,000 a day running an oil company but not for the person working three jobs at a minimum wage who hasn't been boosted for 10 years, not to Natasha Humphrey. She did everything. She went to Stanford, an African-American woman, got her degree, went to work for a technology company. Her last job was to train her replacement, an engineer from India who would work for one-fifth the cost of an engineer in the United States. So things aren't so great for everybody. When you have a $700 billion-a-year trade deficit, over $250 billion a year with China alone, I say you better pay attention. You better get it straight.

ENERGY POLICY

There is a lot to say and a lot to do. I was going to talk about energy policy briefly, but I will only say that one of the major challenges in our country is the challenge of energy. We are so unbelievably dependent on foreign sources of oil. The bulk of our oil comes from outside of our country, well over 60 percent. We are dependent on the Saudis and the Kuwaitis, the Iraqis, the Venezuelans, and others for oil. It is unhealthy.

We need to make a major commitment to renewable energy. What we have done in energy is pretty much what we have done in too many areas. We put in place, in 1916, permanent robust tax incentives to incentivize the production of oil It has been in place for 90 years. In 1992, we said: You know what, let's boost the production of renewable energy, so we put in place a production tax credit—temporary and rather narrow. It has been extended short term five times and allowed to expire three times. There has been virtually no consistent commitment to renewable energy. It has been on again/off again, like a switch. That is not a commitment.

If you are going to commit as a country to move in a direction on energy, whether it is renewable, biofuels, or hydrogen fuel cells, you should make a commitment and say: Here is where the country is headed, where we intend to be in 10 years, and we are going to give a tax incentive for 10 years for the production of these renewable fuels. You should have targets and timetables. That hasn't been the case. It has been a rather limited, tepid, miniature kind of provision that is turned off again and on again, a stutter-stop approach that tells investors: Don't rely on this because this Government isn't committed to it. We need to do better. I hope this year we can decide, as the President asked for in his State of the Union Address, on a much more robust commitment to renewable energy.

Having said that, let me point out, under this President and previous Presidents, the amount of money we have committed to the renewable energy area. We have laboratories, renewable energy laboratories, whose funding dropped consistently. Again, it is one thing to say something and have a goal; it is another thing to decide you are going to take steps to meet the goal. We have not done that.

So, Mr. President, I have said a lot about a lot of things because we are facing a lot of things that, in many ways, are related, including the war in Iraq, the international challenges. All of us want the same thing for our country. We all want this country to succeed and do well. I don't think there is a difference in goals. We will have sharp debate in the next 2 weeks, but I don't believe there is a difference in the goals we have. I suspect everybody in this Chamber wants very much for the Iraq war to be over, for our troops to be home, and for stability to exist in Iraq and in that region. I expect we share the goal on energy. Does anybody think that we as a country aspire to be 60, 65 percent dependent upon oil from Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iraq, and elsewhere? I don't think so. It seems to me that it would make some sense for us to find a way to get the best of what both sides have to offer in these discussions rather than the worst of each. I hope in the coming days we can at least clear away the bill on the floor so we can move to other issues.

Last week, Senator KENNEDY gave a pretty animated presentation about his frustration with the day after day after day digging in the heels of this Chamber to stop or delay the passage of a minimum wage. Again, I just walked through the halls coming over here. They are not filled with people representing the workers at the bottom. We should represent those workers. We have that responsibility. We have the responsibility to do the right thing, and after 10 long years, it is the right thing to pass this minimum wage bill and not hold it hostage for other issues and other agendas. We will have plenty of opportunity with amendments that have nothing to do with this bill; we will have the opportunity to offer them. But not now. Don't hold a bill hostage that would help those working two and three jobs a day trying to take care of their families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Arizona wanted to address the Senate. We also have, as I understand it, a request from the Senator from Alabama to speak from 4 to 5. So I would like to, if I could, speak and I will yield before 4 and request that the Senator from Alabama be delayed by a little. I think we were scheduled to come back to the minimum wage now. I don't mind starting 5 minutes after that. I would be glad to go 5 minutes early and make a request that we delay Senator SESSIONS' 5 minutes, and then the Senator from Arizona would have 10 minutes. I see my other friend here. It is going to get complicated after this. Senator SESSIONS, I think, is to be recognized.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, if I may respond to the Senator, I would like to get in, and I will ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes. I don't know where Senator SESSIONS is. I gather it would be fine if he is delayed for 5 minutes. I don't know what Senator CORNYN's intentions are.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized following Senator KENNEDY and Senator KYL for no more than 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I personally don't have any objection. As I understood it, as part of the general agreement on the minimum wage, Senator SESSIONS would be recognized at 4.

I don't have any personal objection, and I will not object, and I will let those two Senators handle Senator SESSIONS.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

Mr. KENNEDY. Well, Mr. President, I intend to talk now.

Mr. KYL. I am sorry. I thought I would be recognized now. Excuse me.

Mr. KENNEDY. I intend to talk for about 15 to 18 minutes, and then we will be on the minimum wage bill. I plan to speak on that minimum wage bill. I said I would end 5 minutes early to try to accommodate the Senator. We are scheduled to deal with the bill at 3:30. So I have recognition.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

FAIR MINIMUM WAGE ACT OF 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

Pending:

Reid (for Baucus) amendment No. 100, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for Gregg) amendment No. 101 (to amendment No. 100), to provide Congress a second look at wasteful spending by establishing enhanced rescission authority under fast-track procedures.

Kyl amendment No. 115 (to amendment No. 100), to extend through December 31, 2008, the depreciation treatment of leasehold, restaurant, and retail space improvements.

Enzi (for Ensign/Inhofe) amendment No. 152 (to amendment No. 100), to reduce document fraud, prevent identity theft, and preserve the integrity of the Social Security system.

Enzi (for Ensign) amendment No. 153 (to amendment No. 100), to preserve and protect Social Security benefits of American workers, including those making minimum wage, and to help ensure greater Congressional oversight of the Social Security system by requiring that both Houses of Congress approve a totalization agreement before the agreement, giving foreign workers Social Security benefits, can go into effect.

Vitter/Voinovich amendment No. 110 (to amendment No. 100), to amend title 44 of the United States Code, to provide for the suspension of fines under certain circumstances for first-time paperwork violations by small business concerns.

DeMint amendment No. 155 (to amendment No. 100), to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for cooperative governing of individual health insurance coverage offered in interstate commerce, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 regarding the disposition of unused health benefits in cafeteria plans and flexible spending arrangements and the use of health savings accounts for the payment of health insurance premiums for high deductible health plans purchased in the individual market.

DeMint amendment No. 156 (to amendment No. 100), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 regarding the disposition of unused health benefits in cafeteria plans and flexible spending arrangements.

DeMint amendment No. 157 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 100), to increase the Federal minimum wage by an amount that is based on applicable State minimum wages.

DeMint amendment No. 159 (to amendment No. 100), to protect individuals from having their money involuntarily collected and used for lobbying by a labor organization.

DeMint amendment No. 160 (to amendment No. 100), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow certain small businesses to defer payment of tax.

DeMint amendment No. 161 (to amendment No. 100), to prohibit the use of flexible schedules by Federal employees unless such flexible schedule benefits are made available to private sector employees not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007.

DeMint amendment No. 162 (to amendment No. 100), to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 regarding the minimum wage.

Kennedy (for Kerry) amendment No. 128 (to amendment No. 100), to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a pilot program to provide regulatory compliance assistance to small business concerns.

Martinez amendment No. 105 (to amendment No. 100), to clarify the house parent exemption to certain wage and hour requirements.

Sanders amendment No. 201 (to amendment No. 100), to express the sense of the Senate concerning poverty.

Gregg amendment No. 203 (to amendment No. 100), to enable employees to use employee option time.

Burr amendment No. 195 (to amendment No. 100), to provide for an exemption to a minimum wage increase for certain employers who contribute to their employees health benefit expenses.

Chambliss amendment No. 118 (to amendment No. 100), to provide minimum wage rates for agricultural workers.

Kennedy (for Feinstein) amendment No. 167 (to amendment No. 118), to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States.

Enzi (for Allard) amendment No. 169 (to amendment No. 100), to prevent identity theft by allowing the sharing of Social Security data among government agencies for immigration enforcement purposes.

Enzi (for Cornyn) amendment No. 135 (to amendment No. 100), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the Federal unemployment surtax.

Enzi (for Cornyn) amendment No. 138 (to amendment No. 100), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand workplace health incentives by equalizing the tax consequences of employee athletic facility use.

Sessions (for Kyl) amendment No. 209 (to amendment No. 100), to extend through December 31, 2012, the increased expensing for small businesses.

Division I of Sessions (for Kyl) amendment No. 210 (to amendment No. 100), to provided for the permanent extension of increasing expensing for small businesses, the depreciation treatment of leasehold, restaurant, and retail space improvements, and the work opportunity tax credit.

Division II of Sessions (for Kyl) amendment No. 210 (to amendment No. 100), to provided for the permanent extension of increasing expensing for small businesses, the depreciation treatment of leasehold, restaurant, and retail space improvements, and the work opportunity tax credit.

Division III of Sessions (for Kyl) amendment No. 210 (to amendment No. 100), to provided for the permanent extension of increasing expensing for small businesses, the depreciation treatment of leasehold, restaurant, and retail space improvements, and the work opportunity tax credit.

Division IV of Sessions (for Kyl) amendment No. 210 (to amendment No. 100), to provided for the permanent extension of increasing expensing for small businesses, the depreciation treatment of leasehold, restaurant, and retail space improvements, and the work opportunity tax credit.

Division V of Sessions (for Kyl) amendment No. 210 (to amendment No. 100), to provided for the permanent extension of increasing expensing for small businesses, the depreciation treatment of leasehold, restaurant, and retail space improvements, and the work opportunity tax credit.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it has been a week now that the Senate has had on its agenda and before the Senate legislation to increase the minimum wage from $5.15 to $7.25. In that week, every Member of Congress has effectively earned $3,200, but we have not acted on an increase in the minimum wage for hard-working American people who are earning $5.15, to raise their minimum wage to $7.25. We have had 1 week of talking here on the floor of the Senate without action.

It looks to me as if we are going to have, thankfully, as a result of the action of the majority leader, a vote at least on cloture to try to terminate the debate. But there will be additional procedural issues that will mean that those who are opposed to an increase in the minimum wage will be able to delay the increase in the minimum wage for another week.

As the parliamentary situation is playing its way out, there will be the possibility of 60 hours after the vote on cloture, which will take us effectively through the end of this week. So that will be 2 weeks where the Members of the Senate have then earned $6,400, but we have been unwilling to either vote up or down on the increase of the minimum wage from $5.15 an hour to $7.25 an hour.

For the millions of people at the lower end of the economic ladder—men and women of dignity who work hard, those who are assistants to our teachers and work in the schools of this country, those who work in some of the nursing homes and look after the elderly, many of those of the great generation that fought in World War II and brought the country out of the time of the Depression—they are still earning $5.15 an hour. They work in many of the hotels and motels that dot the countryside and the great buildings of American commerce—these people are working at $5.15. They will work for that tomorrow, and they worked for that the day before. And now, because our Republican friends refuse to permit us a vote, they are going to continue to work at $5.15 an hour. It has been 10 years.

I went back and looked at the number of days we have tried to get an increase in the minimum wage since our last increase, and that was 16 days. So we have effectively been debating an

increase in the minimum wage for 23 days since the last increase in the minimum wage, and there has been opposition from our Republican friends.

It is true that we have disposed of some 21 amendments, but there are almost 100 left from that side. We don't have any. We will have some if they insist on some amendments. But our side is prepared to vote now. I daresay the majority leader would come out here, if the minority leader would agree, and set a time—I bet even for this afternoon, in an hour, 2 hours, perhaps even less. Perhaps some colleagues have been notified that we would not have votes today, so in fairness to them we could start the vote at the start of business tomorrow morning. There would not be any objection here. There are no amendments on our side. Still, there are 90 amendments on the other side, and they are exercising parliamentary procedures in order to get to delay the consideration of the minimum wage, including $200 billion in changes in Social Security—that was an amendment offered from that side—$35 billion in tax reductions and areas of education, some of which I support, but certainly with no offsets. They were never considered. They didn't include offsets, for example, with IDEA, the legislation that looks after the disabled children, or didn't increase the Pell grants. We didn't even have a chance to look at it. But no, no, let's do that, use this vehicle for that measure. Let's get those Members on your side and the Democratic side lined up to vote against providing additional assistance on education. Maybe we can use that in the next campaign.

What about health savings accounts—that wonderful idea that benefits the medium income; the people it benefits are those making $133,000 a year. That is the medium income of the people who benefit from the health savings accounts. We are talking about raising the minimum wage to $7.25. They are talking about giving additional tax benefits to individuals in the health savings accounts of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The list goes on, Mr. President. These are matters which have absolutely nothing to do with the minimum wage. It is a delay, and it is to politicize these issues. We all know what is going on. The Republican leadership is opposed to the increase in the minimum wage. When they had the majority of the Senate, they constantly opposed any effort. Even though a majority of the Members of this body and the House of Representatives favored an increase, they refused to permit us to get a vote on it, and the President indicated he would veto it if we had.

So that is where we are as we start off this week on the issue of the minimum wage. We find out our side—the Democratic side—follows the leadership that took place in the House of Representatives with NANCY PELOSI. They had 4 hours of debate, and 80 members of the Republican Party voted for an increase in the minimum wage. But here it is a different story. For the millions of Americans who say: My goodness, here is the House of Representatives; look, in 4 hours, it looks as if hope is on the way—and they didn't understand the strength of the Republican opposition to an increase in the minimum wage. I have seen it at other times. We have seen it at other times.

It is always baffling to me, what the Republicans have against hard-working Americans. What do they have against minimum wage workers? We don't hear about it. They don't debate it. They will debate other matters, but what do they have against them? What possibly do they have against these hard-working Americans? They are trying to provide for families, play by the rules, and work 40 hours a week, and in so many instances they are trying to bring up children. What is so outrageous?

Some say that if we raise the minimum wage, we are going to have the problem of increasing unemployment. We have heard that argument out here on the floor. Let me, first of all, show what has happened historically with the minimum wage.

Until recent times, we have had Republicans and Democrats who supported an increase in the minimum wage, starting with Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman, then Dwight Eisenhower. They raised it $1 in 1955. Then President Kennedy increased it, Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon supported an increase, Jimmy Carter, George Bush I, and William Clinton. That was the last increase. We voted on it in 1996, and it became effective in the fall of 1997. There were two different phases to it.

First, people say: When you raise the minimum wage, look what is going to happen in terms of unemployment. Unemployment will rise.

If we look at what has happened with unemployment at the time we passed the last increase in the minimum wage to $5.15 an hour in 1997, we can see there have been small increases, but the whole trend has been down. So much for the argument of unemployment.

They say: That chart really doesn't show it because it doesn't reflect what is happening in the economy in terms of job growth. Look at what happened when we raised the minimum wage from $4.25 an hour to $4.75 an hour, and then we raised it again to $5.15 an hour. Look at that red line showing steady and constant job growth after an increase in the minimum wage.

Look at what percent the minimum wage is. Increasing the minimum wage to $7.25 is vital to workers, but it is a drop in the bucket to the national payroll. All Americans combined earn $5.4 trillion a year. A minimum wage increase to $7.25 is less than one-fifth of 1 percent of this national payroll. It is less than one-fifth of 1 percent of this national payroll. And we have heard from those who oppose the minimum wage about all of these economic calamities. These are the facts in terms of the national payroll. It isn't even a drop in the bucket. It isn't even a piece of sand on the beach it is so little. Yet they say the economic indicators say this.

Look what has happened to States that have a higher minimum wage than the national minimum wage, and see what has happened in terms of job growth. This chart shows 11 States plus the District of Columbia with wages higher than $5.15 an hour. Overall employment growth has been 9.7 percent; 39 States with a minimum wage at $5.15, 7.5 percent. Those States that have had an increase in the minimum wage have had more job growth, and it is understandable. The economic reports and studies show that if workers are treated fairly, there will be increased productivity. They are going to stay around longer and work. There will be less absenteeism, less turnover, more productivity, and you are going to increase your output. And this is all reflected in various studies.

Look at small business. They say that is good for the Nation, but it doesn't really reflect what is happening to small businesses.

This chart states that higher minimum wages create more small businesses. The overall growth in number of small businesses from 1998 to 2003 is 5.4 percent and 4.2 percent. These are the small businesses about which we heard a great deal. We have the small business exemption that exempts 3.6 million workers who are working for the real mom-and-pop stores, where their gross income is less than $500,000.

This gives us some idea of the nature of the economic arguments. They don't hold water. They didn't hold water previously. We have seen a decline in the purchasing power of the minimum wage over this period of time. This chart is in real dollars. We can see where it was in 1960, 1965, 1970, 1975, going to 1980 and then a gradual decline. Starting in 1980, under President Reagan, it is going down. And we see the increases that came in the nineties under President Clinton. The purchasing power of $5.15, as this chart shows, was probably the lowest it had ever been. Its purchasing power has lost 20 percent. All we are asking is to get it back to $7.25 and to get the purchasing power back to where it was when we went to $5.15. Isn't that outrageous?

What have we done in taxes for all the others? We are trying to restore the purchasing power. Let's look in the meantime at what we have done for companies and corporations. Let me go to this, Mr. President. Look at what has happened. Productivity and profits skyrocket while minimum wage plummets. Look at the profits. From 1997 to 2006 profits were up 45 percent, productivity was up 29 percent, and the minimum wage was down 20 percent.

Historically, in the sixties, seventies, all the way up to 1980, when we saw an

increase in productivity, that was shared with the workers. Companies, corporations shared the increase in productivity with the workers. No longer. That doesn't exist any longer. They take all of that productivity, and it is now an increase in profits.

This chart indicates what has happened to the real minimum wage and what has happened to productivity. See, going back to the sixties, 1960 to 1965, even into the seventies, closer productivity, workers working harder, increasing productivity. They shared in the increasing productivity with wages. Not anymore. All of that productivity has been turned into profits.

I want to spend my last few minutes—now that we have had the economic argument—reviewing quickly the most powerful argument, and that is what has happened in terms of these figures, how they translate into real people's lives. The charts reflect the growth of poverty in America. We are the strongest economic country in the world, and we find that between 2000 and 2005, we see that the number of people who are living in poverty in the United States of America has increased by over 5 million—5 million in the United States of America—during this period of the economy.

I listened to the President talk the other night about how the economy is just going like gangbusters. Talk about the number of bankruptcies, talk about the growth of poverty—5 million. Let's look at what happened with regard to the number of children who are living in poverty. There were 11 million in 2000 and 1.3 million more at the present time.

This country, of all the industrial nations in the world, has the highest child poverty in the world. Look at the chart and look at the end. Look at the red line. It is not even close. The United States of America has the highest child poverty in the world. That means the loss of hopes and dreams for these children, increasing pressures in terms of children dropping out of school because they are living in poverty and are not being fed in the morning. They are not getting good quality health care or any kind of health care. Their parents have two or three jobs and they are not getting the attention they need. The basic abandonment of so many children in our society.

We read last week into the RECORD the New York Times article about the burden that is going to be on the American economy. That may get the attention of some of our friends on the other side. They expect that increased child poverty in this Nation is going to cost another $500 billion just because of what is happening to children in our society.

Let me show what happens to child poverty in States which have a higher minimum wage. This isn't an accident. If the minimum wage is raised, it has an impact on child poverty. Alaska, Connecticut—all the way, the States that are listed here—New Jersey, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, the State of Washington—are above the national average poverty rate. They have higher economic growth, higher small business growth, less child poverty. That is what we have seen. National average child poverty, again, the high minimum wage States, again, have lower child poverty rates.

Very quickly, we have seen two nations of the world that have made child poverty a particular issue—Great Britain and Ireland. Now the minimum wage is $9.58 an hour in Great Britain. They brought 2,000,000 children out of poverty. They are a very strong economy in Europe.

In Ireland, they have reduced child poverty by 40 percent. They are also a very strong economy.

What we know is that the economic arguments don't hold water, and the adverse impact is particularly harsh on children.

All during this time, we have seen this extraordinary explosion of tax breaks that have been given to large companies and small companies. They say these can't do it unless they get help. Over the last 10 years, there have been $276 billion in tax breaks for corporations and $36 billion in tax breaks for small businesses, and our Republican friends are insisting that we add more tax breaks if we want any hope of getting an increase in the minimum wage.

Americans understand fairness, and this is not fair. Trying to hold up an increase in the minimum wage for hard-working Americans, who are working and playing by the rules, is not fair. Americans understand fairness. There are no economic arguments. We have been out here now for 7 days. I haven't heard them. I have been willing to debate any of those arguments. No, no, we don't get into the economic arguments. We used to years ago. Now we don't get into them. We just have to use this vehicle for all these other add-ons in order to basically frustrate this body from getting an increase in the minimum wage.

As I said before, I don't understand what it is that our Republican friends find so obnoxious about hard-working men and women who are working at the minimum wage, but evidently there is something because they will not let the Senate of the United States act on this legislation.

This is about fairness. This is about the hopes and dreams of children. It is about decency and fairness to women because women are the primary recipients of the minimum wage. So many of them have children. Eighty percent of those who receive the minimum wage are adults; 40 percent of those who receive the minimum wage have been receiving it for 3 years.

This is an issue that women are concerned about, that has an enormous impact on children, that is basically a civil rights issue because minimum wage jobs so often are the entry jobs for men and women of color. But it comes back to fairness. It is basically the issue of fairness, whether we are going to be fair to hard-working Americans. Our Republican friends refuse—absolutely refuse—they refuse to let us get a vote on this minimum wage, and they have basically filibustered by amendment.

As I said, we have over 90 amendments remaining. Democrats on this side are prepared, ready, and willing to vote. We thank our leader for bringing up this legislation. We are going to continue to battle on.

We give assurance to those who are looking to us to represent them, to speak for them in the Senate, that we will speak for them. We will stand for them. They should know that we are on their side, and we don't intend to fail.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAQ

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I, too, am anxious to get on to the debate about the resolutions that deal with Iraq. I will speak to that for 10 minutes.

My position is clear. I think we ought to give the President's strategy a chance to work. We asked him to come up with a new strategy. He has done so, and it seems to me that it is our responsibility as a Senate to give that a chance to work or to provide an alternative—not an alternative to leave but an alternative to win. There are plenty of ways to leave. We can begin leaving now and have it done in a year. We can leave in 6 months. We can leave to the border but not beyond. There are a lot of different ideas about how to leave, but an alternative is not how to leave but how to win.

The President has presented such a strategy and I believe we ought to give it a chance to work.

Resolutions that are nonbinding nevertheless have consequences. They can't change the policy that is already being effected, the strategy in Iraq, but what they can do is send very powerful messages. First, they can send a message to our enemies. It seems to me the last message we want to send to the enemy is that the Congress does not support the mission in Iraq. Obviously that emboldens the enemy. That is what GEN David Petraeus said in his testimony before the Armed Services Committee last week. It sends a message to our allies that we are not in it to the end, and they begin to wonder whether they should start hedging their bets.

By the way, it sends a message to a country such as Iran, which is already beginning to offer, now, to in effect take our place in Iraq: They will do the training of troops, they will do the reconstruction if the Iraqis will simply invite them in. That obviously would not be in our best interests, not to mention the Iraqis' best interests.

Most importantly, a resolution such as this sends a message to our troops. It is a very powerful message and a very negative one. It is a message that in effect says we support you, but we don't support your mission. We are sending you into a place where you could well die, but we don't support the cause for which you are dying. We don't think you can win. As a matter of fact, I have more respect for those who advocate voting on whether we should continue to support the effort monetarily—the legitimate function of the Congress, to cut off the funds if we don't like the war—than I do for those who simply want to ''send a message.'' At least the others would be willing to have the courage of their convictions, that if this is not a winnable war, we better stop it now as opposed to simply trying to send a message.

Let me tell you what this message does. Last Friday night I was watching the NBC ''Nightly News.'' Brian Williams was the broadcaster, and he called on Richard Engel, reporting from Iraq, to talk about what was going on there. Richard Engel talked about the Stryker Brigade, Apache Company, setting out on a mission to find bases for U.S. troops. I will quote what he said in the report.

He said:

It's not just the new mission the soldiers are adjusting to. They have something else on their minds: The growing debate at home about the war. Troops here say they are increasingly frustrated by American criticism of the war. Many take it personally, believing it is also criticism of what they've been fighting for.

He goes on to say:

Twenty-one-year-old Specialist Tyler Johnson is on his first tour in Iraq. He thinks skeptics should come over and see what it's like firsthand before criticizing.

And here is what Specialist Tyler Johnson said:

Those people are dying. You know what I'm saying? You may support—''oh we support the troops,'' but you're not supporting what they do, what they share and sweat for, what they believe for, what we die for. It just don't make sense to me.

Back to Richard Engel:

Staff Sergeant Manuel Sahagun has served in Afghanistan and is now on his second tour in Iraq. He says people back home can't have it both ways.

And then Staff Sergeant Manuel Sahagun says the following:

One thing I don't like is when people back home say they support the troops but they don't support the war. If they're going to support us, support us all the way.

Engel then says:

Specialist Peter Manna thinks people have forgotten the toll the war has taken.

And Specialist Peter Manna says:

If they don't think we are doing a good job, everything we have done here is all in vain.

Engel concludes the report by saying:

Apache Company has lost two soldiers and now worries their country may be abandoning the mission they died for.

Richard Engel, ABC News, Baghdad.

That report struck me. I immediately talked to my wife about it, and I said those three soldiers have said more eloquently than I and my colleagues have, than we have, in making the point that you can't have it both ways. You can't both support the troops and oppose the mission we are sending them on, putting them in harm's way. And can we say that their colleagues who died did not die in vain if the Senate goes on record saying we don't support your mission?

This is the conflict that has to be in the minds of the families of those who are putting their lives on the line and the very soldiers and marines who are doing the same.

Last Friday, this Senate confirmed GEN David Petraeus to take command of that theater, and there were all kinds of expressions of support for him. He is, indeed, one of the finest military officers ever to come before the Senate for confirmation. No one said otherwise. Yet at the same time we are talking about passing a resolution that would say to him: We don't believe in the mission we have just sent you on.

He testified he needed more troops in order to carry out the mission and that he supported the President's new strategy, one component of which is to add some troops so that he has the capability, in conjunction with the new Iraqi troops, to stabilize and pacify the city of Baghdad as well as the Al Anbar Province, which is currently being threatened by al-Qaida terrorists. He said he needs those new troops. Yet Congress would go on record as saying we do not believe you should have those new troops.

Again, at least some number of my colleagues, maybe half or thereabouts on the other side of the aisle, would cut off the funding for the troops in order not just to send a message but to end the involvement. At least that is a position that has action attached to it. I disagree with it, but simply sending the message by sending David Petraeus on the way, patting him on the back, saying, ''Go do a good job but, by the way, we don't believe in the mission,'' it seems to me is starting off on the wrong foot.

He said something else in his testimony that I thought was telling. He said: Wars are all about your will, your will and your enemy's will.

When asked a question by Senator LIEBERMAN, he said passage of these resolutions would not be helpful, among other things, because you need to break the enemy's will in a conflict, in a war. This kind of resolution would inhibit his ability, General Petraeus's ability, with our great military, to break the enemy's will to fight. How can you break the enemy's will to fight when the people who are allegedly running the war back home have already signaled that they think it is lost and it is simply a matter of bringing the troops home, and that the mission is not supported by a majority of the Senate?

Resolutions, even if they are nonbinding, have consequences. In this case the consequences are detrimental, to our enemy, to our allies, and to our soldiers and their families.

We have some solemn responsibility here, but none is more serious than putting our young men and women in harm's way. All of us want to bring them home safe and sound. We all understand when we vote for that, people are going to die. Everyone who does that does so with a solemn responsibility. We are all looking for a way also to end the conflict so no more have to die. But the reason we authorized this in the first place was because we understood there was a mission to perform. Even those who disagree with the reasons to begin with appreciate the fact that we cannot leave Iraq a failed state. I think virtually everybody in this body would agree with that proposition. We cannot leave Iraq a failed state. The consequences, not just to the Iraqis and to the other people in the region but to United States security, would be devastating.

Something else on which most people agree is that the Iraqis are not currently in a position to pacify Baghdad and Al Anbar Province all by themselves. They need our help. That is what the testimony before the committees was last week.

If they need our help, if we all agree we can't leave Iraq a failed state, if General Petraeus is saying we need some time and some troops to get this job done in conjunction with a significant change in the way the Iraqis are approaching the war—finally backing us up now when we say we want to go into these areas and not just clear them but hold them, keep the bad guys in jail, the ones who have not been killed, for example—if we agree with all those things, then it seems to me the last thing the Senate should be doing is considering a resolution which would say we disagree with the mission, we disagree with the President's strategy, we don't think we should be sending any more troops, and we want to begin a process of withdrawing from Iraq.

When the debate time comes, I am anxious to have it. The American people deserve a debate. I heard a message yesterday that the American people had spoken. Indeed they did. I had an opponent who said we should withdraw from Iraq. Yet I won the last election, saying we needed to stay there until the mission was completed, and I even supported the addition of more troops if that were necessary. In the case of Arizona, I think people have spoken.

The reality is, however, I think it is a mixed message. They would all like to get out as quickly as possible, but if you ask them, Do you think we should leave before the mission is accomplished, do you think we should leave even though there is the strong probability of a failed Iraqi state, do you think we can say we support the American troops but we don't support the mission, I think we would disagree with that proposition.

It is up to us as leaders to lead. That means to let them know we support not just them but their mission, that we want to see it accomplished, and we will not undercut that mission or their support by passing a resolution that disapproves of the new strategy.

I hope my colleagues will agree we have to give this strategy a chance to work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 8 minutes, and following that, the Senator from Alabama to speak for up to an hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have two amendments before the body I would like to explain briefly. Then I am impelled to respond to some of the argument we have heard from the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I guess the question he put was what do Republicans have against hard-working Americans? I will respond to that in a moment.

AMENDMENT NO. 135

My first amendment has to do with the Federal unemployment surtax. In the 1970s, the Unemployment Trust Fund faced financial strains, so Congress imposed a surtax to bring money into the unemployment system, the unemployment compensation system, in order to meet its obligations. That debt was paid off in the 1980s. Congress has continued, however, to collect the unemployment surtax, proving the maxim once stated by Ronald Reagan that the closest thing to eternal life here on Earth is a temporary government program. I think this proves that.

The Federal unemployment surtax should have expired 20 years ago. Since 1987, the surtax has taken approximately $28 billion out of the pockets of U.S. businesses. Is that $28 billion over 20 years worth the broken promise to eliminate it? I think not. Elimination of the surtax, which this amendment will do, will save businesses across the country—and in my particular State, $135 million—but it will save businesses across the country proportionate amounts.

This is an easy and logical way to trim payroll taxes. The FUTA tax without the surtax is sufficient to fund State and Federal unemployment administrations. Without the surtax, the Federal unemployment tax generates nearly $6 billion a year, and all accounts associated with the Federal Unemployment Trust Fund have ample balances.

It is simply a matter of keeping the faith with the American people, when we tell them we have a temporary program and that program runs its course and serves its purpose, to eliminate it. That is what this amendment would do, and I ask the support of my colleagues for that amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 138

My second amendment addresses the issue of preventive health care. You might ask what does that have to do with regulatory and tax relief to small businesses and the minimum wage? Well, this amendment, which asks for the adoption of a stand-alone bill called the Workforce Health Improvement Program Act, would put small businesses on a level playing field with big businesses to provide health benefits to their employees that they can deduct but for which small businesses cannot deduct the same benefits they might want to give by outsourcing those to health clubs, for example.

Let me explain where I am coming from. Public health experts unanimously agree that people who maintain active and healthy lifestyles dramatically reduce the risk of contracting chronic diseases. A physically fit population helps decrease health care costs, 50 percent of which, by the way, are borne by the Federal taxpayer. A physically fit population reduces Federal Government spending, reduces illnesses, and improves worker productivity.

The costs, though, are not just measured in dollars. According to the Surgeon General's ''Call to Action to Prevent and Decrease Overweight and Obesity'' published in 2001, 300,000 deaths per year in America are associated with being overweight or obese. Regular physical activity reduces the risk of developing or dying from some of the leading causes of illness and death in the United States.

Additionally, Medicare and Medicaid programs currently spend $84 billion annually on five major chronic diseases: diabetes, heart disease, depression, cancer, and arthritis. It is important we not only treat these diseases once they are manifested but that we also explore ways to prevent them in the first place. Consider this statistic—the numbers are staggering. This is from the American Diabetes Association:

> The total annual economic cost of diabetes in 2002 in the United States of America was $132 billion. Direct medical expenditures totaled $92 billion and $23.2 billion of that was for diabetes care, $24.6 billion was for chronic diabetes-related complications, and $44.1 billion was for excess prevalence of general medical conditions related to diabetes. Indirect costs resulting to lost work days, restricted activity days, mortality, and permanent disability due to diabetes totaled $40.8 billion.

One NIH study reported in the New England Journal of Medicine showed that modest changes in exercise and diet can prevent diabetes in 58 percent of the people at high risk for the disease. What is more, the trial showed that participants over 60 years of age benefited the most, preventing the onset of diabetes by 71 percent. Even assuming that intervention with modest changes in exercise and diet is only half that effective, they estimated the possible 10-year savings to the health care system would be $344 billion.

I think it makes enormous sense, as we look to try and level the playing field for small businesses as part of this comprehensive package, that we seriously consider leveling the playing field by providing an ability to prevent the occurrence—the incidence, I should say—of obesity-related diseases, namely diabetes, which causes so much human misery and so much unnecessary expense that could be avoided if we could encourage more Americans to a more active lifestyle and a better diet.

So I ask my colleagues for their consideration of this amendment as well.

Mr. President, could I ask how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DURBIN). The Senator from Texas has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if I may ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes, for a total of 3 minutes, I would appreciate it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts a moment ago asked—because Republicans have asked for additional tax and regulatory relief for small businesses that employ 70 percent of the American people—what it is that Republicans have against hard-working Americans because of our desire to pass not just a minimum wage of $7.25 an hour, up from the $5.15 an hour. He said that this was an effort to politicize the issue.

So I would have to ask the Senator, when the minimum wage affects 2.5 percent of the workforce in America, mainly teenagers and part-time workers, people entering the workforce, is this the way to address the needs of hard-working Americans? Why is it we are so focused on a minimum wage, when what we ought to be focused on is maximizing the wages of American workers primarily, I believe, through increased training, workforce initiatives, working through community colleges with the private sector to train people for good wages, much higher than minimum wage, that exist in this country but go wanting for lack of trained workers. These programs exist in our communities in my State and throughout the country, and I think we would do better to focus our efforts to try to improve the standard of living for people across America.

I simply disagree with the Senator from Massachusetts, if he says by focusing on 2.5 percent of the workforce and by trying to ameliorate some of the harm to small businesses that generate 70 percent of the jobs, we are doing anything that would harm hard-working Americans. To the contrary, what we are trying to do is make sure those hard-working Americans have jobs, not that they are put out of work by well-intentioned but unsuccessful attempts for Government to mandate wages without taking into account the impact on small businesses, the primary employers in our country.

Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Alabama, who

was supposed to start speaking at 4 o'clock, allowing a couple of us to speak, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

IRAQ

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair and I thank Senator CORNYN and Senator KYL for their remarks. I share with Senator KYL his concern over the resolution that we will be apparently addressing later this week or next week. He quoted an NBC News report in which soldiers in Iraq in harm's way said that, in their view, you can't support the soldiers without supporting the policy we sent them on, and that is a troubling thing.

Today I talked to a businessman from Alabama—quite a fine, upstanding leader in the community. His son is in Iraq right now. They already heard about the Senate Foreign Relations Committee resolution. It was very troubling to them. They didn't know how to read it, according to him, or what it meant to them. I talked to a lady not long ago, within the last week, and she told me her son was in his second tour there, and he believed in what he was doing. He was proud to serve, but he didn't know what we were doing here. He said he: ''Didn't want to be the last soldier to die if we weren't going to follow through on a policy that we have set here.''

So we are in a difficult time, and we need to remember those things as we set about our policy. I don't know all of the answers. I don't disrespect people who would disagree with me on this. I know there are a lot of people with a lot of different ideas about what to do in Iraq. But my observation is and my thought is that we, as a Congress, ought to affirm the policies we are asking our soldiers to execute. They say we are not asking them, but the President is, and the President speaks for us, until Congress withdraws that power by reducing his funding. The President executes the policies as Commander in Chief. So it is a big deal and we need to be careful about what we do and I am disappointed we will be dealing with those resolutions.

Mr. President, I remember during the immigration debate last fall, last summer and spring, Senator KENNEDY and I were on the floor one night, and I talked about how I believe the large amount of immigration we are seeing today, much of it illegal, was adversely affecting the wages of American workers. Senator KENNEDY didn't object to that, but he stood up and in response basically said: Well, we are going to offer a minimum wage bill, and that is going to take care of it. If anyone heard Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER's speech on Friday—and not many people did; it was after the vote had been cast—but he went into some detail and with great care explained how the minimum wage is not reaching poor working people in this country in the ways most people think it is but that most people making minimum wage are part of a household whose income exceeds $40,000 a year, I believe was the figure he cited, and there are a number of studies on that. The point being that usually it is a transition period for young people or others—maybe they are part time and that kind of thing.

I am not saying people would not like an increase in the minimum wage, but the working poor, the people who are every day out giving their best to try to raise their families and who need to have a higher income, people who have been out there for years and working, they are already above $7 an hour, for the most part. If they show up on time and are reliable and give an honest day's work, as almost all of them do, then they are going to be above $7 an hour now. Do you follow me? So this is not the panacea we are concerned about. What we want and what we care about, fellow citizens and Members of the Senate, is having better wages for working Americans, having all the people be able to go out and get a better wage they can take home and take care of their families with. That includes how much taxes are taken out, how much insurance is taken out.

President Bush has a great proposal that is going to help a lot of people. I assure my colleagues a lot of people will feel a substantial benefit from this health care tax credit plan he has proposed. That is a way to help working people, a real significant way.

Senator ALEXANDER mentioned the earned-income tax credit, and he went into some detail about it. Economists and experts are quite clear: The earned-income tax credit more appropriately benefits working Americans than a minimum wage at much less cost. We spend $40 billion a year on the earned-income tax credit. That is what the credit amounts to in terms of benefits to working Americans. Their wages are lower, and, at certain levels, they don't qualify for other benefits. And as a result, they do qualify for the earned-income tax credit. So I would like to talk about that.

I offered an amendment that would have required the earned-income tax credit to be paid on individual's paychecks, when they get their paycheck each payday. That is correct, in my view, as a matter of policy. It is a complex thing. Some are concerned about the mechanics of it. So I offered another amendment that was accepted by the Democratic leadership and the Republican leadership that required the Department of the Treasury to review what would happen and how it could be done if we allowed people to get their earned-income tax credit on their weekly or biweekly paycheck. It can be done now. In fact, a little less than 2 percent of the people get their earned-income tax credit, or at least a portion of it, on their check each week.

So we would like to talk about that because as we debate the minimum wage, the real debate is how to help working Americans, middle-class Americans, lower income Americans get more legitimate pay for the work they do.

Now, that is what we are all about; not some fetish with having an increase in the minimum wage, particularly when it is not going to be as effective in meeting the needs of the working poor, as is being sold to this Congress and the American people.

In 2004, more than 22 million Americans—get this—more than 22 million Americans claimed the earned-income tax credit, putting $40.7 billion into the pockets of the working poor. This is a very large program. It is a very large shift of resources to the working poor. The amount of the credit for each recipient depends on several factors, such as the worker's income and the number of dependent children they claim.

Nonetheless, a low-income worker with one child will be eligible to claim up to $2,853 for tax year 2007, while a worker with two or more children could receive $4,718 on a 2,200-hour work year. The average earned-income tax credit for a beneficiary with a qualifying child was $1,728 in 2004. That is almost $1 an hour on average.

Many have criticized the earned-income tax credit over the years, saying it is another welfare handout and it has far too much fraud in it. Some numbers have shown fraud as high as over 30 percent, but the tax credit is here to stay. I don't see any real movement to eliminate it. Why don't we see if we can make it work better?

The idea is to reward work. It is a benefit of the Government, an earned tax credit, earned by working. That was the purpose of the earned-income tax credit from the beginning, to encourage welfare recipients and others who were not in the workforce to decide that it was beneficial for them to work. Some of this came from Milton Friedman, the great free market economist who recently died, calling for a negative income tax. That is sort of what inspired this.

All is not perfect. The earned-income tax credit has provided real money for low-income Americans working hard to pull their family out of poverty. As Senator ALEXANDER demonstrated in some detail, remarkably and ably, it gets to the working poor far better than an increase in the minimum wage.

An important feature added to the earned-income tax credit occurred in 1978, a few years after the law was passed. That allows the credit recipients to receive the benefit on their paychecks rather than as a one-time lump sum tax refund. Now, you work all year. Most people have no idea if they are earning any earned-income tax credit. They are not receiving extra money for their work. And next year, they file for a tax refund and get a big check, disconnecting, in their minds, the receipt of that check with the work they did the year before. Therefore, it ceases to be the kind of incentive to work we want it to be.

Receiving an advanced payment under the law is simple. Workers believing they will be eligible can fill out

a form or W–5 with their employer, and once completed workers will receive part of their EITC benefit on their paycheck based on the amount they are expected to receive over the year based on their income. So despite a number of campaigns by the IRS to increase the number that sign up for this advance payment, only a few do, less than 2 percent. The majority, unaware they can receive the credit in advance, receive it in the form of a tax refund in the spring of the next year.

Recipients earn the tax credit by working throughout the year. Yet they do not receive the benefit until months after when they file their tax returns. For most workers who receive the EITC as a lump sum at the end of the year, they never make that connection between the increased work and the increased paycheck, as they simply receive a fat check.

How can it encourage work if there is no correlation for most recipients between the work they do and the money they receive?

An amendment, which the Senate has already accepted, challenges the Secretary of the Treasury, the Department of the Treasury, to get us a report on how we can do this effectively. It is important. It will ensure the taxpayers who are giving this benefit to working Americans get the second part of the benefit that the taxpayers intended them to receive.

The first part, of course, is helping the working poor have more money for their families. We want to help them. The second benefit we want to occur is for the overall economy and health of America to encourage people to work, to make work more rewarding. If you are making $7 an hour and you get $1 an hour pay raise as a result of the earned-income tax credit, you have received a substantial increase, well over 10 percent increase in your take home pay, especially since there are no taxes taken out of that part that has accrued as a result of the earned-income tax credit.

That encourages work. That makes work more attractive. That helps meet the needs of America today. That is what this is about. A worker who is making $6 an hour would be making closer to $7. Workers making $8 would be making closer to $9. It adds up to real money as the years go by.

We can do a much better job of utilizing the existing program without any cost beyond what we are already expending, but in a way that gets money to people when they need it, right then on their paycheck. They may have a tire blow out and they need a new tire. The transmission may have broken in their car. A child may need to go on a trip at school. They need the money as they earn it so they can apply it in a sound way to their family's budgetary needs instead of one big fat check sometime in the spring of the next year. That is a suggestion I have for improving the quality of life for American workers.

Another sense-of-the-Senate amendment I offered, that was accepted, we voted on 98 to 0, was to call on Congress to state that it is a sense of the Senate that we should do a better job in Congress of establishing a uniform savings plan for Americans. We in the Government have a wonderful plan called the thrift plan. It allows every Federal worker, in any department or agency, to put money in the thrift plan and the Federal Government would match up to 5 percent of their contributions.

Many young people starting to work for the Government today, if they contribute 5 percent each paycheck, with the Government matching it, will retire with $1 million in the bank—trust me on that—with the power of compound interest. It is an exciting program.

Many private companies have similar programs, 401(k)-type programs, but many don't. Half of the workers in America today work for a company that does not have such a retirement plan. A chunk of those, even if they do, don't take advantage of it. This is particularly concerning to me because I have learned from Secretary of Labor Elaine Chao that the average American has nine jobs by the time they are 35. What does that say to the practical men and women of the Senate? It says they are bouncing around a lot. They may go to a company that has a plan and they may invest in it a little bit, then they go to a company that doesn't. Or they go to a company that says they have to work for 6 months or a year before they can participate in their plan, or they decide not to put into that plan. Or, if they put in some money and they change jobs and the account is $500, $2,000, $1,500—we have statistics that show that over 40 percent of them cash in those accounts paying the penalties—they think it is not enough money to worry about.

Whereas, if they set aside a small amount of money from the day they start working at age 18, or out of college, every day, every paycheck, a small amount of money set aside as is done by most of the thrift account savers, they could retire with hundreds of thousands in the bank, which would allow for an annuity, if they purchased it at age 65, to pay someone $2,000 a month for the rest of their life, easy. Those things are realistically possible.

It is a great tragedy, it is a tremendous national tragedy, that in a time where we have relatively low unemployment—in my State it is not much over 3 percent, maybe 3.6 percent in Alabama—and most people are working, the wages have gone up, although not as much as we would like, but our wages are beginning to edge back up, that most Americans are not saving. They could be setting aside even a small amount that would transform their retirement years from retirement years that depend solely on Social Security, the retirement years can be supplemented by a substantial flow of money.

Finally, I talk about another subject, our general concern that wages have not kept up in America. I share that concern. I have heard the economists make the argument—many in the business community are people I respect—make the argument that wages tend to lag behind. Gross domestic production growth goes up for a while and wages do not go up, but they catch up, and there is some truth to that. I don't deny that.

But if you look at the numbers and how middle-class and lower income workers are getting along today, you cannot be pleased with what is occurring, particularly in certain areas and certain fields. It is from that perspective I say, as part of this debate over minimum wage which we are told is designed to help people have more money to take home, to take care of their families, and if you think this is not the right way to do it, you don't love families and you don't want to help poor people; that is not correct.

I hope to be able to vote for this minimum wage bill. I voted for several to increase the minimum wage. I am just saying the minimum wage has been demonstrated by analysis, by top-flight econometric firms, that it does not reach the poor people in a way that most people think it does. It oftentimes helps young people who are children of some corporate executive who may be working.

Our motivation, and I think it is universal in the Senate, through the legislation moving through the Senate now, is designed to improve the take-home pay of Americans so they can more ably benefit from the great American dream and take care of their families effectively.

Significant economic evidence indicates the presence of large amounts of illegal labor in low-skilled job sectors is depressing the wages of American workers. That is an important statement if it is true, right? If that is true, isn't that important? First of all, we are a nation of laws. We think the laws ought to be enforced.

Overwhelmingly the American people agree with that. But if it also is depressing the wages of working Americans, that is a double concern, particularly as we are asking ourselves in this debate: How can we help low-wage workers do better? I will talk about that. We have to talk about this.

Harvard economist George Borjas, who testified before the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, and Lawrence Katz, also of Harvard, estimate that the influx of low-skilled, low-wage immigration into our country from 1980 to 2000 has resulted in a 3-percent decrease in wages for the average American worker—that is all workers—and has cut wages to native-born high school dropouts—those who have not obtained a high school degree; unfortunately, we have quite a number of those in our country—who make up the poorest 10 percent of our workforce, by some 8 percent. Eight percent, if you figure that

out on a yearly basis, amounts to $1,200 a year. That is $100 a month.

Now, for some people in America today, $100 a month is not a lot. But if you are making near the minimum wage, $100 a month is a lot of money.

Alan Tonelson, a research fellow at the U.S. Business and Industry Council Educational Foundation, says:

[T]he most important statistics available show conclusively that, far from easing shortages—

Shortages of labor—

illegal immigrants are adding to labor gluts in America. Specifically, wages in sectors highly dependent on illegals, when adjusted for inflation, are either stagnant or have actually fallen.

Now, he is referring to Labor Department data and information from the Pew Hispanic Center. For example, he cites data from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics that indicates the following: inflation-adjusted wages for the broad Food and Services and Drinking Establishments category—they have a category for that: the broad Food and Services and Drinking Establishments category; and they monitor the wages for it—between the years 2000 to 2005 fell 1.65 percent.

The Pew Hispanic Center estimates that illegal immigrants comprise 17 percent of food preparation workers, 20 percent of cooks, and 23 percent of dishwashers, about a fifth of those workers; three-fifths, four-fifths being legal native citizens. But contrary to what we have been told, that you cannot get workers at the wages they are paying, and paying fair wages, it looks as though the wages have fallen, which is a matter of interest.

Inflation-adjusted wages for the food manufacturing industry—the Pew Hispanic Center estimates that illegal immigrants comprise 14 percent of that workforce—fell 2.4 percent between 2000 and 2005.

Inflation-adjusted wages for hotel workers—the Pew Hispanic Center estimates illegal immigrants make up 10 percent of that workforce—fell 1 percent from 2000 to 2005.

Inflation-adjusted wages in the construction industry—Pew estimates that illegal immigrants make up 12 percent of the workforce there—fell 1.59 percent between 2000 and 2005.

Inflation-adjusted wages in the animal processing and slaughtering subcategory—and Pew estimates that illegal immigrants comprise 27 percent of that workforce, the highest percentage—fell 1.41 percent between 2000 and 2005.

So if these numbers are correct—and they come from the objective BLS and are supposed to be accurate, and we rely on them for our business around here—something is amiss if people say they cannot get workers, yet they are getting the work done, and they are paying less in 2005 than they were in 2000.

Now, you tell me.

Others studying the same issue have found similar trends. According to a recent City Journal article by Steven Malanga, a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute:

. . . low-wage immigration has produced such a labor surplus that many of these workers are willing to take jobs without benefits and with salaries far below industry norms. . . .

Well, let me go on. Day laborers—these are people who gather at certain known locations within areas, and they hang out until somebody comes out and hires them—who work in construction in urban areas ''like New York and Los Angeles . . . sell their labor by the hour or the day, for $7 to $11 an hour . . . far below what full time construction workers earn.''

You see, we want Americans to be able to have a job that has some permanency to it, that pays a decent wage, that has retirement benefits, and has health care benefits. But our workers who might be interested in construction—and more are than most people think—are having to compete against people who will work by the day for $7 and $11 an hour and do not demand any benefits.

Robert Samuelson, a contributing editor of Newsweek, has written a column for the Washington Post since 1977. In his column last spring he summed up the impact of illegal immigration on the unskilled American worker this way:

Poor immigrant workers hurt the wages of unskilled Americans. The only question is how much. Studies suggest a range ''from negligible to an earnings reduction of almost 10 percent,'' according to the [Congressional Budget Office].

That is a lot: 10 percent. Five percent is a lot.

To put this impact into a larger perspective, one might ask how much native workers have lost as a whole due to competition with low-skilled immigrant laborers. Although only a few studies have ever looked at this issue, a 2002 National Bureau of Economic Research paper written by Columbia University economics professors Donald R. Davis and David E. Weinstein is on point.

Using complex methodology, they aggregated the total loss to the U.S. native workers and found that the magnitude of losses for U.S. native workers equates roughly to $72 billion a year, or .8 percent of GDP. Now, I don't know if that figure is correct, but the earned income tax credit is just $40 billion a year, and they say it amounts to $72 billion a year. The economics professors at Columbia University also said immigration is as costly to the United States as all trade protections.

When wages are suppressed, people drop out of the workforce. In addition to the evidence that low-skilled American workers—and particularly African-American workers—are suffering wage suppression due to the competition they face from illegal alien labor, we also know competition is causing some Americans to drop out of the labor force.

Steven Camorota, last spring, of the Center for Immigration Studies, analyzed the steady decline in the share of less-educated adult natives in the workforce between March 2000 and March 2005.

Prior to Hurricane Katrina, there were 4 million unemployed natives—those looking for jobs who were unable to find them—with high school degrees or less in the workforce. An additional 19 million natives with high school degrees or less existed but were not actively looking for jobs.

Between 2000 and 2005, the number of adult immigrants—legal land illegal—with only a high school degree or less in the labor force increased by 1.6 million.

During the same time period, unemployment among high school graduates and less educated native Americans increased by nearly 1 million—so unemployment among our high school graduates or high school dropouts increased by nearly 1 million—and an additional 1.5 million left the workforce altogether.

Although jobs grew in the United States from 2000 to 2005, natives only benefited from 9 percent of the total net job increase. That is an important factor. Although jobs grew in the U.S. from 2000 to 2005, natives only benefited from 9 percent of that total. The number of adult natives holding a job grew by only 303,000, while the number of adult immigrants holding a job increased by 2.9 million. So it is 303,000 compared to 2.9 million among high school graduates or high school dropouts.

Steven Malanga, a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute, recently explained:

[M]any of the unskilled, uneducated workers now journeying here labor . . . in shrinking industries, where they force out native workers, and many others work in industries where the availability of cheap workers has led businesses to suspend investment in new technologies that would make them less labor-intensive. . . . [T]he unemployment rate among native-born ''unskilled workers is high—about 30 percent.''

The unemployment rate among native-born, unskilled workers is about 30 percent, I repeat.

To me, those numbers do indicate a significant problem. It is a problem we need to talk about as we talk about how to help working Americans get a better wage.

Mr. President, I will note a few more points before I wrap up.

Professor Richard Freeman—the Herbert S. Ascherman Professor of Economics at Harvard—testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee. I participated in that hearing last spring. He said:

If you're a poor Mexican, your income in the U.S. will be six to eight times what it is in Mexico.

Robert Samuelson explained in a March 2006 column in the Washington Post:

They're drawn here by wage differences, not labor ''shortages.''

American workers, I think it is fair to say, cannot compete with the wage gap between their country and other countries. I was in South America last May with Senator SPECTER. We visited Peru, and we saw a poll that had just been published in Nicaragua while we were there that said 60 percent of the people in Nicaragua would come to the United States if they could. I mentioned that to the State Department team there in Peru, and they told me that a poll in Peru had recently shown, just about this time last year, that 70 percent of the people in Peru would come to the United States if they could.

So I guess what I am saying to my colleagues is, we need an immigration policy that allows immigration and that is consistent with our historic values as a nation that welcomes immigrants, but the numbers and the skill sets that they bring ought to be such that they do not depress wages of our lower income people because we cannot accept everybody in the world who would like to come here. It is not physically possible to any degree that we could accept that.

We have a lottery section that does not have any requirements of skills in it. You apply to it if you want to come to America. It allows for 50,000 to be drawn out of a hat each year. And those who are drawn get to come to America on a random basis. We had 5 million people, according to Professor Borjas at Harvard, who applied for those 50,000 slots. I do not blame people who want to come here. I am not demeaning them. Most of them are good and decent people who want to get ahead. But we have such a higher wage base that we could attract people from all over the world in virtually unlimited numbers, and it does have the impact, if allowed to be too great and too concentrated in certain industries, to pull down American wages.

While we are thinking about how to increase the wages of American workers, we need to think about that. That is all I am saying. And we are going to talk about that if we talk about immigration this year, as I expect we will. We can have immigration, but it needs to be done right.

How do we level the playing field? Let's consider the advice given by Dr. Barry Chiswick. He is the head of the Department of Economics at the University of Illinois in Chicago. He testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee last spring, stating:

> [T]he large increase in low-skilled immigration . . . has had the effect of decreasing the wages and employment opportunities of low-skilled workers who are currently residing in the United States.

He goes on to say:

> Over the past two decades . . . The real earnings of low skilled workers have either stagnated or decreased somewhat.
>
> [W]e . . . need to . . . provide greater assistance to low-skilled Americans in their quest for better jobs and higher wages. [O]ne of the best ways we can help them in this regard is by reducing the very substantial competition that they are facing from this very large and uncontrolled low-skilled immigration that is the result of both our legal immigration system and the absence of enforcement of immigration law.

That is pretty much indisputable. I haven't heard a professor who would dispute that yet, or anybody who can seriously object to those numbers.

Professor Harry Holzer, associate dean and professor of public policy at Georgetown University, a great university here, also testified at that same hearing. He believes American workers do want jobs currently being held by illegal laborers.

I don't agree with this idea that these are jobs Americans want to take. Americans are not interested in a job that is only going to last for 3 months, that pays the minimum wage and has no health care and no retirement benefits. I will say that. And neither do we want them to take those jobs.

Professor Holzer believes that absent illegal immigrant competition, employers would raise wages and improve working conditions to attract the American worker:

> I believe that when immigrants are illegal, they do more to undercut the wages of native-born workers, because the playing field isn't level and employers don't have to pay them market wages.
>
> . . . [T]here are jobs in industries like construction that I think are more appealing to native-born workers, and many native-born low-income men might be interested in more of those jobs. . . . Absent the immigrants, the employer might need to raise those wages and improve those conditions of work to entice native-born workers into those jobs.

That is true. That is all I am saying. As we discuss the minimum wage—and I am confident somehow we will work our way through this, but there are some amendments and votes that need to be taken—it should be done only as part of a serious evaluation of what is happening to the wages of low-skilled workers and middle-class workers. If we do that and think it through, we will see we ought to reform the earned income tax credit so people can receive that benefit while they work. We will conclude we ought to create a savings program every American worker can put money into throughout their working career, from the first paycheck they get until the day of their retirement. It would transform the retirement years of those people. We have that in our capability.

As we craft an immigration policy, we cannot craft that policy in such a way that it only benefits corporate profits. It must be done in a way that considers the impact that is occurring on our own low-skilled workers. If we do a good lawful system of immigration that is in harmony with our history of immigration in America but at the same time provides protection to the least of our American workers, we will have done something worthwhile.

Unfortunately, I have to say the bill that passed the Senate last year would have been a disaster. It would have increased legal immigration in this country, skewed mostly to low-skilled workers, by almost three times the current rate. How can that have done anything other than hurt our workers?

Those are some thoughts. I appreciate the opportunity of sharing them.

I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and that amendment No. 147, which I have offered, which deals with increased fines for employers who hire illegal immigrants, be called up. That fine currently is $250. I think that is too low. I ask that that be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair.

I think that is relevant to the issue we are talking about: How to help people get more take-home pay for their labor. One of the reasons that is not happening to the degree we would like is the large flow of illegal labor. One of the problems we have is that enforcement in the workplace is not adequate. Most employers want to do the right thing, but a $250 fine is too low. We will be dealing with that again later on.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 221 TO AMENDMENT NO. 157

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I call for the regular order with respect to amendment No. 157 and send a second-degree amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] proposes an amendment numbered 221 to amendment No. 157.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

> At the end of the amendment add the following:
>
> Section 2 of the bill shall take effect one day after date of enactment.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I want to speak a few minutes about what we are doing. I also have several things I would like the American people to see. I have spent a lot of time thinking about the minimum wage and kind of the farce of what we are doing here. If we tell people we want them to have a real minimum wage, the debate ought to be about $13 an hour. If we, as the Government, are going to tell the States and the employers what they ought to be paying, giving them a real minimum wage, then surely they deserve to earn $28,000 a year. That is a livable wage. You can make it on that. The fact that nobody wants to do that and it will be voted down proves they

know how onerous that would be on the economy. Nobody wants to do that. Nobody wants to so disrupt wages. But it is OK to do it in a small amount. That is what we are talking about.

The first poster I have shows that 29 States and the District of Columbia have a minimum wage that is higher than the Federal minimum wage.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COBURN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SESSIONS. Dr. COBURN is such a thoughtful commentator on many issues, but he is an expert and has done a lot of work on the health care issue. I know he has some of his own ideas. But one of the ways you could help low-income workers would be to reduce the health care burden they pay in terms of health insurance. For example, the President's proposal of tax deductibility that he made in his State of the Union Address would be a rather sizable benefit to a lot of low-income workers, if it were passed, would it not?

Mr. COBURN. It will be a benefit but not to the extent a direct tax credit to them would be. Right now the average American, if you are in the upper income scale, gets $2,700 worth of tax benefit from our income tax code. And if you are on the lower scale, you get $103 worth of tax benefit.

Mr. SESSIONS. This is for health insurance deductibility.

Mr. COBURN. Under the President's proposal, that would be narrowed. I believe it ought to be the same for every American. Every American ought to get the same tax benefit. I also believe every American ought to be covered. There ought to be access for anybody with disease. There are ways to do that, and I will be introducing a global health care bill within the next month that attacks every aspect of health care and what we need to do about it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I wanted to say I am interested in the earned income tax credit, immigration, and in savings. The Senator has mentioned health care. All of those are ways, apart from mandating a salary or minimum wage increase, to help workers. The bill the President proposed would not go as far as Senator COBURN would like to see—and I am impressed with his analysis—but it would, in fact, provide a good benefit for working Americans.

Mr. COBURN. The Senator from Alabama is correct.

You can see from this chart that 29 States currently have a minimum wage higher than the Federal minimum wage, and you can also see from the next chart that 14 other States are in their legislature right now considering increasing their own minimum wage. One of the things our Founders thought and planned and hoped we would stick with is having the States be laboratories of experimentation with respect to our democracy. So if you have 14 plus 29, you have 43 States out of 50 and the District of Columbia that have already answered this question. We are going to go through and answer it for them again.

There are a lot of problems associated with this. I want to put up another slide that shows what has happened since 1998 as far as the number of people on the minimum wage. It is a precipitous decline from over 4 million to less than 1.9 million workers presently. You need to break that down. When you break that down, when we say we want to help single moms with kids or four-person families, those working at the minimum wage, what happens is, when you run the numbers, in many instances we are going to hurt people who are making the minimum wage. Let me prove my point.

In Oklahoma today, if you are earning the minimum wage, you have access to the following benefits: A State tax credit—I am talking about families with children on the minimum wage, and there are 40,000 of those in Oklahoma—a school lunch program, which is federally sponsored; temporary assistance to needy families; childcare subsidies; Medicaid, which is called SoonerCare in our State; the earned income tax credit, which is over $4,400 per year; food stamps; housing vouchers; plus what they earn on the minimum wage.

What happens is, if you are a family of four in Oklahoma today earning the minimum wage, your aftertax net benefits, taking advantage of what we are supplying supporting people making the minimum wage, is $36,438 per year. The median household income is only $38,000 and that is pretax. So the average person receiving the benefits we have offered for people who have less means in Oklahoma today actually has more benefit than the average Oklahoma family. What is going to happen when we pass this minimum wage for that person in Oklahoma? What is going to happen is, on the childcare, they are going to go from $22 a month copay to $95 a month. That is what is going to happen to families in Oklahoma. TANF, they are going to go from $3,500 a year to $2,600 a year, based on this minimum wage bill. On food stamps, they are going to go from $3,588 a year to $2,808 a year. Under this very bill, that is what is going to happen to families earning the minimum wage in Oklahoma. Their housing subsidy is going to go from $4,140 a year to $3,096, a 25-percent reduction. Their Medicaid, if they are a family of four, they are not going to qualify for the whole family anymore; only their children will be qualified. So, in essence, what they are going to lose is $4,600 a year in aftertax benefits.

Net net, when you think about the median household income in Oklahoma being $38,000 and they are paying a State income tax of less than 6 percent, and an average Federal income tax of about 18 percent, what you are going to see is they are going to lose.

In the name of helping them, they are going to lose. The vast majority of the people we want to help, which is not the vast majority of the people on minimum wage anywhere in this country—the people who we really want to help the most, not the teenagers or the kids living in a family who have a minimum wage job as a first job, but those in Oklahoma and in 19 other States—you are going to actually decrease their income with this bill. It is not going to have any effect.

Put Massachusetts up there on the chart. The Senator from Massachusetts wants Oklahoma to have his minimum wage bill. The median household income in Massachusetts is $52,354 a year. The total income for somebody making the Massachusetts minimum wage, they are making $45,416 if they take advantage of the benefits available to them in Massachusetts. So his State won't be impacted because he is already above the minimum wage which is being proposed in the minimum wage bill.

How smart is it for us to decide that we want to take away from the families of 19 States—those people who we say we really want to help but, in essence, we are going to cut their aftertax income by about $1,000, a net/net loss for them? Is that what we intend to do? That is the unexpected consequence of what we are going to do. Nobody is considering the fact that the 19 States that have lower minimum wages which will be impacted by this bill—their needy families, single moms with kids, are going to lose under this bill in the name of them winning. It is because we didn't think it out.

The reason we didn't think it out is because this isn't about minimum wage; this is about wage compression. This is about raising the wages of those people above minimum wage. It is not about minimum wage. We come down here and say it is, but it is not. It is designed to raise the wages of anybody under $15 an hour. That is what it is going to do. We know wage compression. If you have 100 people working and the highest is making $12 and the lowest is now making $6, and you say they are going to have to make $7.25 or $7.50, what is going to happen to the other wages? They are going to have to be bumped up. The minimum wage is no longer designed to protect people as far as their income.

You can see it from this chart and you can see it in California—and I have it for every State—where the vast majority of the benefits don't come from what we earn in terms of a salaried job; they come from the other benefits the country put in as a social safety net. So in the States in which we would raise the minimum wage that have not done it, in 19 States what is going to happen is we are going to hurt the very people we say we want to help.

How is it we can do that? Why is it we will do that? We will do it because there is a very powerful interest group that is behind this called the labor unions in this country. For every dollar increase in labor rates paid through

the labor unions, what happens to the union's fees? More money. So is it about helping those people who need our help or is there another agenda here?

I have great respect for Senator KENNEDY. He is very eloquent on the floor. But when you see his charts, there are false questions asked. He showed the increase in the level of income in this country since we raised the minimum wage. It doesn't consider all of the other things that have happened over the last 20 years that, through productivity increases, have raised wages. Mandating a minimum wage in any market by any economist will not increase the market. That is not the reason. It looks good on a chart. But you don't consider all of the other benefits and factors that might have considered that. You just say this must have been it because it looks like it. I can show that on anything that we do in the Senate.

Here is a chart for New York. The State of New York is another example. The wage per-job average is $51,165. A single mom earning minimum wage under New York's level, which is at $7.15 right now, and taking advantage of all of the benefits there, aftertax income is $49,000 a year in benefits. I am not saying cut the benefits; I am saying don't do something that will cut the benefits to those people you say you are going to help.

It is interesting when you look at this number, knowing that taxes—if you look at New York City's tax, you pay a city income tax, a State income tax, and a Federal income tax. Those people making minimum wage have more aftertax income in terms of benefits and salary than the average household in New York City. We have to ask the question, do we want to help people?

The Senator from Alabama talked about making sure that the earned income tax credit comes as a part of your wage every month instead of at the end of the year. It is a great idea and ought to be something we want to do. I want to show again what is going to happen to families earning the minimum wage in Oklahoma. There is a net loss of $232, but that doesn't include the taxes. So the net loss for Oklahoma families who are on minimum wage under the new minimum wage, in essence, will be about $1,200. Is that what we want to do to Oklahoma and 18 other States? I don't think so. We have to take the lid off of this pressure cooker. For us to pass a minimum wage that undermines the very people we are saying we want to help does not, in the long run, do anything except help organized labor, 1; No. 2, it makes certain jobs go away; we know it will, No. 3, send more jobs out of this country.

I believe and I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will look at our data. I hope he will try to amend his bill in such a way so that we have either a safe harbor or some other mechanism so the people in these 19 States don't lose the very benefits we say we want to give to them. In fact, that is what will happen if this bill passes.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD The Committee on Indian Affairs Rules of Procedure.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Rule 1. The Standing Rules of the Senate, Senate Resolution 4, and the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, to the extent the provisions of such Act are applicable to the Committee on Indian Affairs and supplemented by these rules, are adopted as the rules of the Committee.

MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

Rule 2. The Committee shall meet on Thursdays while the Congress is in session for the purpose of conducting business, unless for the convenience of the Members, the Chairman shall set some other day for a meeting. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman as he may deem necessary.

OPEN HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

Rule 3. Hearings and business meetings of the Committee shall be open to the public except when the Chairman by a majority vote orders a closed hearing or meeting.

HEARING PROCEDURE

Rule 4(a). Public notice, including notice to Members of the Committee, shall be given of the date, place and subject matter of any hearing to be held by the Committee at least one week in advance of such hearing unless the Chairman of the Committee, with the concurrence of the Vice Chairman, determines that the hearing is non-controversial or that special circumstances require expedited procedures and a majority of the Committee Members attending concurs. In no case shall a hearing be conducted with less than 24 hours' notice.

(b) At least 72 hours in advance of a hearing, each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall submit his or her testimony by way of electronic mail, in a format determined by the Committee and sent to an electronic mail address specified by the Committee, or shall submit an original, printed version of his or her written testimony. In addition, each witness, on the day of the hearing, shall provide an electronic copy of the testimony on a computer disk formatted and suitable for use by the Committee.

(c) Each Member shall be limited to five (5) minutes of questioning of any witness until such time as all Members attending who so desire have had an opportunity to question the witness unless the Committee shall decide otherwise.

(d) The Chairman and Vice Chairman or the ranking Majority and Minority Members present at the hearing may each appoint one Committee staff member to question each witness. Such staff member may question the witness only after all Members present have completed their questioning of the witness or at such time as the Chairman and Vice Chairman or the Ranking Majority and Minority Members present may agree.

BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA

Rule 5(a). A legislative measure or subject shall be included in the agenda of the next following business meeting of the Committee if a written request by a Member for consideration of such measure or subject has been filed with the Chairman of the Committee at least one week prior to such meeting. Nothing in this rule shall be construed to limit the authority of the Chairman of the Committee to include legislative measures or subjects on the Committee agenda in the absence of such request.

(b) Notice of, and the agenda for, any business meeting of the Committee shall be provided to each Member and made available to the public at least two days prior to such meeting, and no new items may be added after the agenda published except by the approval of a majority of the Members of the Committee. The notice and agenda of any business meeting may be provided to the Members by electronic mail, provided that a paper copy will be provided to any Member upon request. The Clerk shall promptly notify absent members of any action taken by the Committee on matters not included in the published agenda.

(c) Any bill or resolution to be considered by the Committee shall be filed with the Clerk of the Committee not less than 48 hours in advance of the Committee meeting. Any amendment(s) to legislation to be considered shall be filed with the Clerk not less than 24 hours in advance. This rule may be waived by the Chairman with the concurrence of the Vice Chairman.

QUORUM

Rule 6(a). Except as provided in subsection (b), a majority of the Members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business of the Committee. Consistent with Senate rules, a quorum is presumed to be present unless the absence of a quorum is noted by a Member.

(b) One Member shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of conducting a hearing or taking testimony on any measure before the Committee.

VOTING

Rule 7(a). A recorded vote of the Members shall be taken upon the request of any Member.

(b) A measure may be reported from the Committee unless an objection is made by a member, in which case a recorded vote by the Members shall be required.

(c) Proxy voting shall be permitted on all matters, except that proxies may not be counted for the purpose of determining the presence of a quorum. Unless further limited, a proxy shall be exercised only for the date for which it is given and upon the terms published in the agenda for that date.

SWORN TESTIMONY AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Rule 8. Witnesses in Committee hearings may be required to give testimony under

oath whenever the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Committee deems it to be necessary. At any hearing to confirm a Presidential nomination, the testimony of the nominee, and at the request of any Member, any other witness shall be under oath. Every nominee shall submit a financial statement, on forms to be perfected by the Committee, which shall be sworn to by the nominee as to its completeness and accuracy. All such statements shall be made public by the Committee unless the Committee, in executive session, determines that special circumstances require a full or partial exception to this rule. Members of the Committee are urged to make public a complete disclosure of their financial interests on forms to be perfected by the Committee in the manner required in the case of Presidential nominees.

CONFIDENTIAL TESTIMONY

Rule 9. No confidential testimony taken by, or confidential material presented to the Committee or any report of the proceedings of a closed Committee hearing or business meeting shall be made public in whole or in part, or by way of summary, unless authorized by a majority of the Members of the Committee at a business meeting called for the purpose of making such a determination.

DEFAMATORY STATEMENTS

Rule 10. Any person whose name is mentioned or who is specifically identified in, or who believes that testimony or other evidence presented at, an open Committee hearing tends to defame him or her or otherwise adversely affect his or her reputation may file with the Committee for its consideration and action a sworn statement of facts relevant to such testimony of evidence.

BROADCASTING OR HEARINGS OR MEETINGS

Rule 11. Any meeting or hearing by the Committee which is open to the public may be covered in whole or in part by television, radio broadcast, or still photography. Photographers and reporters using mechanical recording, filming, or broadcasting devices shall position their equipment so as not to interfere with the sight, vision, and hearing of Members and staff on the dais or with the orderly process of the meeting or hearing.

AUTHORIZING SUBPOENAS

Rule 12. The Chairman may, with the agreement of the Vice Chairman, or the Committee may, by majority vote, authorize the issuance of subpoenas.

AMENDING THE RULES

Rule 13. These rules may be amended only by a vote of a majority of all the Members of the Committee in a business meeting of the Committee: *Provided*, that no vote may be taken on any proposed amendment unless such amendment is reproduced in full in the Committee agenda for such meeting at least seven (7) days in advance of such meeting.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. KOHL, Madam President, in accordance with rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Rules of the Special Committee on Aging.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING—JURISDICTION AND AUTHORITY

S. RES. 4, § 104, 95TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION (1977)

(a)(1) There is established a Special Committee on Aging (hereafter in this section referred to as the ''special committee'') which shall consist of nineteen Members. The Members and chairman of the special committee shall be appointed in the same manner and at the same time as the Members and chairman of a standing committee of the Senate. After the date on which the majority and minority Members of the special committee are initially appointed on or affect the effective date of title I of the Committee System Reorganization Amendments of 1977, each time a vacancy occurs in the Membership of the special committee, the number of Members of the special committee shall be reduced by one until the number of Members of the special committee consists of nine Senators.

(2) For the purposes of paragraph 1 of rule XXV; paragraphs 1, 7(a)(1)–(2), 9, and 10(a) of rule XXVI; and paragraphs 1(a)–(d), and 2(a) and (d) of rule XXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate; and the purposes of section 202(I) and (j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the special committee shall be treated as a standing committee of the Senate.

(b)(1) It shall be the duty of the special committee to conduct a continuing study of any and all matters pertaining to problems and opportunities of older people, including, but not limited to, problems and opportunities of maintaining health, of assuring adequate income, of finding employment, of engaging in productive and rewarding activity, of securing proper housing, and when necessary, of obtaining care or assistance. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee, and such committee shall not have power to report by bill, or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

(2) The special committee shall, from time to time (but not less than once year), report to the Senate the results of the study conducted pursuant to paragraph (1), together with such recommendation as it considers appropriate.

(c)(1) For the purposes of this section, the special committee is authorized, in its discretion, (A) to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, (B) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (C) to employ personnel, (D) to hold hearings, (E) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, (F) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of witnesses and the production of correspondence books, papers, and documents, (G) to take depositions and other testimony, (H) to procure the service of individual consultants or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(I) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended) and (I) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(2) The chairman of the special committee or any Member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

(3) Subpoenas authorized by the special committee may be issued over the signature of the chairman, or any Member of the special committee designated by the chairman, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman or the Member signing the subpoena.

(d) All records and papers of the temporary Special Committee on Aging established by Senate Resolution 33, 87th Congress, are transferred to the special committee.

RULES OF PROCEDURE

I. CONVENING OF MEETINGS AND HEARINGS

1. Meetings. The committee shall meet to conduct committee business at the call of the chairman.

2. Special Meetings. The Members of the committee may call additional meetings as provided in Senate Rule XXVI (3).

3. Notice and Agenda:

(a) Hearings. The committee shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing at least one week before its commencement.

(b) Meetings. The chairman shall give the Members written notice of any committee meeting, accompanied by an agenda enumerating the items of business to be considered, at least 5 days in advance of such meeting.

(c) Shortened Notice. A hearing or meeting may be called on not less than 24 hours notice if the chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing or meeting on shortened notice. An agenda will be furnished prior to such a meeting.

4. Presiding Officer. The chairman shall preside when present. If the chairman is not present at any meeting or hearing, the ranking majority Member present shall preside. Any Member of the committee may preside over the conduct of a hearing.

II. CLOSED SESSIONS AND CONFIDENTIAL MATERIALS

1. Procedure. All meetings and hearings shall be open to the public unless closed. To close a meeting or hearing or portion thereof, a motion shall be made and seconded to go into closed discussion of whether the meeting or hearing will concern the matters enumerated in Rule II.3. Immediately after such discussion, the meeting or hearing may be closed by a vote in open session of a majority of the Members of the committee present.

2. Witness Request. Any witness called for a hearing may submit a written request to the chairman no later than 24 hours in advance for his examination to be in closed or open session. The chairman shall inform the committee of any such request.

3. Closed Session Subjects. A meeting or hearing or portion thereof may be closed if the matters to be discussed concern: (1) national security; (2) committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure; (3) matters tending to reflect adversely on the character or reputation or to invade the privacy of the individuals; (4) committee investigations; (5) other matters enumerated in Senate Rule XXVI (5)(b).

4. Confidential Matter. No record made of a closed session, or material declared confidential by a majority of the committee, or report of the proceedings of a closed session, shall be made public, in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless specifically authorized by the chairman and ranking minority Member.

5. Broadcasting:

(a) Control. Any meeting or hearing open to the public may be covered by television, radio, or still photography. Such coverage must be conducted in an orderly and unobtrusive manner, and the chairman may for good cause terminate such coverage in whole or in part, or take such other action to control it as the circumstances may warrant.

(b) Request. A witness may request of the chairman, on grounds of distraction, harassment, personal safety, or physical discomfort, that during his testimony cameras, media microphones, and lights shall not be directed at him.

III. QUORUMS AND VOTING

1. Reporting. A majority shall constitute a quorum for reporting a resolution, recommendation or report to the Senate.

2. Committee Business. A third shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of committee business, other than a final vote on reporting, providing a minority Member is present. One Member shall constitute a quorum for the receipt of evidence, the swearing of witnesses, and the taking of testimony at hearings.

3. Polling:

(a) Subjects. The committee may poll (1) internal committee matters including those concerning the committee's staff, records, and budget; (2) other committee business which has been designated for polling at a meeting.

(b) Procedure. The chairman shall circulate polling sheets to each Member specifying the matter being polled and the time limit for completion of the poll. If any Member so requests in advance of the meeting, the matter shall be held for meeting rather than being polled. The clerk shall keep a record of polls, if the chairman determines that the polled matter is one of the areas enumerated in Rule II.3, the record of the poll shall be confidential. Any Member may move at the committee meeting following a poll for a vote on the polled decision.

IV. INVESTIGATIONS

1. Authorization for Investigations. All investigations shall be conducted on a bipartisan basis by committee staff. Investigations may be initiated by the committee staff upon the approval of the chairman and the ranking minority Member. Staff shall keep the committee fully informed of the progress of continuing investigations, except where the chairman and the ranking minority Member agree that there exists temporary cause for more limited knowledge.

2. Subpoenas. Subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses or the production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other materials shall be issued by the chairman, or by any other Member of the committee designated by him. Prior to the issuance of each subpoena, the ranking minority Member, and any other Member so requesting, shall be notified regarding the identity of the person to whom the subpoena will be issued and the nature of the information sought, and its relationship to the investigation.

3. Investigative Reports. All reports containing findings or recommendations stemming from committee investigations shall be printed only with the approval of a majority of the Members of the committee.

V. HEARINGS

1. Notice. Witnesses called before the committee shall be given, absent extraordinary circumstances, at least 48 hours notice, and all witnesses called shall be furnished with a copy of these rules upon request.

2. Oath. All witnesses who testify to matters of fact shall be sworn unless the committee waives the oath. The chairman, or any member, may request and administer the oath.

3. Statement. Witnesses are required to make an introductory statement and shall file 150 copies of such statement with the chairman or clerk of the committee at least 72 hours in advance of their appearance, unless the chairman and ranking minority Member determine that there is good cause for a witness's failure to do so. A witness shall be allowed no more than ten minutes to orally summarize their prepared statement.

4. Counsel:

(a) A witness's counsel shall be permitted to be present during his testimony at any public or closed hearing or depositions or staff interview to advise such witness of his rights, provided, however, that in the case of any witness who is an officer or employee of the government, or of a corporation or association, the chairman may rule that representation by counsel from the government, corporation, or association creates a conflict of interest, and that the witness shall be represented by personal counsel not from the government, corporation, or association.

(b) A witness is unable for economic reasons to obtain counsel may inform the committee at least 48 hours prior to the witness's appearance, and it will endeavor to obtain volunteer counsel for the witness. Such counsel shall be subject solely to the control of the witness and not the committee. Failure to obtain counsel will not excuse the witness from appearing and testifying.

5. Transcript. An accurate electronic or stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of all witnesses in executive and public hearings. Any witness shall be afforded, upon request, the right to review that portion of such record, and for this purpose, a copy of a witness's testimony in public or closed session shall be provided to the witness. Upon inspecting his transcript, within a time limit set by the committee clerk, a witness may request changes in testimony to correct errors of transcription, grammatical errors, and obvious errors of fact, the chairman or a staff officer designated by him shall rule on such request.

6. Impugned Persons. Any person who believes that evidence presented, or comment made by a Member or staff, at a public hearing or at a closed hearing concerning which there have been public reports, tends to impugn his character or adversely affect his reputation may:

(a) file a sworn statement of facts relevant to the evidence or comment, which shall be placed in the hearing record;

(b) request the opportunity to appear personally before the committee to testify in his own behalf; and

(c) submit questions in writing which he requests be used for the cross-examination of other witnesses called by the committee. The chairman shall inform the committee of such requests for appearance or cross-examination. If the committee so decides; the requested questions, or paraphrased versions or portions of them, shall be put to the other witness by a Member or by staff.

7. Minority Witnesses. Whenever any hearing is conducted by the committee, the minority on the committee shall be entitled, upon request made by a majority of the minority Members to the chairman, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify or produce documents with respect to the measure or matter under consideration during at least one day of the hearing. Such request must be made before the completion of the hearing or, if subpoenas are required to call the minority witnesses, no later than three days before the completion of the hearing.

8. Conduct of Witnesses, Counsel and Members of the Audience. If, during public or executive sessions, a witness, his counsel, or any spectator conducts himself in such a manner as to prevent, impede, disrupt, obstruct, or interfere with the orderly administration of such hearing the chairman or presiding Member of the committee present during such hearing may request the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, his representative or any law enforcement official to eject said person from the hearing room.

VI. DEPOSITIONS AND COMMISSIONS

1. Notice. Notices for the taking of depositions in an investigation authorized by the committee shall be authorized and issued by the chairman or by a staff officer designated by him. Such notices shall specify a time and place for examination, and the name of the staff officer or officers who will take the deposition. Unless otherwise specified, the deposition shall be in private. The committee shall not initiate procedures leading to criminal or civil enforcement proceedings for a witness's failure to appear unless the deposition notice was accompanied by a committee subpoena.

2. Counsel. Witnesses may be accompanied at a deposition by counsel to advise them of their rights, subject to the provisions of Rule V.4.

3. Procedure. Witnesses shall be examined upon oath administered by an individual authorized by local law to administer oaths. Questions shall be propounded orally by committee staff. Objections by the witnesses as to the form of questions shall be noted by the record. If a witness objects to a question and refuses to testify on the basis of relevance or privilege, the committee staff may proceed with the deposition, or may at that time or at a subsequent time, seek a ruling by telephone or otherwise on the objection from a Member of the committee. If the Member overrules the objection, he may refer the matter to the committee or he may order and direct the witness to answer the question, but the committee shall not initiate the procedures leading to civil or criminal enforcement unless the witness refuses to testify after he has been ordered and directed to answer by a Member of the committee.

4. Filing. The committee staff shall see that the testimony is transcribed or electronically recorded. If it is transcribed, the witness shall be furnished with a copy for review. No later than five days thereafter, the witness shall return a signed copy, and the staff shall enter the changes, if any, requested by the witness in accordance with Rule V.6. If the witness fails to return a signed copy, the staff shall note on the transcript the date a copy was provided and the failure to return it. The individual administering the oath shall certify on the transcript that the witness was duly sworn in his presence, the transcriber shall certify that the transcript is a true record to the testimony, and the transcript shall then be filed with the committee clerk. Committee staff may stipulate with the witness to changes in this procedure; deviations from the procedure which do not substantially impair the reliability of the record shall not relieve the witness from his obligation to testify truthfully.

5. Commissions. The committee may authorize the staff, by issuance of commissions, to fill in prepared subpoenas, conduct field hearings, inspect locations, facilities, or systems of records, or otherwise act on behalf of the committee. Commissions shall be accompanied by instructions from the committee regulating their use.

VII. SUBCOMMITTEES

1. Establishment. The committee will operate as a Committee of the Whole, reserving to itself the right to establish temporary subcommittees at any time by majority vote. The chairman of the full committee and the ranking minority Member shall be ex officio Members of all subcommittees.

2. Jurisdiction. Within its jurisdiction as described in the Standing Rules of the Senate, each subcommittee is authorized to conduct investigations, including use of subpoenas, depositions, and commissions.

3. Rules. A subcommittee shall be governed by the committee rules, except that its quorum for all business shall be one-third of the subcommittee Membership, and for hearings shall be one Member.

VIII. REPORTS

Committee reports incorporating committee findings and recommendations shall be printed only with the prior approval of the committee, after an adequate period for review and comment. The printing, as committee documents, of materials prepared by staff for informational purposes, or the printing of materials not originating with the committee or staff, shall require prior consultation with the minority staff; these publications shall have the following language printed on the cover of the document: ''Note: This document has been printed for informational purposes. It does not represent

either findings or recommendations formally adopted by the committee.''

IX. AMENDMENT OF RULES

The rules of the committee may be amended or revised at any time, provided that not less than a majority of the committee present so determine at a committee meeting preceded by at least 3 days notice of the amendments or revisions proposed.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation adopted rules governing its procedures for the 110th Congress on January 24. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, on behalf of myself and Senator STEVENS, I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying Rules from the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

I. MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

1. The regular meeting dates of the Committee shall be the first and third Tuesdays of each month. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman as the Chairman may deem necessary, or pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 3 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

2. Meetings of the Committee, or any subcommittee, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or series of meetings by the Committee, or any subcommittee, on the same subject for a period of no more than 14 calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in subparagraphs (A) through (F) would require the meeting to be closed, followed immediately by a record vote in open session by a majority of the members of the Committee, or any subcommittee, when it is determined that the matter to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings—

(A) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(B) will relate solely to matters of Committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure;

(C) will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

(D) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interest of effective law enforcement;

(E) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets of, or financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to, a given person if—

(1) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(2) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(F) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulations.

3. Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or any subcommittee shall file with the Committee, at least 24 hours in advance of the hearing, a written statement of the witness's testimony in as many copies as the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee prescribes.

4. Field hearings of the full Committee, and any subcommittee thereof, shall be scheduled only when authorized by the Chairman and ranking minority member of the full Committee.

II. QUORUMS

1. A majority of the members, which includes at least 1 minority member, shall constitute a quorum for official action of the Committee when reporting a bill, resolution, or nomination. Proxies may not be counted in making a quorum for purposes of this paragraph.

2. Eight members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of all business as may be considered by the Committee, except for the reporting of a bill, resolution, or nomination. Proxies may not be counted in making a quorum for purposes of this paragraph.

3. For the purpose of taking sworn testimony a quorum of the Committee and each subcommittee thereof, now or hereafter appointed, shall consist of 1 Senator.

III. PROXIES

When a record vote is taken in the Committee on any bill, resolution, amendment, or any other question, the required quorum being present, a member who is unable to attend the meeting may submit his or her vote by proxy, in writing or by telephone, or through personal instructions.

IV. BROADCASTING OF HEARINGS

Public hearings of the full Committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall be televised or broadcast only when authorized by the Chairman and the ranking minority member of the full Committee.

V. SUBCOMMITTEES

1. Any member of the Committee may sit with any subcommittee during its hearings.

2. Subcommittees shall be considered *de novo* whenever there is a change in the chairmanship, and seniority on the particular subcommittee shall not necessarily apply.

VI. CONSIDERATION OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

It shall not be in order during a meeting of the Committee to move to proceed to the consideration of any bill or resolution unless the bill or resolution has been filed with the Clerk of the Committee not less than 48 hours in advance of the Committee meeting, in as many copies as the Chairman of the Committee prescribes. This rule may be waived with the concurrence of the Chairman and the ranking minority member of the full Committee.

NOMINATION OF GENERAL DAVID PETRAEUS

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I regret that commitments in North Dakota prevented me from voting on the nomination of David H. Petraeus to be promoted to the rank of General in the U.S. Army and to be commander of Multinational Forces Iraq.

If present, I would have voted in favor of General Petraeus's nomination.

I believe General Petraeus is well-qualified to command in Iraq. He was unanimously approved by the Senate Armed Services Committee because of his leadership skills and his operational experience. And he is widely recognized as one of the military's top experts on counterinsurgency operations.

He is an excellent choice to be entrusted with the operational command and welfare of over 130,000 American servicemembers who are in the middle of a bloody sectarian battle over the future of Iraq. He is familiar with the situation in that country from his experiences as an infantry division commander during and immediately after the invasion of Iraq, and from his tenure as the commander of U.S. efforts to train and equip Iraqi security forces. Altogether, he has served 27 months in Iraq since the war began.

I was impressed by the fact that General Petraeus promised to regularly update Congress on whether the President's new plan in Iraq is working and on how much progress the Iraqi Government is making toward assuming responsibility for security.

But my support for General Petraeus's nomination should not be taken as support for the President's decision to send additional soldiers and marines to Iraq and to escalate our military involvement there.

I am very skeptical that the President's plan to send 21,500 additional troops to Iraq is going to work.

I have listened to what President Bush and his advisers have said about the subject, and I listened to what General Petreaus said during his confirmation hearing. But I do not think they have adequately explained away the Senate testimony given less than 2 months ago by General Abizaid, the top commander of American troops in Iraq. In November General Abizaid said:

> I met with every divisional commander, General Casey, the corps commander, General Dempsey. We all talked together. And I said, ''In your professional opinion, if we were to bring in more American troops now, does that add considerably to our ability to achieve success in Iraq?'' And they all said no. The reason is because we want the Iraqis to do more. It is easy for the Iraqis to rely upon us to do this work. I believe that more American forces prevent the Iraqis from doing more, from taking more responsibility for their own future.

Has that changed? Has something changed in 2 months? The question for us now is: Should American troops be in the middle of that civil war? Should we send additional troops to that circumstance? If so, for what purpose? And why the change only two months after General Abizaid said the commanders do not believe additional troops will be effective?

That issue is going to be debated here in Congress in the coming weeks. All of us in that debate want to find the right solution for this country to support our

soldiers, make the right choices for them, and make the right judgments for our country's long-term interests. I believe that sending General Petreaus to Iraq will help accomplish that. I wish him well and Godspeed.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO HELEN FENSKE

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, today I wish to honor Helen Fenske, the grandmother of environmentalism in my great home State of New Jersey. I join with New Jerseyeans and environmentalists everywhere in mourning her passing on January 19, 2007.

Helen was truly a pioneer in understanding the importance of preserving our environmental resources for future generations. Her activism began in the late 1950s and early 1960s, when the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey had plans to build a jetport on swampy land in Chatham Township, in Morris County, NJ. But not on Helen Fenske's watch. Self-described as ''the little old lady in sneakers,'' she understood that the swamp was a treasure—an environmentally sensitive area—and that a jetport would be an ecological disaster to the region. With dogged determination, Helen Fenske mobilized a group of likeminded residents in the Green Village vicinity. In a grassroots effort that included raising money, creating awareness, and lobbying to retain this environmental resource, Helen Fenske managed to procure substantial acreage to be donated to the federal government. This acreage became the nucleus of the 7500 acre Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge—established by Congress in November 1960.

The Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge is, indeed, a treasure and was the first refuge to receive national wilderness recognition—signed into law by President Johnson in 1968. This was the culmination of Helen Fenske's efforts to save the Great Swamp. Thanks to Helen's perseverance and vision, today, one can walk on a boardwalk through vast portions of the swamp to enjoy the natural wildlife that inhabits it, including 244 species of birds, mammals such as red fox, coyote, beaver, raccoons, fish, reptiles, and amphibians, and many large oak and beech trees, and plants such as mountain laurel, mosses, and ferns.

But Helen Fenske's legend did not stop with the Great Swamp. She went on to become an environmental advocate assuming key leadership positions in State government, as special assistant to the first commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Richard Sullivan, and Assistant Commissioner for Natural and Historic Resources. Her leadership became the inspiration for a myriad of conservation efforts, including the battle to save Sunfish Pond along the Appalachian Trail at the Delaware Water Gap. She was additionally the inspiration for the formation of the New Jersey Conservation Foundation and was involved with the Association of New Jersey Environmental Commissions, Patriot's Path, the Hudson River Walkway, the Morris Parks and Land Conservancy, and the preservation of the Highlands along with many other efforts.

For her groundbreaking efforts as a champion of the environment, Helen Fenske was the deserving honoree of numerous awards, including the Marcellus Hartley Dodge Award from the Great Swamp Watershed Association; a Congressional Citation for her work in saving the Great Swamp and the creation of the American Revolution Heritage Corridor; the Achievement Award of the Washington Association; and honorary degrees from Ramapo College and Drew University.

Even after she moved to New Hampshire, she remained in touch with her New Jersey roots, always connected to her fight to preserve the Great Swamp and its environs. She died in New Hampshire, but left a living legacy in New Jersey. She will be greatly missed, but the legacy of the ''old lady in sneakers'' has been passed on to a new generation of environmentalists who have taken on her very important mission.•

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–491. A communication from the Administrator, Dairy Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Milk in the Northeast and Other Marketing Areas—Interim Final Order'' (Docket No. DA–06–01) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–492. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Office of Secondary Market Oversight, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Funding and Fiscal Affairs; Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Disclosure and Reporting Requirements; Risk-Based Capital Requirements'' (RIN3052–AC17) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–493. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of two violations of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–494. A communication from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, transmitting, pursuant to law, (14) reports relative to vacancy announcements within the Department, received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–495. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's purchases from foreign entities for fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–496. A communication from the Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Department of Defense Policy on Organizations that Seek to Represent or Organize Members of the Armed Forces in Negotiation or Collective Bargaining'' (RIN0790–AH99) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–497. A communication from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Restriction on Carbon, Alloy, and Armor Steel Plate'' (DFARS Case 2005–D002) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–498. A communication from the Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Service by Members of the Armed Forces on State and Local Juries'' (RIN0790–AH99) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–499. A communication from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Material Inspection and Receiving Report'' (DFARS Case 2003–D085) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–500. A communication from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Inflation Adjustment of Acquisition-Related Thresholds'' (DFARS Case 2004–D022) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–501. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Programs and Legislation Division, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a competition that was performed to reduce the cost of the Base Operating Support function at Homestead Air Reserve Base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–502. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations'' (72 FR 269) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–503. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Flood Elevation Determinations'' (72 FR 272) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–504. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management

Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Flood Elevation Determinations'' (72 FR 287) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–505. A communication from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Commission's competitions in fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–506. A communication from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reports and Public Disclosure of Indebtedness of Executive Officers and Principal Shareholders to a State Nonmember Bank and its Correspondent Banks'' (RIN3064–AD14) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–507. A communication from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Community Reinvestment'' (RIN3064–AD11) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–508. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Flood Elevation Determinations'' (71 FR 75885) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–509. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Flood Elevation Determinations'' (71 FR 76206) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–510. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–511. A communication from the Director, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the Office's competitive sourcing efforts for fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–512. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the nuclear device detonated by North Korea on October 9, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–513. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary for Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's intent to impose new foreign policy-based export controls; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–514. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Temporary Rule; Closure (Closure of Quota Period 2 Fishery for Spiny Dogfish)'' (RIN0648–AT59) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–515. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Temporary Rule; Inseason Bluefish Quota Transfers from MA to RI'' (I.D. No. 122806A) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–516. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Temporary Rule; Closure (New Jersey Summer Flounder Commercial Fishery)'' (I.D. No. 111406C) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–517. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Temporary Rule; Inseason Bluefish Quota Transfer from Maryland to Rhode Island and Delaware to Rhode Island'' (I.D. No. 121806B) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–518. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Arrowtooth Flounder and Flathead Sole in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (I.D. No. 122006D) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–519. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Temporary Rule; Inseason Summer Flounder Quota Transfers from Maryland to New York'' (I.D. No. 121906A–X) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–520. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Closure of Tilefish Permit Category C to Directed Tilefish Fishing—Temporary Rule'' received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–521. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Temporary Rule; Closure'' received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–522. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Commission's competitive sourcing activities for fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–523. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Commission's competitive sourcing activities of fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–524. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Administration's competitive sourcing efforts during fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–525. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's competitive sourcing efforts during fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–526. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the ''Hydrogen Posture Plan''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–527. A communication from the Attorney, Office of Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Standards for Certain Ceiling Fan Light Kits'' (RIN1904–AB54) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–528. A communication from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report entitled ''Annual Report to Congress on Implementation of Public Law 106–107''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–529. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Alabama Beach Mouse'' (RIN1018–AU46) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–530. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2007–2012; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–531. A communication from the Acting Regulations Officer, Office of Disability and Income Security Programs, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Title II Cost-of-Living Adjustments in Primary Insurance Amounts'' (RIN0960–AG42) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–532. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fees for Certain Services'' (RIN1505–AB62) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–533. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the President's intent to transfer $1.8 million in funds to the International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement account; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–534. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2006–304–2006–313); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–535. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a semi-annual report relative to the continued compliance of certain nations with the freedom of emigration provisions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–536. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the certification of the effectiveness of the Australia Group; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–537. A communication from the White House Liaison, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–538. A communication from the White House Liaison, Office of the Under Secretary,

Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of action on a nomination for the position of Under Secretary, received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–539. A communication from the White House Liaison, Office of the Under Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of discontinuation of service in an acting role for the position of Under Secretary, received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–540. A communication from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Foundation's competitive sourcing efforts during fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–541. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's annual report on Grants Streamlining; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–542. A communication from the Chief, Human Capital Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a change in previously submitted reported information and action on a nomination for the position of Inspector General, received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–543. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Supplements and Other Changes Approved New Animal Drug Applications'' ((RIN0910–AF59)(Docket No. 1999N–1415)) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–544. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medical Devices; Patient Examination and Surgeons' Gloves; Test Procedures and Acceptance Criteria'' (Docket No. 2003N–0056) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–545. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's competitive sourcing efforts of fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–546. A communication from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the organization's competitive sourcing activities of fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–547. A communication from the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bureau's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–548. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2006 Report to Congress on the Costs and Benefits of Federal Regulations and Unfunded Mandates on State, Local, and Tribal Entities''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–549. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's six-month periodic report for the period that ended September 30, 2006; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–550. A communication from the Federal Co-Chair, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report for the period from April 1, 2006 through September 30, 2006; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–551. A communication from the Corps of Engineers Secretary, Mississippi River Commission, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Annual Report for calendar year 2006; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–552. A communication from the Acting Chief of Staff, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Service's Annual Report for fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–553. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the unvouchered expenditures report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–554. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Actions Taken on Office of Inspector General Recommendations''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–555. A communication from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the building project survey for Burlington, Vermont; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–556. A communication from the Deputy Director for Administration and Information Management, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the competitions performed by the Office in fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–557. A communication from the Inspector General, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Audit Report Register for the six-month periods ending March 31, 2006 and September 30, 2006; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–558. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, the President's Pay Agent, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the extension of locality-based comparability payments; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–559. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel and Designated Reporting Official, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, (2) reports relative to vacancy announcements within the Office, received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–560. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's competitive sourcing efforts during fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–561. A communication from the Chief of Regulations Management, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Accrued Benefits'' (RIN2900–AM28) received on January 25, 2007; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KOHL, from the Special Committee on Aging, without amendment:

S. Res. 45. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Special Committee on Aging.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Lisa Godbey Wood, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Georgia.

Philip S. Gutierrez, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Lawrence Joseph O'Neill, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California.

Valerie L. Baker, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Gregory Kent Frizzell, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Oklahoma.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BURR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. KYL, and Mr. ALLARD):

S. 415. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States to prevent the use of the legal system in a manner that extorts money from State and local governments, and the Federal Government, and inhibits such governments' constitutional actions under the first, tenth, and fourteenth amendments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 416. A bill for the relief of Denes Fulop and Gyorgyi Fulop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 417. A bill for the relief of Claudia Marquez Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 418. A bill for the relief of Shigeru Yamada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 419. A bill for the relief of Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elna Cobian Arreola, Nayely Bibiana Arreola, and Cindy Jael Arreola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 420. A bill for the relief of Jacqueline W. Coats; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 421. A bill for the relief of Robert Liang and Alice Liang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mrs. HUTCHISON):

S. 422. A bill to authorize any alien who has been issued a valid machine-readable biometric border crossing identification card

to be temporarily admitted into the United States upon successfully completing a background check; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. WEBB, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 423. A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2007, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 424. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to carry out the Penobscot River Restoration Project; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 425. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the resources eligible for the renewable energy credit to kinetic hydropower, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NELSON of Nebraska:

S. 426. A bill to provide that all funds collected from the tariff on imports of ethanol be invested in the research, development, and deployment of biofuels, especially cellulosic ethanol produced form biomass feedstocks; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. KOHL:

S. Res. 45. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Special Committee on Aging; from the Special Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 10

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 10, a bill to reinstate the pay-as-you-go requirement and reduce budget deficits by strengthening budget enforcement and fiscal responsibility.

S. 43

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 43, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to preserve and protect Social Security benefits of American workers and to help ensure greater congressional oversight of the Social Security system by requiring that both Houses of Congress approve a totalization agreement before the agreement, giving foreign workers Social Security benefits, can go into effect.

S. 85

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 85, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to clarify that territories and Indian tribes are eligible to receive grants for confronting the use of methamphetamine.

S. 206

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 206, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 207

At the request of Mr. COLEMAN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) were added as cosponsors of S. 207, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow taxpayers to designate part or all of any income tax refund to support reservists and National Guard members.

S. 211

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 211, a bill to facilitate nationwide availability of 2–1–1 telephone service for information and referral on human services, volunteer services, and for other purposes.

S. 214

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 214, a bill to amend chapter 35 of title 28, United States Code, to preserve the independence of United States attorneys.

S. 223

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 223, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 261

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 261, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen prohibitions against animal fighting, and for other purposes.

S. 280

At the request of Mr. CARPER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 280, a bill to provide for a program to accelerate the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States by establishing a market-driven system of greenhouse gas tradeable allowances, to support the deployment of new climate change-related technologies, and to ensure benefits to consumers from the trading in such allowances, and for other purposes.

S. 291

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) were added as cosponsors of S. 291, a bill to establish a digital and wireless network technology program, and for other purposes.

S. 315

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 315, a bill to establish a digital and wireless network technology program, and for other purposes.

S. 326

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 326, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a special period of limitation when uniformed services retirement pay is reduced as a result of award of disability compensation.

S. 340

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 340, a bill to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States and for other purposes.

S. 358

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 358, a bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of genetic information with respect to health insurance and employment.

S. 368

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 368, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enhance the COPS ON THE BEAT grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 376

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) were added as cosponsors of S. 376, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve the provisions relating to the carrying of concealed weapons by law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 381, a bill to establish a fact-finding Commission to extend the study of a prior Commission to investigate and determine facts and circumstances surrounding the relocation, internment, and deportation to Axis countries of Latin Americans of Japanese descent from December 1941 through February 1948, and the impact of those actions by the United States, and to recommend appropriate remedies, and for other purposes.

S. 382

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 382, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a State family support

grant program to end the practice of parents giving legal custody of their seriously emotionally disturbed children to State agencies for the purpose of obtaining mental health services for those children.

S. 388

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 388, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a national standard in accordance with which nonresidents of a State may carry concealed firearms in the State.

S. 413

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 413, 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.

S. RES. 36

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 36, a resolution honoring women's health advocate Cynthia Boles Dailard.

AMENDMENT NO. 105

At the request of Mr. MARTINEZ, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 105 proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

AMENDMENT NO. 169

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 169 proposed to H.R. 2, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 416. A bill for the relief of Denes Fulop and Gyorgyi Fulop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I offer today a private immigration relief bill to provide lawful permanent residence status to Denes and Gyorgyi Fulop, Hungarian nationals who have lived in California for more than 20 years. The Fulops are the parents of six U.S. citizen children. Today, they face deportation having exhausted all administrative remedies under our immigration system.

The Fulop's story is a compelling one and one which I believe merits Congress' consideration for humanitarian relief.

The most poignant tragedy to affect this family occurred in May of 2000, when the Fulops eldest child, Robert ''Bobby'' Fulop, an accomplished 15 year-old teenager, died suddenly of a heart aneurism. Bobby was considered the shining star of his family.

That same year their six-year-old daughter, Elizabeth, was diagnosed with moderate pulmonary stenosis, a potentially life-threatening heart condition and a frightening situation similar to Bobby's. Not long ago, she successfully underwent heart surgery, but. requires medical supervision to ensure her good health.

The Fulop's youngest child, Matthew, was born seven weeks premature. He subsequently underwent several kidney surgeries and is still being closely monitored by physicians.

Compounding these tragedies is the fact that today the Fulops face deportation. They face deportation, in part, because in 1995 the family traveled to Hungary and remained there for more than 90 days.

Under the pre-1996 immigration law, prior to the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, their stay in Hungary would not have been a factor in their immigration case and they would have been eligible for adjustment of status to lawful permanent residents.

Indeed, in 1996, Mr. and Mrs. Fulop applied to the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) for permanent resident status. Due to large backlogs, the INS did not interview them until 1998. By the time their applications were considered, the new 1996 immigration law had taken effect. Given their one-time 90 day trip outside the United States, they were statutorily ineligible for relief pursuant to the cancellation of removal provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

One cannot help but conclude that had the INS acted on the Fulop's application for relief from deportation in a timelier manner, they would have qualified for suspension of deportation under the pre-1996 law, given that they were long-term residents of the United States with U.S. citizen children and many positive factors in their favor.

The irony of this situation is that the Fulops were gone from the United States for nearly five months in 1995 because they traveled to Hungary to help Mr. Fulop's brother build his home. Mr. Fulop's brother is handicapped and they went to help remodel his home.

The Fulops are good and decent people. Mr. Fulop is a masonry contractor and the owner and president of his own construction company—Sumeg International. He has owned this business for 12 years and currently has three full-time employees.

The couple is active in their church and community. As Pastor Peter Petrovic of the Apostolic Christian Church of San Diego says in his letter of support, ''[t]he family is an exceptional asset to their community.'' Mrs. Fulop has served as a Sunday school teacher and volunteers regularly at Heritage K–8 Charter School in Escondido. Mrs. Morris, a Heritage K–8 Charter School faculty member says in her letter of support that Mrs. Fulop is ''. . . a valuable asset to our school and community.''

This is a tragic situation. Essentially, as happened to many families under the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, the rules of the game were changed in the middle. When the Fulops applied for relief from deportation they were eligible for suspension of deportation. By the time the INS got around to their application, nearly three years later, they were no longer eligible and in fact suspension of deportation as a form of relief ceased to exist.

The Fulops today have been in the United States since the early 1980s. Most harmful is the effect that their deportation will have on the children, all of whom were born here and who range from three years old to 19 years of age. Their eldest, Dennis, is a 4.0 honor student at Palomar Community College. His sister, Linda, has a 3.8 grade point average, is an honor student in high school, and is also taking one class at Palomar Community College.

It is my hope that Congress sees fit to provide an opportunity for this family to remain together in the United States given their many years here, the profound sadness they have already experienced and the harm that would come from their deportation to their six U.S. citizen children.

I ask unanimous consent that the three letters of community support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APOSTOLIC CHRISTIAN CHURCH
OF SAN DIEGO,
Escondido, CA, December 28, 2006.

Re The Denes Fulop Family.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: My family and I have known Denes and Joy Fulop for many year. They have been members in good standing in our church for approximately 20 years. Denes has served the congregation faithfully in many capacities. He was a building committee member during the construction of our church 10 years ago. He also served as church treasurer for four years and Sunday School Superintendent for many years. Presently he is a member on the board of trustees.

Joy Fulop was a building sub-committee member during the construction of the church and also served for a few years as a Sunday school teacher. Joy is a devoted and committed homemaker, and a wonderful example of a loving mother and wife. Their three younger children, Elizabeth, Sarah and Abigail are actively involved in Sunday school and in various youth group activities. The two oldest, Denny and Linda, are also active in the church. Linda is currently a Sunday school teacher for 2nd to 5th grade children. Linda and Denny are very diligent and excellent students in High School and College and are outstanding citizens.

The family is an exceptional asset to their community. Denes has been self-employed for many years and is a knowledgeable and

successful contractor. Their family has never depended on any government aid, but rather contributes and shares their blessings with others. Denes, Joy, and their six children are truly an asset to our church and community.

Should you have any further questions, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER PETROVIC,
Pastor.

DECEMBER 29, 2006.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: The purpose of this letter is to describe our relationship with the Fulop family over the five years when they became our neighbors.

Dennis Fulop, a contractor, appears to be a very hard working man, carrying out the responsibilities of owning his business plus carrying out responsibilities at home for his wife and six children. I've come to know that Joy, Mrs. Fulop, spends every free minute taking care of the family, home, and involving herself in church and school activities. We have found them to be excellent neighbors, kind, thoughtful, and ready to carry out any favor we may have.

The six children have been wonderful to see grow up over the last several years. They excel in school, are well-mannered, church going, involved in church ministry, and very polite on every occasion.

Our family finds itself fortunate to have a congenial and honest family living next door. It is rare to find such a quality family.

Sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH BRANDSTATER SHAW.

R. RIMMER CONSTRUCTION INC.,
Cardiff, CA, January 3, 2007.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

The purpose of this letter is to describe my relationship with Dennis Fulop whom I have known for approximately twenty-four years.

As a building contractor in the San Diego area I have been fortunate to have worked with Dennis for most of those years. He has constructed nearly all of the foundations for the room additions and new houses that I have built. Dennis has also constructed most of the driveways, sidewalks, retaining walls, fireplaces and masonry on my projects. He has also attended to much of my finish grading, drainage and backhoe construction needs.

Dennis has long been an invaluable member of my construction ''team''. He is very knowledgeable in nearly all construction matters. He has always been very reliable and responsible in meeting deadlines and upholding high standards of construction quality.

Dennis is also a very successful small business owner. He has his own credit accounts with all of the necessary construction suppliers and to my knowledge has always paid his bills in a timely manner. In fact, I have never been contacted or liened by any of his suppliers to date. Dennis is also very proficient at managing and providing work for his employees.

Dennis' wife Joy is a dedicated wife and mother to their six children. She is also actively involved in their church, the Apostolic Christian Church of Escendido.

I am thankful to know the Fulops on a personal level as well. They have graciously invited me and my family to several family and holiday festivities over the years. We always look forward to getting together with the Fulops and other members of their church.

Sincerely,

RON RIMMER,
President, R. Rimmer Construction Inc.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 417. A bill for the relief of Claudia Marquez Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am offering today private relief legislation to provide lawful permanent residence status to Claudia Marquez Rico, a Mexican national living in Redwood City, CA.

Born in Jalisco, Mexico, Claudia was brought to the United States by her parents 16 years ago. Claudia was just 6 years old at the time. She has two younger brothers, Jose and Omar, who came to America with her, and a sister, Maribel, who was born in California and is a U.S. Citizen. America is the only home they know.

Six years ago that home was visited by tragedy. As Mr. and Mrs. Marquez were driving to work early on the morning of October 4, 2000, they were both killed in a horrible traffic accident when their car collided with a truck on an isolated rural road.

The children went to live with their aunt and uncle, Hortencia and Patricio Alcala. The Alcalas are a generous and loving couple. They are U.S. citizens with two children of their own. They took the Marquez children in and did all they could to comfort them in their grief. They supervised their schooling, and made sure they received the counseling they needed, too. The family is active in their parish at Buen Pastor Catholic Church, and Patricio Alcala serves as a youth soccer coach. In 2001, the Alcalas were appointed the legal guardians of the Marquez children.

Sadly, the Marquez family received bad legal representation. At the time of their parents' death, Claudia and Jose were minors, and qualified for special immigrant juvenile status. This category was enacted by Congress to protect children like them from the hardship that would result from deportation under such extraordinary circumstances, when a State court deems them to be dependents due to abuse, abandonment or neglect. Today, their younger brother Omar is on track to lawful permanent residence status as a special immigrant juvenile. Unfortunately, the family's previous lawyer failed to secure this relief for Claudia, and she has now reached the age of majority without having resolved her immigration status.

I should note that their former lawyer, Walter Pineda, is currently answering charges on 29 counts of professional incompetence and 5 counts of moral turpitude for mishandling immigration cases and appears on his way to being disbarred.

I am offering legislation on Claudia's behalf because I believe that, without it, this family would endure an immense and unfair hardship. Indeed, without this legislation, this family will not remain a family for much longer.

Despite the adversity they encountered, Claudia and Jose finished school and now work together in a pet grooming store in Redwood City, where Claudia is the store manager. They support themselves, and they are dedicated to their community and devoted to their family. In fact, last year Claudia became the legal guardian of her 14-year-old sister Maribel, who lives with her and Jose at their home in Redwood City. Omar, now 17 years old, continues to live with the Alcalas so as not to interrupt his studies at Aragon High School in San Mateo. Again, Maribel is a U.S. citizen, and Omar is eligible for a green card.

Claudia has no close relatives in Mexico. She has never visited Mexico, and she was so young when she was brought to America that she has no memories of it. How can we expect her to start a new life there now?

It would be a grave injustice to add to this family's misfortune by tearing these siblings apart. This is a close family, and they have come to rely on each other heavily in the absence of their deceased parents. This bill will prevent the added tragedy of another wrenching separation.

Given these extraordinary and unique facts, I ask my colleagues to support this private relief bill on behalf of Claudia Rico.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 418, A bill for the relief of Shigeru Yamada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I offer today private relief legislation to provide lawful permanent residence status to Shigeru Yamada, a 24-year-old Japanese national who lives in Chula Vista, CA.

I have decided to re-introduce a private bill on his behalf because I believe that Mr. Yamada represents a model American citizen, for whom removal from this country would represent an unfair hardship. Without this legislation, Mr. Yamada will be forced to return to a country in which he lacks any linguistic, cultural or family ties.

Mr. Yamada legally entered the United States with his mother and two sisters in 1992 at the young age of 10. The family was fleeing from Mr. Yamada's alcoholic father, who had been physically abusive to his mother, the children and even his own parents. Since then, he has had no contact with his father and is unsure if he is even alive. Tragically, Mr. Yamada experienced further hardship when his mother was killed in a car crash in 1995. Orphaned at the age of 13, Mr. Yamada spent time living with his aunt before moving to Chula Vista to live with a close friend of his late mother.

The death of his mother marked more than a personal tragedy for Mr. Yamada; it also served to impede the process for him to legalize his status. At the time of her death, Mr. Yamada's family was living legally in the United States. His mother had acquired a student visa for herself and her children qualified as her dependants. Her death revoked his legal status in the United States. In addition, Mr. Yamada's

mother was engaged to an American citizen at the time of her death. Had she survived, her son would likely have become an American citizen through this marriage.

Mr. Yamada has exhausted all administrative options under our current immigration system. Throughout high school, he contacted attorneys in the hopes of legalizing his status, but his attempts were unsuccessful. Unfortunately, time has run out and, for Mr. Yamada, the only option available to him today is private relief legislation.

For several reasons, it would be tragic for Mr. Yamada to be deported from the United States and forced to return to Japan.

First, since arriving in the United States, Mr. Yamada has lived as a model American. He graduated with honors from Eastlake High School in 2000, where he excelled in both academics and athletics. Academically, he earned a number of awards including being named an Outstanding English Student his freshman year, an All-American Scholar, and earning the United States National Minority Leadership Award. His teacher and coach, Mr. John describes him as being responsible, hard working, organized, honest, caring and very dependable. His role as the Vice-President of the Associated Student Body his senior year is an indication of Mr. Yamada's high level of leadership, as well as, his popularity and trustworthiness among his peers. As an athlete, Mr. Yamada was named the Most Inspirational Player of the Year in Junior Varsity baseball and football, as well as, Varsity football. His football coach, Mr. Jose Mendoza, expressed his admiration by saying that he has seen in Shigeru Yamada the responsibility, dedication and loyalty that the average American holds to be virtuous.

Second, Mr. Yamada has distinguished himself as a local volunteer. As a member of the Eastlake High School Link Crew, he helped freshman find their way around campus, offered tutoring and mentoring services, and set an example of how to be a successful member of the student body. After graduating from high school, he volunteered his time for four years as the coach of the Eastlake High School Girl's softball team. The former head coach, who has since retired, Dr. Charles Sorge, describes him as an individual full of integrity who understands that as a coach it is important to work as a team player. His level of commitment to the team was further illustrated to Dr. Sorge when he discovered, halfway through the season, that Mr. Yamada's commute to and from practice was two hours long each way. It takes an individual with character to volunteer his time to coach and never bring up the issue of how long his commute takes him each day. Dr. Sorge hopes that, once Mr. Yamada legalizes his immigration status, he will be formally hired to continue coaching the team.

Third, sending Mr. Yamada back to Japan would be an immense hardship for him and his family here. Mr. Yamada does not speak Japanese. He is unaware of the nation's current cultural trends. And, he has no immediate family members that he knows of in Japan. Currently, both of his sisters are in the process of legalizing their immigration status in the United States. His older sister is married to a United States citizen and his younger sister is being adopted by a maternal aunt, who is a United States citizen. Since as all of his family lives in California, sending Mr. Yamada back to Japan would serve to split his family apart and separate him from everyone and everything that he knows. His sister contends that her younger brother would be lost if he had to return to live in Japan on his own. It is unlikely that he would be able to find any gainful employment in Japan due to his inability to speak or read the language.

As a member of the Chula Vista community, Mr. Yamada has distinguished himself as an honorable individual. His teacher, Mr. Robert Hughes, describes him as being an upstanding All-American young man. Until being picked up during a routine check of riders' immigration status on a city bus, he had never been arrested or convicted of any crime. Mr. Yamada is not, and has never been, a burden on the State. He has never received any Federal or State assistance.

Currently, Mr. Yamada holds sophomore status at Southwestern Community College. However, he is taking this semester off in order to alleviate his financial burdens by working full time. He had hoped to pursue a career in law enforcement, but his plans have recently changed due to his current immigration status dilemma. Until he obtains citizenship, Mr. Yamada will be prohibited from pursuing a career in law enforcement. Due to the circumstances, Mr. Yamada has changed his career goal to that of becoming a high school teacher. Mr. Yamada's commitment to his education is admirable. He could have easily taken a different path but, through his own individual fortitude, he has dedicated himself to his studies so that he can live a better life.

With his hard work and giving attitude, Shigeru Yamada represents the ideal American citizen. Although born in Japan, he is truly American in every other sense. I ask you to help right a wrong and grant Mr. Yamada lawful permanent resident status so that he can continue towards his bright future.

Given these extraordinary and unique facts, I ask my colleagues to support this private relief bill on behalf of Mr. Yamada.

I also ask unanimous consent that the three letters of community support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EASTLAKE HIGH SCHOOL,
Chula Vista, California, January 9, 2007.

Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN: I am more than happy to write this letter on behalf of Shigeru Yamada as he pursues his efforts to stay in the United States. I was Shigeru's counselor while he attended Eastlake High School. During that time he always displayed exemplary behavior, academic focus, and personal determination.

Academically Shigeru was a model student. He earned a 3.84 grade point average; he made the National Honor Roll and was nominated to Who's Who Among High School Students for three straight years. Shigeru plans to attend a university to study sports medicine and physical therapy so he has set high goals for himself. He has the ability to not only handle college-level work, but to thrive on the challenge the university will bring. His quiet determination has been an example to his peers and was a joy to his instructors.

Shigeru Yamada not only took the most from his high school experience, but he has consistently ''given back'' his talents, time, and effort to serve the school community. He was elected ASB vice-president during his senior year. He demonstrated leadership skills as president of the Inter-Club Council on campus; he mentored incoming ninth-grade students and worked on numerous service projects. In addition to his involvement in student government, Shigeru participated in football, baseball, and wrestling. He was named '''Most Inspirational Player of the Year'' for both his junior varsity baseball and football teams. He was also awarded the J.T. Franks Memorial Award (most inspirational) from the varsity football team. (This award carries a great deal of respect amongst the players as it is named after a teammate who died of cancer.) Shigeru was a role model for our students when he attended our school: He earned good grades; he was an athlete; and he was involved in a variety of additional activities. He is the kind of student that Eastlake High School has been proud to have.

A further testimony to Shigeru's character is what he has been doing since graduating. This young man has come back to serve as an assistant football and wrestling coach for our students. He has given his time and energy to working with individual students during the week and on weekends; he has not only advised them on how to improve their athletic skills, but he has also been a wonderful role model and mentor. He is someone to whom the young men can relate, a person whose opinions are valued. I have personally seen Shigeru interact with these boys; the respect he gives them and the respect they give Shigeru is an absolute indication of the positive influence he has in their lives.

* * *

WORD & BROWN,
San Diego, CA, January 17, 2007.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

For over 11 years now Shigeru Yamada has been my best friend. His presence in my life has been a blessing. From the very first moment I met him I knew that he was a special person destined to impact positively everyone's lives around him. His ability to see the silver lining even around the darkest rain cloud is amazing to me. As a student Shigeru was amongst the best and brightest. He was a California Scholarship Federation Scholar every semester, he was Spanish student of the year two years in a row, and he served as Associated Student Body Vice-President his senior year. As an athlete, Shigeru was a varsity letterman in Football, Wrestling,

and Track and Field. He also served as a team captain on the Football team. As a member of the community, Shigeru has donated of his time freely coaching the Eastlake High Softball team and Eastlake High football team. His ability to give so much and ask for so little in return is an inspiration to all around him. For the last few years Shigeru has been able to legally work in this country. In those few years Shigeru has risen to the top sales levels at Nordstrom's department store and was even promoted to assistant manager. In every aspect and in every arena in which Shigeru has been in he has always excelled. He exemplifies that which makes this country great; bravery, honesty, hard work. In this time of change and uncertainty people like Shigeru Yamada remind me what it is that makes this country of ours work. His pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness has been a difficult one but he has never stopped believing and working towards that goal. I respectfully request that you once again push for Shigeru Yamada to be granted full legal status in this great country of ours.

PEDRO MIGUEL REYES.

JANUARY 11, 2007.

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN: I am writing to you from San Diego, CA on behalf of my friend Shigera Yamada's life-long quest for American citizenship.

I have known Shiggy as a fellow associate, as his manager, as a confidante, and most importantly as a friend. Shiggy is kind, honest, funny, giving, and intelligent. He is the type of person who will pick you up no matter how out of his way it is, bring you breakfast when you are sick, or just listen to you when you need to talk.

One of the qualities I admire most about Shiggy is his never-ending positive attitude. For the past two years that I have known him, I have never heard him complain about his situation. While going to school, working overtime, and standing in as a father figure for his baby sister, he was always there for me whenever I needed him. He has overcome so many obstacles in his life that have only made him stronger.

Shiggy is a model citizen who has worked extremely hard to get to where he is today. I am grateful for the chance to have befriended Shiggy. He is one of the most respectful and professional people I have ever met and had the chance to work with. I know that he does not take a single thing in his life for granted, and will continue to realize his goals through hard work.

Our country would be lucky to acquire his high caliber of determination, positive attitude, and perseverance as a citizen. I admire his ability to use the curveballs life throws his way as nothing less than learning experiences, and highly recommend him for United States citizenship.

Thank You,

SARA CHAFFEE-STANDISH.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 419. A bill for the relief of Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elna Cobian Arreola, Nayely Bibiana Arreola, and Cindy Jael Arreola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I offer today private immigration relief legislation to provide lawful permanent residence status to Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Bibiana Arreola and Cindy Jael Arreola, Mexican nationals living in the Fresno area of California.

Mr. and Mrs. Arreola have lived in the United States for over 20 years. Two of their five children, Nayely, age 20, and Cindy, age 18, also stand to benefit from this legislation. Their other three children, Roberto, age 15, Daniel, age 11, and Saray, age 9, are United States citizens. Today, Mr. and Mrs. Arreola and their two eldest children face deportation.

The story of the Arreola family is compelling and I believe they merit Congress' special consideration for such an extraordinary form of relief as a private bill.

The Arreolas are in this uncertain situation in part because of grievous errors committed by their previous counsel, who has since been disbarred. In fact, the attorney's conduct was so egregious that it compelled an immigration judge to write the Executive Office of Immigration Review seeking his disbarment for the disservice he caused his immigration clients.

Mr. Arreola has lived in the United States since 1986. He was an agricultural migrant worker in the fields of California for several years, and as such would have been eligible for permanent residence through the Seasonal Agricultural Workers (SAW) program, had he known about it.

Mrs. Arreola was living in the United States at the time she became pregnant with her daughter Cindy, but returned to Mexico to give birth so as to avoid any problems with the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Given the length of time that the Arreolas had, and have been, in the United States it is quite likely that they would have qualified for relief from deportation pursuant to the cancellation of removal provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, but for the conduct of their previous attorney.

Perhaps one of the most compelling reasons for permitting the family to remain in the United States is the devastating impact their deportation would have on their children—three of whom are U.S. citizens—and the other two who have lived in the United States since they were toddlers. For these children, this country is the only country they really know.

Nayely, the oldest, is a junior at Fresno Pacific University. She was the first in her family to graduate from high school and the first to attend college. She attends Fresno Pacific University, a regionally ranked university, on a full tuition scholarship package and works part-time in the admissions office. She is majoring in international business.

At her young age, Nayely has demonstrated a strong commitment to the ideals of citizenship in her adopted country. She has worked hard to achieve her full potential both in her academic endeavors and through the service she provides her community. As the Associate Dean of Enrollment Services, Cary Templeton, at Fresno Pacific University states in a letter of support, ''[t]he leaders of Fresno Pacific University saw in Nayely, a young person who will become exemplary of all that is good in the American dream.''

In high school, Nayely was a member of Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID), a college preparatory program in which students commit to determining their own futures through achieving a college degree. Nayely was also president of the Key Club, a community service organization. She helped mentor freshmen and participates in several other student organizations in her school. Perhaps the greatest hardship to this family, if forced to return to Mexico, will be her lost opportunity to realize her dreams and further contribute to her community and to this country.

It is clear to me that Nayely feels a strong sense of responsibility for her community and country. By all indication, this is the case as well for all of the members of her family.

The Arreolas also have other family who are lawful permanent residents of this country or United States citizens. Mrs. Arreola has three brothers who are U.S. citizens and Mr. Arreola has a sister who is a U.S. citizen. It is also my understanding that they have no immediate family in Mexico.

According to immigration authorities, this family has never had any problems with law enforcement. I am told that they have filed their taxes for every year from 1990 to the present. They have always worked hard to support themselves. As I previously mentioned, Mr. Arreola was previously employed as a farm worker, but now has his own business repairing electronics. His business has been successful enough to enable him to purchase a home for his family.

It seems so clear to me that this family has embraced the American dream and their continued presence in our country would do so much to enhance the values we hold dear. Enactment of the legislation I have introduced today will enable the Arreolas to continue to make significant contributions to their community as well as the United States.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to support this private bill. I ask unanimous consent that eight letters of community support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

January 2, 2007.

DEAR SENATOR DIANNE FEINSTEIN. I Maria Esthela Garay would like to let you know that Nayely Arreola was my student at the beginnings of January 1989. It was my pleasure to meet and have her as my student. She was very obedient and nice. Nayely was always a very organized girl, and respected the rules of the class. She also always finished the class work since she was in preschool. I am glad I met Nayely since she was and will always be an educated girl.

Nayely is a young girl who will continue her education with the help of her parents whom I appreciate very much. She is the pride and joy of those around her and her family in Porterville California. If you would

like to know more feel free to call me at [redacted].

Sincerely,

MARIA ESTHELA GARAY.

JESSE AND ANGIE ALDACO,
Terra Bella, CA, January 2, 2007.

Re Arreola Family.

DEAR DIANNE FEINSTEIN. We have known the Arreola family for three years now and are delighted to have ever met them. Mr. Isidro Arreola is a very good father, husband, businessman and member of his church. He portrays everything a good citizen should be.

His wife Maria Elena is a very hard working woman as well as a great caretaker of her family. She motivates her children to further their education.

Their oldest daughter is attending the University and taking courses on International Affairs. She comes during the weekends to be with her family.

The Arreolas are a great example to other members of the community of how a good Christian family should be.

Sincerely,

JESSE AND ANGIE ALDACO.

RAQUEL GARZA,
Porterville, CA, January 3, 2007.

Re Arreola Family.

DEAR DIANNE FEINSTEIN. The Arreola Family are very good friends of mine. They participate in the church that I also attend. Isidro Arreola is a very hard workingman and has his own business from home. Mr. and Mrs. Arreola bring up their children a in a good Christian environment. They are a great example in their church and the community. They are elders in their church and are considered leaders. They always go an extra mile than what is asked of them. Their children try very hard in accomplishing their dreams and goals. It is a privilege to know this family and would not hesitate to speak up for them in any situation. This family is very honest and loving.

Sincerely,

ROQUEL GARZA.

MARIA GONZALEZ,
Porterville, CA, January 2, 2007.

Re Arreola Family.

DEAR DIANNE FEINSTEIN: I have known the Arreola family for 5–6 years. I used to work with Maria Elena Arreola and are delighted to have ever met her and her family.

This family is a great example to fellow community members. They are a good Christian family that set good examples to others. Isidro Arreola is a very hard working man repairing appliances. We attend the same church and they are leaders in the church. They demonstrate many Godly traditions and beliefs. They are a great family to know and have nearby. Their children are very studious in school and are always eager to become better. We are all very proud of their oldest daughter that attends the University and accomplishes her dreams.

Sincerely,

MARIA GONZALEZ.

JANUARY 1, 2007.

Re Arreola Family

DEAR DIANNE FEINSTEIN: The Arreola Family are very active in their church and Mr. Isidro Arreola is a very hard working man. They do what they can to bring up their children in a positive environment. I can seriously say that they are a very good family wanting the best for their children. They are good friends of ours and visit socially my family. If you require any more information do not hesitate to call me in the evenings.

Sincerely,

PERLA GARZA MARTINEZ.

DECEMBER 31, 2006.

DEAR DIANNE FEINSTEIN, (Senator): I am writing this recommendation on behalf of the Arreola family. It has been my profound comfort and pleasure to have known this family for many years. I have found them to be bright, well organized, self sufficient people.

Seldom have I met a family with more social integrity. Their togetherness, respect and appreciation for one another can not go unnoted.

Their degree of civility is not only noticed in their church but in their community and in their institutions of learning. They are gracious, honest people who have, by their own initiative, earned the right to human freedom and dignity.

The above statement is based on humanitarian observances and has little to do with the political movements dealing with immigration.

I am interested in the wellbeing of the Arreola family in its entirety.

I do not believe that it would be prudent for the State of California to make any disruptive moves effecting the life style of the Arreola family.

Senator Feinstein, I am asking you to consider the unique role in which this family plays in the wellbeing of the State of California.

The family consists of: Mother, MariaElaina, Father, Esidronio, Children, Nayely and Cindy, Children, (already citizens), Roberto, Daniel, Saray.

Thank You,

MR. LYNN MORGAN MCLEAN,
Retired Educator.

PORTERVILLE, CA.

Ms. DIANE FEINSTEIN

Regards: Areola Family

DEAR MS. FEINSTEIN: Pursuant to the case of the Areola family, I would like to take this opportunity to give my highest and best recommendation on behalf of my family and myself. We had the pleasure of meeting this wonderful family through Christian Services. They have proved to be a very respectful family with strong principles and that of accomplishing many goals that will prepare them for their future.

I am a business owner, therefore I am very careful about making any types of recommendations or references on behalf of my family, myself and our family owned business. This family, however, is very special to many, including our congregation and community.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to read my letter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me.

Respectfully,

PATRICIA ESQUIVEL.

JANUARY 2, 2007.

SENATOR DIANE FEINSTEIN Greetings: The present letter I am writing to you is to recommend Nayely Arreola. I know Nayely since she was 8 years old. At that age she was my best student in Sunday school class, always eager to learn God's Word. She was a very smart child and demonstrated good behavior among her fellow students treating them with kindness and respect.

As a young lady Nayely developed very fine manners. I always remember her coming out from one of the classrooms at Granite Hills High School were I used to work as custodian, She always greets me with a broad smile and a big hug; not caring if I was sweaty and dirty.

Moreover, my husband and I, know her parents very well. We attend the same Christian church regularly, where I am pleased to see Nayely when she is in town. We all have had a good friendship through all these years.

Sincerely,

MARIA OCHOA.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 420. A bill for the relief of Jacqueline W. Coats; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I offer today private relief legislation to provide lawful permanent residence status to Jacqueline Coats, a 26-year old widow currently living in San Francisco.

Mrs. Coats came to the U.S. in 2001 from Kenya on a student visa to study Mass Communications at San Jose State University. Her visa status lapsed in 2003, and the Department of Homeland Security began deportation proceedings against her.

Mrs. Coats married Marlin Coats on April 17, 2006, after dating for several years. The couple was happily married and planning to start a family when, on May 13, Mr. Coats tragically died in a heroic attempt to save two young boys from drowning.

The couple had been on a Mother's Day outing at Ocean Beach with some of Mr. Coats' nephews when they heard cries for help. Having worked as a lifeguard in the past, Mr. Coats instinctively dove into the water. The two children were saved with the help of a rescue crew, but Mr. Coats, caught in a riptide, died. Mrs. Coats received a medal honoring her husband.

Four days before Mr. Coats' death, the couple prepared and signed an application for a green card at their attorney's office. Unfortunately the petition was not filed until after his death, rendering it invalid. Mrs. Coats currently has a hearing before an immigration judge in San Francisco on August 24, but her attorney has informed my staff that she has no relief available to her and will be ordered deported.

Mrs. Coats, devastated by the loss of her husband, is now caught in a battle for her right to stay in America. At a recent news conference with her lawyer, Thip Ark, she explained of her situation, ''I feel like I have nothing to live for. I have nothing to go home to . . . I've been here four years . . . It would be like starting a new life.''

Ms. Ark explains that Mrs. Coats is extremely close with her late husband's family, with whom she lives in San Leandro, CA. Mrs. Coats has said that her husband's large family has become her own. Ramona Burton of San Francisco, one of Marlin Coats' seven brothers and sisters explains, ''She spent her first American Christmas with us, her first American Thanksgiving . . . I can't imagine looking around and not seeing her there. She needs to be there.''

The San Francisco and Bay Area community is rallying strong support for Mrs. Coats. The San Francisco chapters of the NAACP, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and the San Francisco Police Department, have all

passed resolutions in support of Mrs. Coats' right to remain in the country.

Unfortunately, if this private relief bill is not approved, this young woman, and the Coats family, will face yet another disorienting and heartbreaking tragedy. Mrs. Coats will be deported to Kenya, a country she has not lived in since she was 21. In her time of grieving, she will be forced to leave her home, her job with AC Transit, her new family, and everything she has known for the past 5 years.

I cannot think of a compelling reason why the United States should not allow this young widow to continue the green card process. Had her husband lived, Mrs. Coats would have filed the papers without difficulty. It was because of her husband's selfless and heroic act that Mrs. Coats must now struggle to remain in the country. As one concerned California constituent wrote to me, ''If ever there was a case where common fairness, morality and decency should reign over legal technicalities, this is it. We, as a country, need to reward heroism and good.''

I believe that we can reward the late Mr. Coats for his noble actions by granting his wife citizenship. It is what he intended for her. It can even be argued that a green card for his wife was one of his dying wishes, as the papers were signed just 4 days prior to his death.

For these reasons, I offer this private relief immigration bill and ask my colleagues to support it on behalf of Mrs. Coats.

I also ask unanimous consent that two letters of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dear Judge,

This woman's husband sacrificed his life to save mine! They didn't get any type of award, or gift instead they got more of a punishment. Marlon Coates died and the wife is now a widow, when they just got married, she deserves some mercy, and a little consideration for her. She should stay in the country, she just got here she has bonded with Marlon's family, she gotten to know everyone. Please let her stay she really deserves it please!!

My Name is Chance Goss I'm 11 Love to design and go on roller coasters, paint, do art. I think it means compassion I think its heroic and wonderful. The incident made me think before doing don't!!!

Life is a very precious thing. When lost, it is very nostalgic to everyone. Not only is it a tragic thing, but it also affects the people around that are still living. I'm greatly traumatized by this whole quandary.

There happens to be a fine line between deaths by a bullet through the head of various thugs than deaths of heroes.

They don't hurt the same. People are saved everyday and you must wonder why Marlon? He transpired to be loved by everyone. He was a former lifeguard, and he saw my brother out in the water.

A real hero will do what Marlon did. He ran to the bone-chilling river, knowing that he might breathe his last breath. He knew that he might not be able to save him. He knew that might be the last time he saw his wife again.

He took this into account and dove into the water.

His wife is now crying, because she may face deportation after losing the only love in her life other than God. You must ask yourselves, is this fair? Marlon was her ticket in this country and he has deceased.

There should be no question of whether she should stay or not! She will never see him again. But emotionally they are still together, because in my mind, marriage is not until death do us part! His soul is still with her, in her heart, Let me conclude with me saying let her stay!!!

With God and Jesus giving you hope,

Nate Ewing—Adria's son

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 421. A bill for the relief of Robert Liang and Alice Liang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I offer today private relief legislation to provide lawful permanent residence status to Robert Kuan Liang and his wife, Chun-Mei ''Alice'' Hsu-Liang, foreign nationals who live in San Bruno, CA.

I have decided to offer private relief immigration bills on their behalf because I believe that, without it, this hardworking couple and their three United States citizen children would endure an immense and unfair hardship. Indeed, without this legislation, this family may not remain a family for much longer.

The Liangs are foreign nationals facing deportation on account of their overstay of visitors visas and the failure of their previous attorney to timely file a suspension of deportation application before the immigration laws changed in 1996.

Mr. Liang is a foreign national and refugee from Laos. His wife is a citizen of Taiwan. They entered the United States 24 years ago as tourists and established residency in the San Bruno, CA. Because they overstayed the terms of their temporary visas, they now face deportation from the United States.

After living here for so many years, removal from the United States would not come easily or perhaps without tearing this family apart. The Liangs have three children born in this country: Wesley, 15 years old, Bruce, 12 years old, and Eva, 9 years old. Young Wesley suffers from asthma and has a history of social and emotional anxiety.

The immigration judge who presided over the Liang's case in 1997 concluded that there was no question that the Liang children would be adversely impacted if they were required to leave their relatives and friends behind in California to follow their parents to Taiwan, a country whose language and culture is unfamiliar to them.

I can only imagine how much more they would be adversely impacted now given the passage of 9 more years.

The Liangs have filed annual income tax returns; established a successful business, Fong Yong Restaurant, in the United States; are homeowners, and are financially successful. Since they arrived in the United States, they have pursued and, to a degree, achieved the American Dream.

Mr. and Mrs. Liang's quest to legalize their immigration status began in 1993 when they filed for relief from deportation before an immigration judge.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service, INS, however, did not act on their application until nearly 5 years later, in 1997, after which time the immigration laws had significantly changed.

According to the immigration judge, had the INS acted on their application for relief from deportation in a timely manner, they would have qualified for suspension of deportation, given that they were long-term residents of this country with U.S. citizen children and other positive factors. By the time INS processed their application, however, Congress passed the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, which changed the requirements for relief from removal to the Liangs' disadvantage.

I supported the changes of the 1996 law, but I believe sometimes there are exceptions which merit special consideration. The Liangs are such a couple and family. Perhaps what distinguishes this family from many others is that through hard work and perseverance, Mr. Liang has achieved a significant degree of success in the United States while battling a severe form of post traumatic stress disorder.

According to his psychologist, this disorder stems from the persecution he, his family and community experienced in his native country of Laos during the Vietnam war.

Throughout his childhood and adolescence, Mr. Liang was exposed to numerous traumatic experiences, including the murder of his mother by the North Vietnamese and frequent episodes of wartime violence. He also routinely witnessed the brutal persecution and deaths of others in his village. In 1975, he was granted refugee status in Taiwan.

The emotional impact of Mr. Liang's experiences in his war-torn native country has been profound and continues to haunt him. His psychologist has also indicated that he suffers from severe clinical depression, which has been exacerbated by the prospect of being deported to Taiwan, where on account of his nationality, he believes he and his family would be treated as second-class citizens.

Moreover, Mr. Liang believes that the pursuit of further mental health treatment in Taiwan would only exacerbate the stigma of being an outsider in a country whose language he does not speak. Given those prospects, he also fears the impact such a stigma would have on the well-being and future of his children.

Given these extraordinary and unique facts, I ask my colleagues to support this private relief bill on behalf of the Liangs.

I also ask unanimous consent that two letters of community support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 2, 2007.

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN: I am writing to ask you to once again introduce a private bill to aid my friends Alice and Robert Liang, who are seeking permanent lawful resident status in the United States.

Without your assistance, the Liangs face deportation for overstaying their temporary visas by 24 years. Being forced to leave the United States would devastate their family. Their three minor children, Eva, Bruce and Wesley, are U.S. citizens and know no other home. Robert, a refugee from Laos, suffers from post-traumatic stress disorder that would be exacerbated if he were forced to relocate to Taiwan after building a life here.

The Liangs own and run a successful vegetarian Chinese restaurant, Garden Fresh, in Mountain View. They work hard, pay taxes and own their own home in San Bruno. Though they are by no means wealthy, they are generous donors to a variety of charities and are quick to provide food or assistance to anyone who needs help. They are also loving parents and wonderful people who have nearly magically turned hundreds of their customers into a community of friends vitally concerned about their welfare. The fact that so many of their customers are committed to ensuring their future in the U.S. is a testament to the Liangs high character.

Two years ago, you told Congress that the extraordinary and unique facts surrounding the Liangs situation merited the introduction of a private bill on their behalf. I hope that you will be similarly supportive once again, and I urge you to continue your efforts to aid this very worthy family.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

JUNE D. BELL.

DECEMBER 27, 2006.

Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN: We are honored to write to you in support of the Liang family of San Bruno, California. We have known Robert and Alice for twelve years, and are repeatedly awed by their support of their children and their communities. They are the kind of people that we all wish could surround us: honest, hard-working and extraordinarily generous.

Anyone who has enjoyed their restaurants has unknowingly become a part of Alice's family, as a first-timer noted. But it is their service to the community, schools, and anyone in need, that is so extraordinary. For example, on two recent occasions, after the Katrina and Rita hurricanes, and again after the Asian tsunami, Robert and Alice gave every penny received on a full day to the relief efforts. Then on several occasions, they have taken food and solace to hospitalized customers (including me), giving up their free day. And for years, Robert and Alice have provided food for a local public school, at cost.

This kindness comes from a man who still suffers the effects of his childhood during the war years in southeast Asia, and a woman who grew up on a small farm in rural Taiwan. They are therefore driven to provide a better life for their American-born children.

We ask that you submit and guide to passage a Private Bill that would permit this wonderful family to stay together in our country, thereby enhancing not just the five of them, but all of us who are touched by them. All five members of the Liang family should be allowed to stay together in this country and call themselves American.

Sincerely,

W. CAMERON CASWELL, Jr.,

BARBARA ANNE MAAS.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mrs. HUTCHISON):

S. 422. A bill to authorize any alien who has been issued a valid machine-readable biometric border crossing identification card to be temporarily admitted into the United States upon successfully completing a background check; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President. I rise today to introduce the Secure Border Crossing Card Entry Act of 2007. This bill allows certain travelers who seek to enter the U.S. temporarily and have already undergone rigorous security screening prior to entry and at the border, to enter our country and remain for up to 6 months.

We all agree that comprehensive immigration reform is a top priority this year—not only for the administration but also for Congress. I have stated that no effort on immigration reform can succeed without enhanced border security and worksite enforcement. We have been working hard to ramp up our border and interior enforcement efforts. Just last year, Congress dedicated approximately $1.3 billion in last years Homeland Security Appropriations bill targeted at enhanced border security. I am pleased that the President and Secretary Chertoff have made border security a top priority this year as well.

Strong border security, however, must be balanced against policies that facilitate legitimate trade and travel to the U.S. The security of our Nation is always paramount. But we also must ensure that the U.S. remains an economic leader and a welcoming nation for visitors who seek to enjoy the many business and recreational benefits that the U.S. has to offer.

We have in place now a program that allows visitors who possess a machine-readable border crossing card, also known as the ''laser visa,'' to enter this country for up to 30 days. The laser visa is issued by the State Department to Mexican nationals, but only after they have been screened and determined not to be a security risk or inadmissible to the U.S. Laser visa holders are screened again when they come to our borders and are inspected by an immigration inspector.

Canadian visitors, on the other hand, are not required to get a laser visa from the State Department prior to seeking to enter the U.S. Canadian visitors also can remain in the U.S. for up to 6 months initially. I see no reason that we should treat citizens and nationals of our northern neighbor differently from our southern neighbor.

The goal of this bill is to treat all citizens and nationals of our northern and southern neighbors seeking to temporarily visit the U.S. the same—allowing them to temporarily visit or conduct business in the U.S. for up to 6 months. And, because laser visa holders must undergo background checks before they are issued their secure travel documents, this policy change would not conflict with our country's goal of improving border security.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. WEBB, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 423. A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2007, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, today, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I introduce the Veterans Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2007. This measure would direct the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs to increase, effective December 1, 2007, the rates of veterans' compensation to keep pace with the rising cost-of-living in this country. The rate adjustment is equal to that provided on an annual basis to Social Security recipients and is based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price Index. Several of my colleagues on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, including Ranking Member, LARRY CRAIG, and Senators ROCKEFELLER, MURRAY, SANDERS, BROWN, WEBB, and ENSIGN join me in introducing this important legislation.

Congress regularly enacts an annual cost-of-living adjustment, COLA, for veterans' compensation in order to ensure that inflation does not erode the purchasing power of the veterans and their families who depend upon this income to meet their daily needs. This past year Congress passed, and the President signed into law, Public Law 109–361, which resulted in a COLA increase of 3.3 percent for 2007.

It is important that we view veterans compensation, including the annual COLA, and indeed all benefits earned by veterans, as a continuing cost of war. It is clear that the ongoing conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan will continue to result in injuries and disabilities that will yield an increase in claims for compensation. Studies by VA indicate that the most significant predictor of new claims activity is the size of the active force. More than 1 million servicemembers have deployed in support of Operations Enduring and Iraqi Freedom. And, according to the Department of Defense, as of today there have been 24,216 reported casualties during these operations. This number, however, does not take into account conditions that develop over the course of a war, including musculoskeletal disorders. Therefore VA can expect a significant increase in the number of new claims for compensation as a result of these ongoing conflicts.

The COLA affects, among other benefits, veterans' disability compensation

and dependency and indemnity compensation for surviving spouses and children. Many of these more than 3 million recipients of those benefits depend upon these tax-free payments not only to provide for their own basic needs, but those of their spouses, children and parents as well. Without an annual COLA increase, these veterans and their families would see the value of their hard-earned benefits slowly diminish, and we, as a Congress, would be in dereliction of our duty to ensure that those who sacrificed so much for this country receive the benefits and services to which they are entitled.

Disbursement of disability compensation to our Nation's veterans constitutes one of the core missions of the Department of Veterans Affairs. It is a necessary measure of gratitude afforded to those veterans whose lives were irrevocably altered by their service to this country.

I urge our colleagues to support passage of this COLA increase. I also ask our colleagues for their continued support for our Nation's veterans.

By Mr. SMITH (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 425. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the resources eligible for the renewable energy credit to kinetic hydropower, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a bill that will further our Nation's energy independence, and provide for sustainable electricity generation. This bill, which is cosponsored by my colleague from Oregon Senator WYDEN, will make facilities that generate electricity using kinetic hydropower eligible for the production tax credit under Section 45 of the Internal Revenue Code.

As with many emerging renewable technologies, wave and tidal energy are more costly than traditional generation using fossil fuels. Yet, for our environment and our energy security, we must provide incentives that will encourage the development and commercialization of these resources.

Under this bill, kinetic hydropower is defined as: ocean free flowing water derived from flows from tidal currents, ocean currents, waves, or estuary currents; ocean thermal energy; or free flowing water in rivers, lakes, man-made channels, or streams.

These innovative technologies are renewable, non-polluting resources that can help meet our Nation's growing demand for electricity. In Oregon, it would be possible to produce and transmit over two hundred megawatts of wave energy without any upgrades to the existing transmission system. Already numerous preliminary permits have been filed at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for wave energy facilities off the Oregon coast. Due to the increasing interest in this form of energy, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission even held a conference in December 2006 to assess the types of wave and tidal technologies that developers are pursuing.

These facilities would be virtually invisible from shore, and could provide predictable generation that could be easily integrated with other electricity resources. In addition, according to a January 2005 report issued by the Electric Power Research Institute, ''with proper siting, converting ocean wave energy to electricity is believed to be one of the most environmentally benign ways to generate electricity.''

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and to provide this production tax credit.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 425

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

SECTION 1. EXPANSION OF RESOURCES ELIGIBLE FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDIT TO KINETIC HYDROPOWER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 45(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining qualified energy resources) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (G), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (H) and inserting '', and'', and by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(I) kinetic hydropower.''.

(b) DEFINITION OF RESOURCES.—Section 45(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(10) KINETIC HYDROPOWER.—The term 'kinetic hydropower' means any of the following:

''(A) Ocean free flowing water derived from flows from tidal currents, ocean currents, waves, or estuary currents.

''(B) Ocean thermal energy.

''(C) Free flowing water in rivers, lakes, man made channels, or streams.''.

(c) FACILITIES.—Section 45(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to qualified facilities) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(11) KINETIC HYDROPOWER FACILITY.—In the case of a facility using kinetic hydropower to produce electricity, the term 'qualified facility' means any facility owned by the taxpayer which is originally placed in service after the date of the enactment of this paragraph and before January 1, 2011. Such term shall not include a facility which includes impoundment structures.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. NELSON of Nebraska:

S. 426. A bill to provide that all funds collected from the tariff on imports of ethanol be invested in the research, development, and deployment of biofuels, especially cellulosic ethanol produced from biomass feedstocks; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce the ''Biofuels Investment Trust Fund Act'' because I believe it is legislation that can help America progress towards a more secure energy future; I believe it is a small piece to the puzzle that is our energy policy. The Biofuels Investment Trust Fund Act seeks to take a simple, common sense step down the path we in this country need to take to improve our energy security. The Act would direct that all money collected by the Federal Government pursuant to the tariff on imported ethanol be invested in the research, development and deployment of biofuels—especially biofuels like cellulosic ethanol that can be produced from biomass feedstocks.

There are some who advocate removing the ethanol tariff but I believe that it is currently unwise to do so. We are in the early stages of trying to build a renewable fuels industry that will eventually allow ethanol and other biofuels to be a real alternative to the fuels we currently derive from oil. The tariff is an important part of that because it helps the nascent ethanol industry and it ensures that we are not providing subsidies to ethanol produced in other nations.

It seems to me, however, that the money collected from this tariff can be put to better, more productive uses than merely deposited in the general fund. And, it would seem, that using these funds to help build our domestic ethanol production would be the wisest use of the money. Therefore, I propose that the tariff funds be collected in a specific trust fund and only be used for investment in biofuels research, development and deployment. Moreover, I propose that those funds be more specifically invested in the next generation of ethanol production—cellulosic ethanol produced from biomass feedstocks. These funds can be used in any of a number of ways to help offset the substantial costs inherent in starting an entire industry—like one for cellulosic ethanol—from scratch and in the face of volatile commodities and energy markets.

Our Nation faces a serious crisis brought on by our energy consumption and, most importantly, by our reliance on foreign sources of oil. As a Nebraskan, my focus has been on the role agriculture can play in the development of alternative sources of energy and I am convinced that American agriculture is positioned to supply the nation with an abundant source of clean, high-quality energy that will reduce our destructive reliance on foreign oil.

I also believe that biofuels production can be the catalyst for a new wave of American innovation as a part of the continuing search for better energy solutions. The virtue in producing cleaner, more sustainable fuels derived from our own fields rather than extracted from distant lands could help spur new technologies, new jobs and new growth in our national economy.

We in Nebraska know the value of ethanol. We know the benefits it holds for the environment and our farmers and we know that it is critical in lessening our dependence on foreign oil.

We also know that the ethanol industry creates jobs—nearly 1 in 4 jobs in Nebraska are agriculture related and new ethanol plants are opening across the State.

I believe that a national emphasis on biofuels production represents an important investment in the proud tradition of the American farmer, American ingenuity and American productivity. It's a win-win-win situation—a win for farmers, a win for agriculture and win for national security.

There is not an area of the country that does not have some agriculture product that can be used as an alternative energy source whether it's corn in Nebraska, forestry wastes in the Northeast and Northwest, or sugar cane in Hawaii, Louisiana and Florida; or whether it is biomass energy crops that can be grown throughout the country.

In conclusion, I am proud to introduce the Biofuels Investment Trust Fund Act with the hope that it will be part of the solution to our energy problems. The money we deposit in this Biofuels Trust Fund will help grow our biofuels industry and through that investment we will improve our national energy security, as well as boosting the economies in agriculture and our rural communities.

I request that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 426

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Biofuels Investment Trust Fund Act''.

SEC. 2. BIOFUELS INVESTMENT TRUST FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund, to be known as the ''Biofuels Investment Trust Fund'' (referred to in this Act as the ''Trust Fund''), consisting of such amounts as may be transferred to the Trust Fund under paragraph (2).

(2) TRANSFER.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Trust Fund, from amounts in the general fund of the Treasury, such amounts as the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be equivalent to the amounts received in the general fund as of January 1, 2007, that are attributable to duties received on articles entered under heading 9901.00.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(b) EXPENDITURES FROM TRUST FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury, shall use amounts in the Trust Fund to provide financial assistance for research, development, and deployment programs for biofuels to increase the amount and diversity of biofuels produced in the United States and made available to consumers, especially for cellulosic ethanol production from biomass feedstocks.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of Energy shall ensure that amounts made available under paragraph (1) shall be used only—

(A) to provide financial assistance to farmers, producers, biorefiners, researchers, universities, and other persons or entities involved in the research, development, deployment, or production of biofuels, especially the production of biomass feedstock for cellulosic ethanol production; or

(B) as otherwise directed by Congress to advance research, development, and deployment of biofuels, especially cellulosic ethanol produced from biomass feedstocks.

(c) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest such portion of the Trust Fund as is not, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury, required to meet current withdrawals.

(2) INTEREST-BEARING OBLIGATIONS.—Investments may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States.

(3) ACQUISITION OF OBLIGATIONS.—For the purpose of investments under paragraph (1), obligations may be acquired—

(A) on original issue at the issue price; or

(B) by purchase of outstanding obligations at the market price.

(4) SALE OF OBLIGATIONS.—Any obligation acquired by the Trust Fund may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury at the market price.

(5) CREDITS TO TRUST FUND.—The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in the Trust Fund shall be credited to and form a part of the Trust Fund.

(d) TRANSFERS OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amounts required to be transferred to the Trust Fund under subsection (a)(1) shall be transferred at least quarterly from the general fund of the Treasury to the Trust Fund on the basis of estimates made by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS.—Proper adjustment shall be made in amounts subsequently transferred to the extent prior estimates were in excess of or less than the amounts required to be transferred.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 45—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. KOHL submitted the following resolution; from the Special Committee on Aging; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. RES. 45

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Special Committee on Aging is authorized from March 1, 2007, through September 30, 2007; October 1, 2007, through September 30, 2008; and October 1, 2008, through February 28, 2009, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. (a) The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2007, through September 30, 2007, under this resolution shall not exceed $1,524,019, of which amount (1) not to exceed $117,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946), and (2) not to exceed $5,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(b) For the period October 1, 2007, through September 30, 2008, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $2,670,342, of which amount (1) not to exceed $200,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946), and (2) not to exceed $5,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

(c) For the period October 1, 2008, through February 28, 2009, expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $1,133,885, of which amount (1) not to exceed $85,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946), and (2) not to exceed $5,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 2008, respectively.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required (1) for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate, or (2) for the payment of telecommunications provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (3) for the payment of stationery supplies purchased through the Keeper of the Stationery, United States Senate, or (4) for payments to the Postmaster, United States Senate, or (5) for the payment of metered charges on copying equipment provided by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate, or (6) for the payment of Senate Recording and Photographic Services, or (7) for payment of franked and mass mail costs by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, United States Senate.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 212. Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mrs. LINCOLN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 213. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 100 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 214. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 100 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 215. Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 100 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 216. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table .

SA 217. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table .

SA 218. Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 100 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 219. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 100 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 220. Mr. COLEMAN (for himself and Mr. SMITH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 100 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 221. Mr. DURBIN proposed an amendment to amendment SA 157 proposed by Mr. DEMINT to the bill H.R. 2, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 212. Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mrs. LINCOLN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC.___. EARNED INCOME INCLUDES COMBAT PAY.

(A) EARNED INCOME CREDIT.—Clause (vi) of section 32(c)(2)(B) is amended to read as follows:

''(vi) a taxpayer may elect to treat amounts excluded from gross income by reason of section 112 as earned income.''.

(b) REPEAL OF EGTRRA SUNSET APPLICABILITY.—Section 105 of the Working Families Tax Relief Act of 2004 shall not apply to the amendments made by section 104(b) of such Act.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2006.

SA 213. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 100 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, line 21, strike ''April 1, 2008'' and insert ''April 1, 2008 (January 1, 2009, if placed in service in the Gulf Opportunity Zone (as defined in section 1400M(1))''.

SA 214. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 100 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 6, lines 5 and 6, strike ''April 1, 2008'' and insert ''April 1, 2008 (January 1, 2009, if placed in service in the Gulf Opportunity Zone (as defined in section 1400M(1))''.

SA 215. Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 100 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 16, line 1, strike all through page 31, line 8.

SA 216. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC.___. ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION FOR CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ELECTING SMALL BUSINESS TRUSTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 641(c)(2)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to modifications) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The deduction for charitable contributions allowed under clause (i) shall be determined without regard to section 642(c), and the limitations imposed by section 170(b)(1) on the amount of the deduction shall be applied to the electing small business trust as if it were an individual.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 217. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 3, add the following:

(c) APPLICABILITY TO AMERICAN SAMOA.—Notwithstanding sections 5, 6(a)(3), 8, 10, and 13(e) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 205, 206(a)(3), 208, 210, 213(e)), subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall apply to American Samoa in the same manner as such subsections apply to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

SA 218. Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 100 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC.___. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING HEALTH INSURANCE FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) raising the minimum wage may have an impact on small businesses and the number of employees and dependents who are covered by employee based health insurance; and

(2) the cost of health care is rising at an alarming rate and that almost half of the estimated 45,000,000 uninsured Americans are employees of, or are family members of, employees who work for small businesses.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the Senate of the Senate that, in order to address the issues described in subsection (a), Congress should vote during the first session of the 110th Congress to provide health insurance reforms that allow small businesses to purchase health insurance for their employees.

SA 219. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 100 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC.___. REDUCTION IN INCOME TAX WITHHOLDING DEPOSITS TO REFLECT FICA PAYROLL TAX CREDIT FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYERS LOCATED IN SPECIFIED PORTIONS OF THE GO ZONE DURING 2007.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of any applicable calendar quarter—

(1) the aggregate amount of required income tax deposits of an eligible employer for the calendar quarter following the applicable calendar quarter shall be reduced by the payroll tax credit equivalent amount for the applicable calendar quarter, and

(2) the amount of any deduction allowable to the eligible employer under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for taxes paid under section 3111 of such Code with respect to employment during the applicable calendar quarter shall be reduced by such payroll tax credit equivalent amount.

For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, an eligible employer shall be treated as having paid, and an eligible employee shall be treated as having received, any wages or compensation deducted and withheld but not deposited by reason of paragraph (1).

(b) CARRYOVERS OF UNUSED AMOUNTS.—If the payroll tax credit equivalent amount for any applicable calendar quarter exceeds the required income tax deposits for the following calendar quarter—

(1) such excess shall be added to the payroll tax credit equivalent amount for the next applicable calendar quarter, and

(2) in the case of the last applicable calendar quarter, such excess shall be used to reduce required income tax deposits for any succeeding calendar quarter until such excess is used.

(c) PAYROLL TAX CREDIT EQUIVALENT AMOUNT.—For purposes of this section—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ''payroll tax credit equivalent amount'' means, with respect to any applicable calendar quarter, an amount equal to 7.65 percent of the aggregate amount of wages or compensation—

(A) paid or incurred by the eligible employer with respect to employment of eligible employees during the applicable calendar quarter, and

(B) subject to the tax imposed by section 3111 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) TRADE OR BUSINESS REQUIREMENT.—A rule similar to the rule of section 51(f) of such Code shall apply for purposes of this section.

(3) LIMITATION ON WAGES SUBJECT TO CREDIT.—For purposes of this subsection, only wages and compensation of an eligible employee in an applicable calendar quarter, when added to such wages and compensation for any preceding applicable calendar quarter, not exceeding $10,000 shall be taken into account with respect to such employee.

(d) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER; ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEE.—For purposes of this section—

(1) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''eligible employer'' means any employer which conducts an active trade or business in any specified portion of the GO Zone and employs not more than 75 full-time employees on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) SPECIFIED PORTION OF THE GO ZONE.—The term ''specified portion of the GO Zone'' means any portion of the GO Zone (as defined in section 1400M(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) which is in any county or parish which is identified by the Secretary of the Treasury as being a county or parish in which hurricanes occurring during 2005 damaged (in the aggregate) more than 60 percent of the housing units in such county or parish which were occupied (determined according to the 2000 Census).

(2) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEE.—The term ''eligible employee'' means with respect to an eligible employer an employee whose principal place of employment with such eligible employer is in a specified portion of the GO Zone. Such term shall not include an employee described in section 401(c)(1)(A).

(e) APPLICABLE CALENDAR QUARTER.—For purposes of this section, the term ''applicable calendar quarter'' means any of the 4 calendar quarters beginning after date of enactment.

(f) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

(1) REQUIRED INCOME TAX DEPOSITS.—The term ''required income tax deposits'' means deposits an eligible employer is required to make under section 6302 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 of taxes such employer is required to deduct and withhold under section 3402 of such Code.

(2) AGGREGATION RULES.—Rules similar to the rules of subsections (a) and (b) of section 52 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall apply.

(3) EMPLOYERS NOT ON QUARTERLY SYSTEM.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe rules for the application of this section in the case of an eligible employer whose required income tax deposits are not made on a quarterly basis.

(4) ADJUSTMENTS FOR CERTAIN ACQUISITIONS, ETC.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary—

(A) ACQUISITIONS.—If, after December 31, 2006, an employer acquires the major portion of a trade or business of another person (hereafter in this paragraph referred to as the ''predecessor'') or the major portion of a separate unit of a trade or business of a predecessor, then, for purposes of applying this section for any calendar quarter ending after such acquisition, the amount of wages or compensation deemed paid by the employer during periods before such acquisition shall be increased by so much of such wages or compensation paid by the predecessor with respect to the acquired trade or business as is attributable to the portion of such trade or business acquired by the employer.

(B) DISPOSITIONS.—If, after December 31, 2006—

(i) an employer disposes of the major portion of any trade or business of the employer or the major portion of a separate unit of a trade or business of the employer in a transaction to which paragraph (1) applies, and

(ii) the employer furnishes the acquiring person such information as is necessary for the application of subparagraph (A),

then, for purposes of applying this section for any calendar quarter ending after such disposition, the amount of wages or compensation deemed paid by the employer during periods before such disposition shall be decreased by so much of such wages as is attributable to such trade or business or separate unit.

(5) OTHER RULES.—

(A) GOVERNMENT EMPLOYERS.—This section shall not apply if the employer is the Government of the United States, the government of any State or political subdivision of the State, or any agency or instrumentality of any such government.

(B) TREATMENT OF OTHER ENTITIES.—Rules similar to the rules of subsections (d) and (e) of section 52 of such Code shall apply for purposes of this section.

SA 220. Mr. COLEMAN (for himself and Mr. SMITH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 100 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. BAUCUS) to the bill H.R. 2, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 31, line 9, strike all through page 39, line 10, and insert the following:

PART II—SUBCHAPTER S PROVISIONS

SEC. 211. CAPITAL GAIN OF S CORPORATION NOT TREATED AS PASSIVE INVESTMENT INCOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1362(d)(3) is amended by striking subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), (E), and (F) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(B) PASSIVE INVESTMENT INCOME DEFINED.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subparagraph, the term 'passive investment income' means gross receipts derived from royalties, rents, dividends, interest, and annuities.

''(ii) EXCEPTION FOR INTEREST ON NOTES FROM SALES OF INVENTORY.—The term 'passive investment income' shall not include interest on any obligation acquired in the ordinary course of the corporation's trade or business from its sale of property described in section 1221(a)(1).

''(iii) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN LENDING OR FINANCE COMPANIES.—If the S corporation meets the requirements of section 542(c)(6) for the taxable year, the term 'passive investment income' shall not include gross receipts for the taxable year which are derived directly from the active and regular conduct of a lending or finance business (as defined in section 542(d)(1)).

''(iv) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DIVIDENDS.—If an S corporation holds stock in a C corporation meeting the requirements of section 1504(a)(2), the term 'passive investment income' shall not include dividends from such C corporation to the extent such dividends are attributable to the earnings and profits of such C corporation derived from the active conduct of a trade or business.

''(v) EXCEPTION FOR BANKS, ETC.—In the case of a bank (as defined in section 581) or a depository institution holding company (as defined in section 3(w)(1) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(w)(1)), the term 'passive investment income' shall not include—

''(I) interest income earned by such bank or company, or

''(II) dividends on assets required to be held by such bank or company, including stock in the Federal Reserve Bank, the Federal Home Loan Bank, or the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Bank or participation certificates issued by a Federal Intermediate Credit Bank.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Clause (i) of section 1042(c)(4)(A) is amended by striking ''section 1362(d)(3)(C)'' and inserting ''section 1362(d)(3)(B)''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006.

SEC. 212. TREATMENT OF BANK DIRECTOR SHARES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1361 (defining S corporation) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) RESTRICTED BANK DIRECTOR STOCK.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Restricted bank director stock shall not be taken into account as outstanding stock of the S corporation in applying this subchapter (other than section 1368(f)).

''(2) RESTRICTED BANK DIRECTOR STOCK.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'restricted bank director stock' means stock in a bank (as defined in section 581) or a depository institution holding company (as defined in section 3(w)(1) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(w)(1)), if such stock—

''(A) is required to be held by an individual under applicable Federal or State law in order to permit such individual to serve as a director, and

''(B) is subject to an agreement with such bank or company (or a corporation which controls (within the meaning of section 368(c)) such bank or company) pursuant to which the holder is required to sell back such stock (at the same price as the individual acquired such stock) upon ceasing to hold the office of director.

''(3) CROSS REFERENCE.—

''For treatment of certain distributions with respect to restricted bank director stock, see section 1368(f)''.

(b) DISTRIBUTIONS.—Section 1368 (relating to distributions) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) RESTRICTED BANK DIRECTOR STOCK.—If a director receives a distribution (not in part or full payment in exchange for stock) from an S corporation with respect to any restricted bank director stock (as defined in section 1361(f)), the amount of such distribution—

''(1) shall be includible in gross income of the director, and

''(2) shall be deductible by the corporation for the taxable year of such corporation in which or with which ends the taxable year in which such amount in included in the gross income of the director.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006.

(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR TREATMENT AS SECOND CLASS OF STOCK.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1996, restricted bank director stock (as defined in section 1361(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by this section) shall not be taken into account in determining whether an S corporation has more than 1 class of stock.

SEC. 213. SPECIAL RULE FOR BANK REQUIRED TO CHANGE FROM THE RESERVE METHOD OF ACCOUNTING ON BECOMING S CORPORATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1361, as amended by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) SPECIAL RULE FOR BANK REQUIRED TO CHANGE FROM THE RESERVE METHOD OF ACCOUNTING ON BECOMING S CORPORATION.—In the case of a bank which changes from the reserve method of accounting for bad debts described in section 585 or 593 for its first taxable year for which an election under section 1362(a) is in effect, the bank may elect to take into account any adjustments under section 481 by reason of such change for the taxable year immediately preceding such first taxable year.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006.

SEC. 214. TREATMENT OF THE SALE OF INTEREST IN A QUALIFIED SUBCHAPTER S SUBSIDIARY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (C) of section 1361(b)(3) (relating to treatment of terminations of qualified subchapter S subsidiary status) is amended—

(1) by striking ''For purposes of this title,'' and inserting the following:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this title,'', and

(2) by inserting at the end the following new clause:

''(ii) TERMINATION BY REASON OF SALE OF STOCK.—If the failure to meet the requirements of subparagraph (B) is by reason of the sale of stock of a corporation which is a qualified subchapter S subsidiary, the sale of such stock shall be treated as if—

''(I) the sale were a sale of an undivided interest in the assets of such corporation (based on the percentage of the corporation's stock sold), and

''(II) the sale were followed by an acquisition by such corporation of all of its assets (and the assumption by such corporation of all of its liabilities) in a transaction to which section 351 applies.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006.

SEC. 215. ELIMINATION OF ALL EARNINGS AND PROFITS ATTRIBUTABLE TO PRE-1983 YEARS FOR CERTAIN CORPORATIONS.

In the case of a corporation which is—

(1) described in section 1311(a)(1) of the Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996, and

(2) not described in section 1311(a)(2) of such Act,

the amount of such corporation's accumulated earnings and profits (for the first taxable year beginning after December 31, 2006) shall be reduced by an amount equal to the portion (if any) of such accumulated earnings and profits which were accumulated in any taxable year beginning before January 1, 1983, for which such corporation was an electing small business corporation under subchapter S of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 216. EXPANSION OF QUALIFYING BENEFICIARIES OF AN ELECTING SMALL BUSINESS TRUST.

(a) NO LOOK THROUGH FOR ELIGIBILITY PURPOSES.—Clause (v) of section 1361(c)(2)(B) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''This clause shall not apply for purposes of subsection (b)(1)(C).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2006.

SA 221. Mr. DURBIN proposed an amendment to amendment SA 157 proposed by Mr. DEMINT to the bill H.R. 2, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage; as follows:

At the end of the amendment add the following:

Section 2 of the bill shall take effect one day after date of enactment.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS/MEETINGS

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Thursday, February 1, 2007, at 9:30 a.m. in Room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a confirmation hearing on the President's nomination of Mr. Carl Joseph Artman, to be Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior, to be followed immediately by a business meeting to approve the nomination of Mr. Carl Joseph Artman, to be Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at 224–2251.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the chairman would like to inform the members of the committee that the committee will hold a hearing entitled ''Assessing Federal Small Business Assistance Programs for Veterans and Reservists,'' on Wednesday, January 31, 2007, at 10 a.m. in Russell 428A.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I first ask unanimous consent that two members of my staff, Reed O'Connor and Ramona McGee, be granted the privilege of the floor for the duration of the 110th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h–276k, as amended, appoints the following Senator as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group during the 110th Congress: The Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD).

COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA—LINCOLN WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL TEAM

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 44.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 44) commending the University of Nebraska-Lincoln women's volleyball team for winning the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division 1 Women's Volleyball Championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and I ask that a statement by Senator NELSON of Nebraska be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

● Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Madam President, today I wish to congratulate the No. 1 volleyball team in America: the University of Nebraska Cornhuskers Women's Volleyball Team.

The Cornhuskers won their third national title with a 3–1 victory over Stanford University on December 16, 2006. Previously, Nebraska captured National Collegiate Athletic Association's Women's Division I Volleyball Championships in 1995 and 2000.

The win moved Nebraska into a tie for second place on the list of all-time NCAA Volleyball Championships among all schools. The title was also the second for the Huskers under Coach John Cook, who led Nebraska to the 2000 title in his first season as Nebraska's head coach.

Nebraska ended its 2006 season with a 33–1 record. The team's .971 winning percentage led the Nation and was the second-best mark in school history. The Huskers also became just the third team in NCAA history to be ranked No. 1 for the entire season.

In addition, the Cornhuskers are the first team outside of the Pacific Ten Conference to win a national title in women's volleyball since Nebraska's last title in 2000. After finishing runner-up last year, Nebraska became just the third volleyball team to ever win the National Championship season after losing in the NCAA's final match. Pennsylvania State University, Penn State, and the University of California at Los Angeles, UCLA, are the only other schools to accomplish such a feat.

Attendance at the championship match, played at the Qwest Center in Omaha, NE, totaled 17,209, an all-time collegiate volleyball record. The total attendance for the entire championship session of 34,222 also set an NCAA record. The previous record was 23,978 set during the 1998 Championships in Madison, WI.

On their way to winning the national title, several Huskers collected prestigious individual honors as well. Nebraska's 6-foot, 5-inch junior right-side hitter, Sarah Pavan, led the way, winning the American Volleyball Coaches Association's, AVCA, Division I National Player of the Year award and the 2006–2007 Honda Sports Award for volleyball. Pavan became the fourth Husker to win each award. Along with Pavan, sophomore outside hitter Jordan Larson was named an AVCA First Team All-American, while junior middle blocker Tracy Stalls was a second-team selection and redshirt freshman setter Rachel Holloway was a third-team honoree.

It is a tremendous accomplishment to win a National Championship, and the University of Nebraska's Women's Volleyball Team is to be commended for its excellence and for the pride it has instilled in all Nebraskans.●

The resolution (S. Res. 44) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 44

Whereas the University of Nebraska-Lincoln women's volleyball team (referred to in this preamble as the ''Huskers'') won the 2006 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I Women's Volleyball National Championship at the Qwest Center in Omaha, Nebraska, on December 16, 2006;

Whereas Husker junior Sarah Pavan was chosen as the Nation's top collegiate female volleyball player, winning the 2006–07 Honda Sports Award for volleyball;

Whereas Sarah Pavan was named the ESPN Magazine Academic All-American of the Year, becoming the University of Nebraska's 234th Academic All-American and the university's 29th Academic All-American in volleyball;

Whereas the University of Nebraska leads the Nation in the number of players named Academic All-Americans;

Whereas the Huskers completed the 2006 season with a record of 33–1;

Whereas Husker head coach John Cook has led the team to 3 national championships;

Whereas the Huskers made their sixth appearance in the NCAA finals;

Whereas the 2006 Huskers are only the third team in the history of the NCAA to lead the American Volleyball Coaches Association poll for an entire season;

Whereas the entire Husker volleyball team should be commended for its determination, work ethic, attitude, and heart;

Whereas the University of Nebraska is building an impressive legacy of excellence in its volleyball program; and

Whereas the University of Nebraska volleyball players have brought great honor to themselves, their families, their university, and the State of Nebraska: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the University of Nebraska-Lincoln women's volleyball team for winning the 2006 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Women's Volleyball National Championship; and

(2) recognizes the achievements of the players, coaches, students, and staff whose hard work and dedication made winning the Championship possible.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JANUARY 30, 2007

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m., Tuesday, January 30; that on Tuesday, following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for the transaction of morning business for 60 minutes, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the first 30 minutes under the control of the majority and the final 30 minutes under the control of the minority; that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 2, the minimum wage bill, and that the time until 12:15 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees with the time from 11:55 a.m. to 12:05 p.m. under the control of the Republican leader and the time from 12:05 p.m. to 12:15 p.m. under the control of the majority leader; that at 12:15 p.m., without further intervening action or debate, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Baucus-Reid substitute amendment No. 100; that following the vote, regardless of the outcome, the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 p.m. in order to accommodate the respective party conferences; provided further, that Members have until 11 a.m. to file any second-degree amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, does the distinguished Republican leader have anything this evening?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I would say to my friend, the majority leader, I have no additional observations to make at the moment.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business today, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:35 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, January 30, 2007, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 29, 2007:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

JAMES R. CLAPPER, JR., OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR INTELLIGENCE, VICE STEPHEN A. CAMBONE.

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION

WILLIAM HERBERT HEYMAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2008, VICE THOMAS WATERS GRANT, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL SHELBY G. BRYANT, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL MICHAEL D. DUBIE, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL HOWARD M. EDWARDS, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL NORMAN L. ELLIOTT, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL STEVEN E. FOSTER, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL ROBERT D. IRETON, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL EMIL III LASSEN, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL GEORGE T. LYNN, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL ROBERT B. NEWMAN, JR., 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL TIMOTHY R. RUSH, 0000
BRIGADIER GENERAL STEPHEN M. SISCHO, 0000

To be brigadier general

COLONEL TRAVIS D. BALCH, 0000
COLONEL CRAIG W. BLANKENSTEIN, 0000
COLONEL WILLIAM J. CRISLER, JR., 0000
COLONEL JOHNNY O. HAIKEY, 0000
COLONEL RODNEY K. HUNTER, 0000
COLONEL JEFFREY R. JOHNSON, 0000
COLONEL VERLE L. JOHNSTON, JR., 0000
COLONEL JEFFREY S. LAWSON, 0000
COLONEL BRUCE R. MACOMBER, 0000
COLONEL GREGORY L. MARSTON, 0000
COLONEL JAMES M. MCCORMACK, 0000
COLONEL DEBORAH C. MCMANUS, 0000
COLONEL JOHN E. MOONEY, JR., 0000
COLONEL DANIEL L. PEABODY, 0000
COLONEL KENNY RICKET, 0000
COLONEL SCOTT B. SCHOFIELD, 0000
COLONEL JOHN G. SHEEDY, 0000
COLONEL JOHN B. SOILEAU, JR., 0000
COLONEL FRANCIS A. TURLEY, 0000
COLONEL JAMES R. WILSON, 0000
COLONEL PAUL G. WORCESTER, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. STEPHEN L. JONES, 0000

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING DR. MICHAEL H. MOSKOW

HON. RAHM EMANUEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the long and distinguished career of Dr. Michael H. Moskow. On August 31, Dr. Moskow will retire from his position as President and Chief Executive Officer of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago after 13 years of dedicated service.

Born in Paterson, New Jersey, Dr. Moskow received his B.A. in economics from Lafayette College in Easton, Pennsylvania, in 1959 and a doctorate in business and applied economics from the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School in 1965.

Throughout his career, Dr. Moskow has succeeded in a wide realm of venues. His experiences range from serving on the faculty of Northwestern University's J.L. Kellogg School of Management to 14 years in senior management positions for three Chicago companies and appointment for public duty by the Senate on five different occasions.

During his tenure as a public servant, Mr. Moskow would assume a series of important and influential roles. He served as a U.S. Trade Representative to Southeast Asia, Under Secretary of Labor at the U.S. Department of Labor, senior staff economist at the Council of Economic Advisors, Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Director of the Council on Wage and Price Stability, and finally, President and Chief Executive Officer of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago.

Dr. Moskow also serves on a number of civic, professional, and educational organizations. Currently, Dr. Moskow is chairman of the National Bureau of Economic Research, as well as the director of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, the Council on Foreign Relations in New York City, the Northwestern Memorial Foundation, the Chicagoland Chamber of Commerce, and World Business Chicago. The list of organizations he has guided and served goes on and on.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Michael Moskow on his lengthy and influential career, and thank him for his many outstanding contributions to Chicago and the country as a whole. I wish him the best of luck and continued happiness in his retirement and all his future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. WILFRED G. GOODEN—REAL ESTATE DEVELOPER, PHILANTHROPIST, CIVIC AND POLITICAL ACTIVIST

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life and legacy of Wilfred G. Gooden, civic and political activist who left this world at the age of 84 years and to enter into the RECORD an article in the New York Carib News entitled "Wilfred G. Gooden, 84, a Real Estate Developer, Philanthropist, Civic and Political Activist."

Wilfred G. Gooden was born in Jamaica and spent 60 years residing in New York City. His life is one of those rags to riches stories, including a social, charitable, and political side. Mr. Gooden began in 1977 rehabilitating city-owned abandoned apartment houses, under the Federal Government's section 8 housing subsidy program, along the area of 145th Street from Broadway east to Amsterdam, then south along Amsterdam toward 144th Street.

Gooden never forgot his Jamaican roots. He founded the American Friends of Jamaica in 1982 and remained as a director on its board until his death and founded the Concerned Committee For Christian Education, CCCE, which supported two schools, one in New York and the other in Jamaica. He has received several accolades including the Order of Distinction, O.D., for his contribution to Jamaican charities from the Government of Jamaica and an honorary degree of human letters from the Faith Grant College of Alabama.

Even though Wilfred G. Gooden passed away on January 6, 2007, his contributions to Harlem, my congressional district, are ever present in the buildings he rehabilitated in the area. Please join me in extending heartfelt sympathies to his beloved wife, Sybil, and brother, Vibert.

WILFRED G. GOODEN, 84, A REAL ESTATE DEVELOPER, PHILANTHROPIST, CIVIC AND POLITICAL ACTIVIST

Dr. Wilfred G. Gooden, O.D., of Riverdale, New York, a Jamaican American who arrived in New York almost penniless from Jamaica in 1945, worked hard, saved his money and become one of Harlem's most successful real estate developers. He died in Kingston, Jamaica W.I., at Andrews Memorial Hospital on January 6th, 2007 just weeks away from his 85th birthday.

Mr. Gooden's life embodied not only a rags to riches story, but he entered the social, business, charity and political life of the city, and never forgot his Jamaican roots.

He was a founder of The American Friends of Jamaica in 1982 and remained as a director on its board until his death. The Government of Jamaica honored him with the ''Order of Distinction (O.D.) for his contribution to Jamaican charities and the Faith*Grant College of Alabama presented Mr. Gooden with an Honorary Degree of Human Letters, He also founded The Concerned Committee For Christian Education (CCCE) which supported two schools, one in New York and the other in Jamaica.

It was not unusual to walk into his home and find Congressman Charles R. Rangel and former Mayor David Dinkins in good active conversation. In Jamaica he counted at least three former Prime Ministers as good friends, The Most Hon. Michael Manley, Edward Seaga and P.J. Patterson.

His Christmas season trips were legendary on behalf of The Concerned Committee For Christian Education (Seventh Day Adventists) when he distributed clothing, books, toys and blankets to the children of families in need.

Mr. Gooden is survived by his beloved wife Sybil and a brother, Vibert who is 93 years young of Atlanta, Georgia.

In Lieu of flowers, please make contributions to Concerned Committee For Christian Education (CCCE) Box 683, New York, NY 10039.

Viewing will take place on Sunday 21, 2007 from 3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. followed by the memorial service at 5:00 p.m. at The Ephesus Seventh Day Adventists Church at West 123rd Street and Lenox Avenue (Adam Clayton Powell Blvd.) The burial will be Monday at 10:00 a.m.

IN HONOR OF THE HONORABLE TERRY R. SPENCE

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize the accomplishments and career of the Honorable Terry R. Spence. Mr. Spence is the longest serving Speaker of the House of Representatives in the history of the State of Delaware. Speaker Spence also has held the position longer than any speaker in any state legislature in the United States of America.

Mr. Spence was born and raised in Wilmington, Delaware. He received an associate's degree in business from Goldey-Beacom College and he later received his bachelor's degree from Wilmington College. Speaker Spence is truly a born and bred Delawarean and he has served our state honorably for over 26 years.

First elected in 1980, Terry quickly rose through the ranks to become the Majority Whip of the General Assembly. He served in this position for 3 years and was consistently reelected as a Republican, even though he served in a Democratic district.

As a State Representative for the 18th District, Terry has worked tirelessly to defend the middle class. As a member of Labor and Veteran Affairs committees, Representative Spence has fought to protect the constituents of the 18th.

Having worked with Terry during my years as lieutenant governor, governor, and now U.S. Representative, I can attest to his strong leadership and his dedication to not only his constituents, but to all Delawareans. Serving as Speaker of the House is a formidable task,

and Terry has managed to successfully carry out his duties over an extraordinary period of time.

Speaker Spence continues to serve as a dignified leader in the General Assembly and I wish him luck as he begins his work with the 144th session of Delaware's legislative body. I commend him for a life of service and thank him for his tireless dedication to Delaware.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JULIA CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Ms. CARSON. Madam Speaker, I was unable to record Rollcall votes nos. 56 and 57 due to prior commitments in my District. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on Rollcall votes nos. 56 and 57.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

SPEECH OF

HON. RAHM EMANUEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 2007

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 51, a resolution that honors the contributions of Catholic schools and supports the goals of Catholic Schools Week.

The many accomplishments of Catholic schools and their positive impact on students and communities throughout the nation are evident in the Fifth Congressional District of Illinois, where schools such as St. Pascal Elementary, St. Bartholomew Elementary, and Gordon Technical High School provide a quality education while instilling values that will serve their students throughout their lives. These schools provide strong academic curricula and promote significant parental involvement. They teach students the importance of academic achievement while also providing a balanced perspective on life that promotes responsibility, justice and social service.

Catholic schools also promote ethnic and racial diversity. An increasing number of children in Catholic schools in my district come from our minority communities. Students in Catholic schools achieve exceptionally high graduation rates, and an increasing number are advancing to college and giving back to the community through volunteer service.

Catholic schools foster more than scholastic excellence alone. They provide spiritual guidance to students by encouraging fundamental ideals and an appreciation for family values, community service, and faith in their own lives. This, in turn, shapes Catholic school students into leaders of tomorrow.

I want to take this opportunity to applaud the 2007 "Heart of the School" award winners. Each year, the Archdiocese of Chicago Catholic Schools presents these awards to recognize outstanding and innovative accomplishments of individual teachers at Archdiocese of Chicago schools.

Two 2007 "Heart of the School" award winners teach at schools in the Fifth Congressional District, Kristin McCreary of St. Josaphat School and Lauren Costa at St. Pascal School. I thank these outstanding educators, past winners, and all of the dedicated Catholic school teachers in my district for their devotion to their students and for setting the standard for teaching excellence.

Madam Speaker, I support H. Res. 51 and encourage Catholic schools in my district and across the United States to continue contributing to the development of strong moral, intellectual and social values in America's young people. I thank the National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops for their sponsorship of Catholic Schools Week.

HONORING MS. YVETTE CLARKE—NEWLY-ELECTED REPRESENTATIVE OF THE 11TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF BROOKLYN, NEW YORK

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor YVETTE CLARKE, newly-elected Representative of the 11th Congressional District in Brooklyn, New York and to enter into the RECORD an article in the New York Carib News by Tony Best entitled "Brooklyn Celebrates Yvette Clarke's Assumption of Duties as Representative for 11th Congressional District, Hundreds Attend Community Event at Brooklyn College."

YVETTE CLARKE was born and raised in Brooklyn, New York. She is the daughter of Leslie Clarke, father, and former Brooklyn councilwoman Una Clarke. The Clarkes migrated to the United States before Congresswoman CLARKE was born. CLARKE attended New York City public schools and received a scholarship to Oberlin College in Ohio.

YVETTE CLARKE was elected to the New York City council in November 2001 as the representative for the 40th District in Brooklyn. CLARKE was overwhelmingly re-elected to office in November 2003 and November 2005. She succeeded her pioneering mother, the former city councilmember, Dr. Una Clarke, making them the first mother-daughter succession in the history of the council.

In November 2006, CLARKE was elected to represent the 11th Congressional District in Brooklyn, New York. CLARKE, a life-long Flatbush resident, will continue to ably represent her mostly working-class constituents in her district the same way she did while sitting on the council, particularly as Congress takes up immigration reform and long-deferred issues of economic fairness.

YVETTE CLARKE has the reputation of being a good listener and a true leader. She distinguished herself as a strong negotiator and has a record of getting things done to meet the needs of the residents of her district. I look forward to working closely with YVETTE on the issues facing the American people and I ask you to join me in welcoming Congresswoman CLARKE into the 110th Congress of the United States of America.

[From the New York CaribNews]

BROOKLYN CELEBRATES YVETTE CLARKE'S ASSUMPTION OF DUTIES AS REPRESENTATIVE FOR 11TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT; HUNDREDS ATTEND COMMUNITY EVENT AT BROOKLYN COLLEGE

(By Tony Best)

After one of New York City's big political flash points: a brutal election campaign to fill a Congressional seat once held by the iconic figure Shirley Chisholm, it was time for a community celebration.

And the emotional atmosphere that encased the ceremonial swearing in of Congresswoman Yvette Clarke was punctuated with music, dance, prayers, poetry, glowing tributes by prominent elected officials, tears of joy and the obvious satisfaction of the Clarke family that one of their own had made it to the halls of the U.S. House of Representatives.

"She got there the old fashioned way, she earned it," asserted U.S. Senator Chuck Schumer, a Democrat of New York and one of his party's major architects of the successful mid-term election which resulted in the ousting of the Republicans from control of Capitol Hill.

"We are proud of Yvette," he told a cheering crowd. "She worked hard to get elected. She didn't rest on her laurels. It's a great day for Brooklyn, a great day for the Clarke family, and a great day for the United States."

Actually, the ceremonial taking of the oath of office followed the official swearing-in which had taken place in Washington a week earlier, and when Brooklyn Civil Court Judge Sylvia Ash asked the freshman member of the House to pledge to carry out her duties in accordance with the country's constitution, members of the audience joined in responding in the affirmative as if they too were going to the nation's capital.

Clarke won the 11th Congressional District election last September when she defeated three other candidates in the Democratic Primary. Among the competitors was the well-financed Jewish City Council member David Yassky who had moved into the District just before launching his campaign with the clear and opportunistic goal of capturing the white votes while leaving the Blacks to split their support from the Hispanic, Asian and Black majority. Yassky had raised almost $2 million for his campaign war chest, more than the combined funds raised by the other three candidates. But it didn't work.

The seat had become vacant when Major Owens who had occupied it for at least two decades after succeeding Chisholm in the 1980's decided to retire. He had hoped that his son, Chris Owens, a community activist would succeed him. But like Yassky's plans, that goal failed.

Clarke went on to win the November election with about 90 percent of the vote.

"She worked hard," said U.S. Representative Anthony Weiner, who shocked the political establishment when he endorsed Clarke in the Primary campaign and campaigned with her, instead of backing Yassky. "She shares the values of the community and understands its needs," he told the audience.

The Congressman was on a list of speakers, mainly members of the state legislature in Albany and the City Council in Manhattan, who joined Marty Markowitz, Brooklyn Borough President and others in extolling the qualities which catapulted Clarke from City Hall to Congress, a feat which eluded her mother, Una Clarke, several years ago when she sought to replace Major Owens in a hard fought race.

New York State Assemblyman Nick Perry alluded to that election battle when he told

the crowd that while he had political differences with the Congresswoman's mother it didn't stop him from vigorously backing ''Yvette'' and helping to raise money for her.

''I feel like I won too,'' said Perry who dropped out of the Congressional race early last year and then threw his support behind Clarke. ''She will do great things for America. She is young and bright.''

State Senator John Sampson was another of the elected office holders, who at the urging of both ''Yvette'' and her mother, not only backed her drive for the House but contributed campaign funds and material support. He became philosophical when he invoked the presence and role of the Almighty God in people's lives and reminded the Congressperson that prosperity and success breed many friends but ''adversity proves them.''

State Senator Kevin Parker, who had declined to back Clarke during the Primary, supporting Karl Andrews, at the time a State Senator from Brooklyn instead, said that he too was confident ''Yvette'' would succeed in Washington. In his brief remarks, the Borough President, who sat out the Congressional race by opting not to endorse any of the four candidates, said the new House member was ''committed to public service.''

Dr. Kendal Stewart, a City Councilman, joined in the chorus of praise, saying her victory was a reminder to immigrants and their children, ''those who came by plane or by boat'' that they too could succeed and perhaps follow in ''Yvette's'' footsteps.

Dr. Edison Jackson, President of the highly successful Medgar Evers College, put it differently, describing the lawmaker as a worthy ''advocate'' of the community that sent her to Capitol Hill.

When the time came for Clarke to respond after wiping away tears, she spoke out against the Iraq war and the Bush Administration's misplaced priorities which had resulted in $130 billion needed to fix schools in the 11th Congressional District and elsewhere in the City, State and country being diverted to the Persian Gulf to finance a conflict ''we don't want.''

She said that as a member of the House's Committee that monitors the work of the Department of Homeland Security, she had already backed a measure, which would bring more funds into the City for the Police and Fire Departments as well as the Emergency Medical services.

Congresswoman Clarke insisted that the City urgently needed funds, federal dollars, for its schools, drug treatment programs and other social services. She took time out to thank the community, the hard-working campaign volunteers, staff and others who ''came together'' and worked to place her in Congress.

''I am thankful,'' she said.

She spoke about her parents, Leslie Clarke, father, and Una Clarke, mother, for the way they raised her, and the rest of the family from Jamaica who instilled core values in her.

With the Rev. Barbara Lucas as ''the officiating minister, the celebration featured a mix of ecumenical blessings offered by a variety of religious ministers, including a Jewish Rabbi; dances by young performers of different cultural backgrounds; inspirational songs by a plethora of artistes, among them was Brooklyn Temple Seventh Day Adventist mass choir; steelband music by members CASYM, a youth orchestra; and a celebratory procession by the Panamanian Marching Band. Dr. Harold Robinson, Trinidad and Tobago' Consul-General, summed up the situation when he said that the Caribbean, the source of Congresswoman Clarke's early strength, might consist of countries with different languages but ''we are all one.''

Cynthia Brown-Franklin, Panama's Vice Consul-General, said afterwards ''great things are expected of the Congresswoman and she will deliver on those dreams.''

IN HONOR OF THE HONORABLE STANLEY W. TAYLOR, JR.

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize the career of Stanley W. Taylor. Stan has served in Delaware's Department of Correction for 30 years. He has proven to be a tough and formidable leader in an organization that requires exceptional skill, knowledge, and dedication. I commend Mr. Taylor for his years of service.

Stanley W. Taylor has been a Delaware resident since the age of 5. He was educated at Indian River High School and the University of Delaware. He began his career with the Department of Correction in 1976 when he served as a correctional officer at the Sussex Correctional Institution. He quickly moved through the ranks at Sussex Correctional, being promoted to the positions of correctional counselor, training academy director, security superintendent, and warden.

Stan's hard work and skill was recognized when he was promoted to chief of the Bureau of Prisons, a position in which he was responsible for all prison operations. When Department of Correction Commissioner Robert Watson retired in 1995, my colleague Senator TOM CARPER, who at the time was serving as Governor of Delaware, appointed Stan Taylor to serve as commissioner of the Department of Correction.

For more than 10 years, Stan Taylor has overseen an organization that is responsible for over 6,500 incarcerated offenders, over 18,000 probationers, and more than 10 correctional facilities. He is the first person in the history of the First State to begin his career as a correctional officer and rise through the ranks to eventually lead the Department of Correction as its commissioner.

I join with the people of Delaware to thank Stan for his continued dedication to the correctional system. He has served in a role that can be difficult at times, but is a necessity to the security of our State. I commend him for a life of service and thank him for his tireless dedication to Delaware.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JULIA CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Ms. CARSON. Madam Speaker, on Monday, January 22, I was unavoidably detained in my home district and unable to record my roll call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on Rollcall vote #46.

HONORING BOBBY L. MAXWELL

HON. RAHM EMANUEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Bobby L. Maxwell. Mr. Maxwell may not be familiar to you or to most of America, but on January 23rd, he accomplished something that the Bush Administration has failed to do for the last six years: hold oil companies accountable.

During recent consideration of H.R. 6, the Creating Long-term Energy Alternatives for the Nation or CLEAN Act, our Democratic majority called attention to the fact that the Minerals Management Service (MMS) at the Department of the Interior has failed to collect millions of dollars of royalties from oil and gas companies drilling in public waters. The Administration has largely ignored this problem and possible negligence by top officials at Interior, but last week's federal court decision that the Kerr-McGee Corporation has underpaid the government by approximately $7.5 million should serve as a wake up call on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Unlike the Director of the Minerals Management Service and others at Interior, Bobby Maxwell did not turn a blind eye to the problem of oil companies underpaying or refusing to pay royalties for the use of public lands. Mr. Maxwell used to serve as a top auditor at MMS, but while he was doing his job investigating royalty underpayment by Kerr-McGee and others, senior Interior Department officials ordered him to drop his case. Additionally, Mr. Maxwell lost his job due to a ''reorganization'' shortly thereafter.

Bobby Maxwell did not give up, though. He knew that Kerr-McGee and others were cheating the Federal government and the American taxpayers out of millions of dollars, so he became a whistleblower. Despite having lost his job, Mr. Maxwell continued to stand up to the oil companies by bringing suit under the False Claims Act.

The jury found what Mr. Maxwell and many of us already knew: Kerr-McGee had indeed failed to pay the Federal government approximately $7.5 million they owed for oil production from publicly owned coastal waters. I regret that Mr. Maxwell had to lose his job to expose the greed of this company and the failures at MMS, but his story is a positive one. Both he and the Federal government will benefit from his diligence and service. Kerr-McGee will have to pay significant penalties as a result of underpayment and false statements in their royalty reports. Additionally, Mr. Maxwell is not alone—three other auditors from MMS have filed whistleblowing cases against companies that the Interior Department blocked them from investigating.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Maxwell and these other dedicated public servants deserve our recognition and gratitude. They have stood up and declared that the public's trust and money both deserve our attention, respect, and protection. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Mr. Maxwell and congratulating him on a job well done. Let us follow his example by continuing to put accountability ahead of corporate profits.

TRIBUTE TO PRIVATE FIRST CLASS RYAN HILL

HON. DARLENE HOOLEY

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Ms. HOOLEY. Madam Speaker, I am here today in this hallowed hall with a heavy heart and troubled spirit.

Here, but a few hours ago, we assembled in keeping with an annual ritual that proclaimed our Union to be strong, our nation to be sound.

Sadly, I must contest that notion.

We are not as strong as we could be, as we should be, we are not what we would be without Private First Class Ryan Hill.

For this past week, Private Hill was killed in Baghdad, Iraq. As a member of the 1st Infantry Division, he and his unit were performing duties in keeping with our efforts to foster peace and stability.

America lost someone special when we lost Ryan. He represented the better angels of our nature, he was the kind of young American we need more, not less.

Immediately following high school, Private First Class Hill joined the military to fight for his country, his community—to fight for his family and friends.

Far too often we find ourselves standing here, recognizing the loss of heroes.

Private Hill died while on patrol. Using an improvised explosive device—a weapon without honor, without conscience—our enemies stole from us the America that would have been.

Right now, the community of Keizer, Oregon is seeking comfort in the life and noble sacrifice of Ryan Hill.

This we must do; he answered the call of service voluntarily and fulfilled his duty without hesitation, without complaint.

Private First Class Hill was a model soldier, he was the kind of young man that made everyone around him better.

In correspondence home, he recognized the dangers—he knew well the price of freedom—and yet he soldiered on despite his situation.

His enthusiasm and compassion made Ryan a beacon of hope for his comrades in arms in the shadow of the loss of several friends just a short time ago.

That shadow is now a little denser, a little darker—it reaches farther than before. And this shadow makes the future, our future, less than what it would have been.

I am here today asking us all to consider well the choices before us. We have an opportunity to ensure the life and death of Private Ryan Hill are not forgotten, that his sacrifice endures within our memory.

Let us recommit ourselves to making this Nation a place worthy of the gift Ryan Hill has given us; let us commit ourselves anew.

RECOGNIZING REVEREND DOCTOR HERMAN M. WILLIAMSON

HON. C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise before you today to acknowledge the outstanding lifelong accomplishments of Reverend Doctor Herman M. Williamson. A resident of Havre de Grace, Maryland, Reverend Dr. Williamson is a native of Evergeen, North Carolina, where he attended public schools and graduated with honors. After moving to Baltimore, Maryland, he completed studies at the Cortez Peters Business College. Reverend Dr. Williamson continued his education in engineering and administrative procedures in the Officers School while serving for five years in the United States Army. After his military service, Reverend Dr. Williamson attended Morgan State College.

After moving to Havre de Grace, Maryland, he joined and attended St. James A.M.E. Church before being called to the ministry. Reverend Dr. Williamson decided to return to his roots in the Baptist Church and joined Mt. Zion Missionary Baptist Church. He was licensed to preach and served as Assistant Pastor to the late Reverend Milton C. Phillips. During this time, he completed his course of study at the Maryland Bible Institute. He was called to the pastorate of Mt. Zion Missionary Baptist Church on October 25, 1974 and two days later accepted the pulpit of the Havre de Grace church.

Over the years, Reverend Dr. Williamson has been an advocate of faithful service and positive change to assist the members of his church and the residents of Harford County. His outreach to the communities in and surrounding Havre de Grace has been unsurpassed. He supported and was instrumental in the establishment of the Harford County Fuel Fund, the Harford County Food and Nutrition Program and the St. James Cemetery Preservation Council. He is President Emeritus of the Deacon and Deaconess Union of Baltimore, Harford and Cecil Counties and President Emeritus of the Ministerial Alliance of Baltimore, Harford and Cecil Counties. He has also served as auditor of the United Baptist Missionary Convention and Auxiliaries for the State of Maryland, Inc.

Reverend Dr. Williamson was the first black chaplain appointed to serve the Harford County Detention Center. He s served on the Executive Board of the Harford Interfaith Community Service, Inc., the Neighbor to Neighbor Summit Advisory Committee for Harford County and the Hicks Advisory Board of Harford County. He was granted an Honorary Doctoral Degree from the Bread of Life Ministries in Whiteville, North Carolina, in February 2002. In early 2007, Reverend Dr. Williamson was the recipient of the Joseph Bond Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Humanitarian Award from Harford County.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you join with me today in congratulating Reverend Dr. Herman Williamson for his lifelong and caring devotion to the people of Havre de Grace, Harford County, and the State of Maryland.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF NYS ASSEMBLYMAN JOHN LAVELLE

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring to the House's attention the tremendously sad news of the passing of a dear friend and fellow public servant. I rise today also to honor the memory, and take note of the tireless public service of, my good friend, the late New York State Assemblyman Jack Lavelle.

Jack and I were colleagues in the New York State Assembly from 2000, when he arrived as a freshman, until the end of 2004, when I left Albany after my initial election to Congress.

Madam Speaker, I do not exaggerate when I recount that it was a tremendous honor to serve with Jack, for I greatly valued his counsel, leadership, and friendship. More than that, what I will miss most about Jack is his tremendously warm and kindhearted spirit.

We always knew where Jack was from—his beloved borough of Staten Island. More importantly, Jack never forgot where he was from. Despite being from opposite ends of the state and being of different generations, Jack and I shared a commitment to our respective communities that I am proud to believe was very similar. Both of us were fortunate to learn early on that when you remember where you come from, when you follow the rules, love your family, and give back to your community anything is possible. Jack Lavelle was living proof of that.

Jack's public career was well known, and the respect Jack enjoyed from leaders throughout the state was impressive. Jack's history of community involvement is far too long to list in its entirety, but his work with countless educational committees, community boards and medical advisory councils were well known and well respected.

In November 2000, Jack's succession of revered Assemblywoman Betty Connelly allowed him to continue her legacy of commitment to Staten Island. So many of Jack's successes in Albany involved education, where he made great strides toward the improvement of New York City's public schools.

Jack always spoke with tremendous pride about his family, including his three sons, John, Christopher, and Danny and his grandchildren Jacob, Zachary and Julia. I am certain that all members of the House join with me to offer our most sincere condolences to Jack's family, lost so suddenly as he was.

When I think back about Jack, I think of how tremendously kind he was to me. Although ten years my senior in age, Jack often called me ''Governor,'' because he always said, ''Kid, you're going somewhere.'' When I announced my run for an open Congressional seat in 2004, Jack was among the first to call and offer encouragement. His friendship and support were as genuine as can be.

We all join with Jack's family in mourning his loss, and remain confident that the good work that he did, both in Staten Island and in Albany, has left a powerful legacy for many years to come. Rest in peace, Jack Lavelle; your work here is done, but your legacy will live on for years to come.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CÉSAR E. CHÁVEZ POST OFFICE ACT

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a great man who stood

up for justice and fair treatment for all Americans.

During his life, César E. Chávez was committed to providing fair wages, better working conditions, decent housing, and quality education for all.

Mr. Chávez also served the United States proudly in the Navy during World War II.

His spirit and his vision are still alive today and I am determined to celebrate what he stood for and his great accomplishments.

Madam Speaker, today, I introduce legislation to rename the post office located at 2777 Logan Avenue in the Barrio Logan section of San Diego as the ''César E. Chávez Post Office.'' This is the least we can do to honor such a great but humble man dedicated to justice. Please join me in giving Mr. Chávez his rightful place in American history.

INTRODUCTION OF THE TAXPAYER ABUSE AND HARASSMENT PREVENTION ACT: CONGRESS SHOULD NOT ALLOW BOUNTY HUNTERS TO ABUSE TAXPAYERS

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, last week I introduced H.R. 695, the Taxpayer Abuse and Harassment Prevention Act of 2007, along with Representatives STEVE ROTHMAN, RUSS CARNAHAN and 42 other original cosponsors. If enacted into law, this legislation would repeal the provision tacked onto the 2004 corporate tax bill (H.R. 4520, the so-called American Jobs Creation Act in the 108th Congress) that hands over the tax returns of millions of American taxpayers to private contractors to collect delinquent taxes, and allows them to keep 25 percent of their take as a commission for services rendered.

Three weeks ago, on January 9th, in her annual report to Congress the National Taxpayer Advocate identified the IRS' private debt collection initiative as one of the most serious problems facing taxpayers and called on Congress to repeal the IRS's authority to use private collection agencies to collect federal taxes. The Advocate's report illustrated why the IRS private tax collection program is a waste of taxpayer dollars, invites overly aggressive collection techniques and jeopardizes the financial privacy of American taxpayers:

The IRS's Private Debt Collection initiative is not cost efficient, adds unnecessary costs and burdens to taxpayers, diminishes the improved image of the IRS, and surrenders too many valuable components of our tax administration system. Therefore, Congress should repeal IRC § 6306 and thereby terminate the Private Debt Collection initiative.

We must repeal this provision because it opens the door to taxpayer intimidation and abuse, practices that have been outlawed by Congress. This practice amounts to bounty-hunting—at taxpayer expense—by allowing collection agencies to harass those same American taxpayers, many of whom are guilty of nothing, with the incentive of collecting their commission as their primary motivation. Giving unaccountable outside bounty hunters unfettered access to Americans' personal financial data poses a risk that we just cannot afford.

What's more worrisome is the IRS' inability to oversee the work of these private debt collectors. A 1996 pilot program for private collection was so unsuccessful that a similar pilot program planned for 1997 was cancelled outright. The contractors used in the pilot programs regularly broke the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, did not protect the security of personal taxpayer information, and even then failed to bring in a net increase in revenue. An audit report of the pilot program found that, ''contractors blatantly circumvented IRS policies and procedures even when security personnel identified inappropriate practices.'' In fact, the report found that contractors made hundreds of calls to taxpayers during times prohibited by the FDCPA, and that calls were even placed as early as 4:19 a.m.

While IRS employees are explicitly forbidden from being evaluated on the basis of revenue collected, the private collection scheme would actually link contractor pay to the amount of revenue collection. This policy encourages contractors to use aggressive collection techniques to boost their remuneration. Furthermore, the IRS is currently liable for damages to a taxpayer resulting from the misuse of confidential information by an IRS employee, but taxpayers will not be able to recover damages from the federal government where contractors are guilty of malfeasance.

The House had already expressed its will that this provision not become law when it approved by voice vote an amendment to the FY2005 Treasury Appropriations bill that prevented the expenditure of any federal funds for private collection of federal taxes. Unfortunately, the Treasury Appropriations bill never became law, and the House language was stripped out of the FY 2005 omnibus spending bill by the Republican leadership in the conference—behind closed doors, in the dead of night.

We must repeal this onerous provision. We must protect American taxpayers from intimidation and abuse. We must ensure that personal financial records are protected and remain private. Two decades ago this Congress passed the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act specifically to protect Americans from intimidation and abuse, but last year this Congress perpetrated an injustice by allowing these very abuses to go forward.

I urge my colleagues to join me in working with the IRS to find a more effective means of collecting delinquent tax debt collection and avoid this risky scheme altogether. Let's pass the Taxpayer Abuse and Harassment Prevention Act.

TRIBUTE TO HIS EXCELLENCY LAZAR ELENOVSKI

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I would like to call to your attention to a man I am proud to recognize, His Excellency Lazar Elenovski, Minister of Defense of the Republic of Macedonia, on the occasion of his visit to the United States.

It is only fitting that he be honored in this, the permanent record of the greatest freely elected body on earth, for he has a long history of dedication and commitment to international relations.

Minister Elenovski was born in 1971 in Skopje, Macedonia, and went on to graduate from the Faculty of Economy at Ss. Cyril and Methodius University. A member of the New Social Democratic Party of Macedonia, a part of the coalition government, he was appointed Minister of Defense in August 2006.

Minister Elenovski has long been a great advocate for Atlanticism in Macedonia. He worked to promote and implement the Euro-Atlantic idea and values in Macedonian society in the early 1990s. This effort culminated in his founding of Young Europeans for Security (YES) in 1995.

He was also one of the founders of the Social Democratic Youth of Macedenia (SDYM), and served as its Secretary General from 1996–1999, and then as its president until 2001. He was a member of the Presidency of the Social Democratic Union of Macedenia from 1997 until 2003. He is a signer of the Protocol for Cooperation between the SDYM and PASOK Youth in Athens in 2001.

Between 2001 and 2005, Minister Elenovski served as Secretary General of the Euro-Atlantic Club of Macedonia, and in late 2005, was elected President of the Euro-Atlantic Council of Macedonia, a member of the Atlantic Treaty Association. During this time he was also Deputy LEO of Public Transport in Skopje.

He has implemented many initiatives for the support of NATO and EU integration projects in his nation, for the civilization values of Atlanticism, and notably for the democratic development of Macedenia. In May of 2004, he initiated and served as a signatory of the Declaration for Euro-Atlantic Partnership and Cooperation between the Atlantic Associations of Albania, Croatia, and Macedonia. He is also a founder of the Central and South Eastern European Security Forum-Balkan Mosaic.

Minister Elenovski is known as an advocate for regional cooperation and integration. Along with civil and local authorities, he has worked on many regional and international projects which strengthened regional cooperation, and improved the security and stability of the nation and region.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues, Minister Elenovski's friends, and me in recognizing the outstanding achievements of a true leader, the Minister of Defense of the Republic of Macedonia, Lazar Elenovski.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NIAGARA FALLS NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA ACT

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the Niagara Falls National Heritage Area Act, which will provide Federal resources to preserve and promote one of America's greatest natural wonders.

Every time I make the long drive across my congressional district, I am reminded of how fortunate I am to represent a region with such a diverse geographic make-up. From the Ontario shoreline, to vast vineyards and apple orchards, to the waterfront on Lake Erie, Mother

Nature has bestowed some of her finest treasures upon western New York. But none are as recognized world-wide as Niagara Falls, which attracts more than 7 million visitors annually. The Niagara River Gorge is an exceptionally scenic corridor, carved by the movement of the falls beginning over 10,000 years ago. Federal recognition of this geological wonder and the Niagara frontier is long overdue.

The Niagara Falls National Heritage Area Act will provide Federal resources to help heighten national appreciation for the falls' natural splendor and the region's contributions to our Nation's history. The bill is critically important to the district I represent. With the steady decline in manufacturing, the western New York economy has become increasingly dependent on tourism. In addition to recognizing the falls in our Nation's development, the Niagara Falls National Heritage Area Act will help revitalize and strengthen the local economy by creating a comprehensive strategy to attract tourists to the region.

Niagara Falls is a geological wonder that has been a world-renowned tourist destination for more than 200 years. Rich in natural and cultural resources, the Niagara falls area has significant historical associations with Native Americans, early European exploration, the French and Indian War, the American Revolution, the War of 1812, and the Underground Railroad. In addition, the falls have long been an important site for hydroelectric power and ancillary industries. Together, these elements have greatly contributed to the development of the United States and deserve Federal recognition as a national landmark.

A National Heritage Area designation will heighten appreciation for the region, better preserve its natural and historic resources, improve coordination among existing programs at the site, enhance the quality of life, and expand the economy of the Niagara region. The Niagara Falls National Heritage Area will be comprised of the area stretching from the western boundary of the town of Wheatfield to the mouth of the Niagara River, and from the river to Lake Ontario. It will also include the city of Niagara Falls, the villages of Youngstown and Lewiston, and all land and water lying within these boundaries. The Niagara Falls National Heritage Area will be managed by a Federal Commission for its first 5 years in existence before being turned over to a local management entity. This bill has widespread public support, and a Niagara Falls National Heritage Area has been endorsed by the National Park Service.

Madam Speaker, Niagara Falls has always been a source of pride for western New York. But the Niagara Falls National Heritage Area Act will help to solidify its standing as something more: an engine for the revitalization and promotion of our region's natural, historic, and scenic resources to residents and visitors alike. I look forward to working toward passage of this important legislation.

A TRIBUTE TO ROBERT C. DAVIDSON, JR.

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay special recognition to Robert C. Davidson, Jr. upon being named recipient of Morehouse College's Bennie Leadership Award for the year 2007.

Robert Davidson's long and distinguished career began in the late 1960s, when he began as a Management Consultant with the New York-based Cresap, McCormick and Paget. Robert later moved to Boston, where he cofounded and served as Vice President of the Urban National Corporation, a private venture capital company established with a commitment to increase industry's investment in minority-controlled businesses.

Mr. Davidson's entrepreneurial spirit continued as he served as Chief Executive Officer of Avant Garde Enterprises, and it later led him to develop and head his own management and consulting firm. In 1978, Robert formed Surface Protection Industries, Inc. (SPI) and served as its Chairman and Chief Executive Officer. Under his leadership, SPI developed into one of California's leading African-American-owned manufacturing companies.

Robert Davidson has a strong commitment to community involvement and voluntary service. He currently sits on the Board of Directors for the following organizations: Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia; Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. (NYSE); Broadway Federal Bank (NASDAQ); Fulcrum Venture Capital Corporation; Cedars-Sinai Medical Center; the University of Chicago Graduate School of Business Advisory Council; Art Center College of Design in Pasadena; the South Coast Air Quality Management District Brain Tumor and Air Pollution Foundation; and the Los Angeles Urban League.

Prior board affiliations include Children's Hospital of Los Angeles; Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce; Rebuild LA; Museum of Contemporary Art; Charles Drew University School of Medicine; Armory Center for the Arts in Pasadena; Shaare Zedek Medical Center Jerusalem; Los Angeles Chamber Orchestra; Falcon Cable Community Ventures; the African/American Museum of Art; the Black-Jewish Economic Development Committee of Los Angeles; Big Brothers of Greater Los Angeles; the Weingart Center for the Homeless; and the Planning Commission for the City of Pasadena.

Mr. Davidson lives in Pasadena with his wife Faye and their three sons, Robert III, John Roderick, and Julian.

I ask all Members of Congress to join me today in honoring an outstanding individual of California's 29th Congressional District, Robert C. Davidson, Jr. The entire community joins me in thanking Robert for his success and continued efforts toward making the 29th Congressional District a better place in which to live and work.

TRIBUTE TO THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PENNSYLVANIA FEDERATION OF SPORTSMEN'S CLUBS

HON. CHRISTOPHER P. CARNEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. CARNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 75th anniversary of the PA Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs. The Federation is one of the oldest and largest conservation organizations in Pennsylvania. Since 1932, the Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs has been the leading advocate of our outdoor heritage, wildlife habitat and environmental protection in the Commonwealth.

For three-quarters of a century this great organization has worked diligently to defend the rights of individuals under the Second Amendment of the United States Constitution, as well as ensure the rights of all citizens to a healthy environment. The Federation was the driving force behind the passage of the Nation's first environmental laws, including PA's Clean Streams Law in 1937.

Throughout its proud history, the Federation has been a strong partner in conservation with our State and Federal natural resource and wildlife management agencies, such as the PA Game Commission, the PA Fish and Boat Commission, and the PA Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. In cooperation with these public agencies, the Federation has helped to conserve precious wildlife habitat, protect clean water, and provide countless recreational opportunities for millions of American citizens.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the members of the PA Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, past and present, for their 75 years of distinguished service to the United States of America.

A WISE CHOICE FOR SPEAKER

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, no one who knew them both could ever deny the power of the relationship and marriage between Phil and Sala Burton. It brought together two people who cared deeply about America and believed strongly in progressive values and actions. As the enclosed article notes, Sala Burton saw these same values and talent in our new Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, many years ago. When Sala, seriously ill, asked NANCY PELOSI to run for her congressional seat, she was acting on the same values and trust that she and Phil brought to public life. Sala made a decision that changed the history of the House of Representatives and our country forever.

I would like to share the article with our colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 3, 2007]

SALA'S CHOICE

NANCY PELOSI CARRIES ON A POWERFUL LEGACY

(By Harold Meyerson)

Sala Galant Lipschultz Burton made two critical decisions during her lifetime, the full meaning of which could not have been apparent to her at the time she made them. The first, in the early 1950s, was to marry a young lawyer and Democratic activist named Phil Burton, who was to become the single most important member of the House of Representatives in the '60s and '70s.

As a leader of the California Young Democrats and a rising force in San Francisco politics, the young Phil Burton had already won a reputation for his political brilliance—and for his explosive temper. Nobody worked harder for liberal causes. Nobody demanded more of his associates and staffers: If they

didn't match his crazy hours, his ability to count votes or his understanding of the art of the deal, they'd be subjected to eruptions from the Burton volcano.

Throughout his career, in fact, the biggest obstacle to Burton's success was his rage. That he accomplished as much as he did was due in part to Sala. The late John Jacobs, whose 1995 biography of Burton, ''A Rage for Justice,'' is one of the great political biographies of the past quarter-century, reported that Sala was Phil's confidante, co-strategist and champion, but that was only the beginning. ''She cleaned up his messes,'' Jacobs wrote, ''soothing and placating those he insulted or abused. She alone could intervene in a conversation to shut him up.''

Phil Burton was first elected to the House in 1964. In his 19 years as a congressman—he died of a ruptured aorta in 1983—he was responsible for the legislation that established Supplemental Security Income (SSI) for the aged, blind and disabled; created black-lung compensation for coal miners; increased the minimum wage; made strikers eligible for food stamps; greatly expanded the size and number of national parks; and abolished the House Un-American Activities Committee. More broadly, he broke the power of the old Dixiecrat barons in the House by subjecting committee chairmanships to secret ballot elections within the Democratic caucus. He engineered reapportionments of California that were greatly to his party's benefit, and he steered contributions to the Democratic candidates who needed them most.

When he died, Sala succeeded him in a special election. Just four years later, in January 1987, Sala herself lay dying of cancer. She asked Phil's brother, John Burton, who had represented an adjoining congressional district in San Francisco, to come to the hospital and told him that she wanted ''Nancy'' to succeed her. For a moment, John Burton was unsure which Nancy she was referring to, but as she explained to family and friends at her bedside, the woman in question was the former California Democratic Party chair Nancy Pelosi.

Pelosi had been associated with the Burtons since shortly after she and her husband had moved to San Francisco in the years when Phil's star was rising. The Pelosis had a large, attractive house, and the first thing she recalls Phil saying to her was, ''We'll use this for fundraisers.'' But Phil's appreciation of Pelosi wasn't confined to her abilities as a hostess. He saw in her a commitment to progressive values and a clear political sense of how to turn those values into laws. When John stepped down from Congress in 1982, Phil asked Pelosi to stand for election to replace him, but she declined, saying her children were too young. Five years later, Sala, on her deathbed, evidently saw in Pelosi the same qualities that Phil had seen.

This time, her children older, Pelosi said yes, and in April she won a squeaker of a special election.

In the House, Pelosi has continually sought the counsel of another Burton protege, George Miller, whose district is right across the Bay from hers. Appointed early on to a seat on the Appropriations Committee, she demonstrated, says the committee's new chairman, Wisconsin's David Obey, that she was ''operational''—a Burton word meaning able to steer difficult measures to enactment.

When the Newt Gingrich Republicans swept to power in 1994, political almanac authors Michael Barone and Grant Ujifusa termed it ''the collapse of the House that Phil Burton built'' Nancy Pelosi, as smooth as Phil Burton was rough, is far more open to openness in the legislative process than her sometimes secretive mentor was. Politically, she understands the limits of the possible and that she can expand them only as far as the American people are willing to go. But she also knows that the American people want Congress to do any number of things that were stubbornly, and, in the end, suicidally resisted by the now-collapsed house that Newt Gingrich built.

The Burtonistas—with different causes and methods for a new era, to be sure—are back. Score two for you, Sala.

IN RECOGNITION OF JUDGE JACK HUGHES

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I respectfully ask for the attention of the House today to pay recognition to Judge Jack Hughes, a highly respected public servant who is retiring from 19 years of service. Currently, Judge Hughes presides as Circuit Judge of the Seventh Judicial Circuit in Anniston, Alabama.

Judge Hughes has served our nation in a number of important capacities. Prior to graduating from the Birmingham School of Law in 1983, Judge Hughes served our Nation in the United States Army, as well as in a law enforcement capacity at the Anniston Police Department. After earning his law degree, he has worked in both private practice and has served as the Presiding Judge for the Seventh Judicial Circuit, and Presiding Family Court Judge.

Our great Nation is made stronger by those who serve the common good. Jack Hughes has served his community and his Nation well, and for that we all extend to him our most hearty thanks. I salute Judge Hughes on this important occasion, and congratulate him on his service to the legal field and to our community.

RECOGNIZES ROBERT CLEMENT ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. GINNY BROWN-WAITE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Robert ''Bob'' Clement on the occasion of his retirement. A dedicated public servant for more than 40 years, Bob worked for many years in law enforcement and customs inspection, eventually finishing his career leading a youth mentoring program in New York City.

Bob began his career in government service when he entered the Army in December, 1963. Serving 6 years in the U.S. Army, including 2 years in Vietnam, Bob was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for ground action. Honorably discharged from the Army in April, 1970, Bob left with the rank of Staff Sergeant.

Entering civilian government service in November 1970 as an original member of the Air Marshal Program, Bob served there throughout the 3 year pilot program commission. He then became a U.S. Customs Inspector, where in addition to the normal duties of a Customs Officer he volunteered in 1991 for the colateral duty of serving as the advisor for a youth program sponsored by U.S. Customs and Border Protection. The program is known as Law Enforcement Exploring and may be sponsored by any Federal, State or local law enforcement agency. The program is open to young men and women, ages 14 to 21. Throughout the U.S. there are over 20,000 youth involved with this program. in the Greater New York Area there are over 4,000 explorers.

As the leader in youth law enforcement mentoring, Bob has been recognized by various governmental agencies for his dedication and hard work. Bob has twice been awarded the coveted Commissioner of Customs Award, twice named the Advisor of the Year in the Greater New York area, and awarded the title of Partner in Education for his contributions of leadership, expertise, service, and support to the youth in the New York City public school system. Finally, Bob was named the first ever recipient of the National Advisor of the Year Award in 2004.

Madam Speaker, Bob Clement has worked a lifetime helping others. His commitment to protecting our borders and to mentoring our children is to be commended. This Congress should take this moment to honor Bob on the occasion of his retirement and thank him for his service to our children and to our Nation.

.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF GEORGE H. CARDINET, JR.

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of the passing of George Cardinet on January 19, 2007. California has lost a tireless leader whose many contributions as an outspoken advocate for trails and open space will be remembered and revered by the citizens of Contra Costa County and all who knew him.

George Cardinet was born on April 8, 1909, in San Francisco, California, to George H. Cardinet, co-founder of the Cardinet Candy Company, and Mary de Sales Cardinet. George succeeded his father as President of the company, and retired as a candy maker but his passion has long been for horses and trails and open space.

In 1940 George bought a ranch in Concord, California, which backed up to Mt. Diablo and began forging trails in what is now Mt. Diablo State Park. Each of the single-track trails on the eastern slope of the mountain was handbuilt by George and his fellow horsemen. George was an avid equestrian and for 65 years worked tirelessly as an advocate for the preservation of public parks and the development of riding and hiking trails.

There are more than 200 miles of trails throughout the East Bay that Cardinet helped build. George was one of the leaders of the California State Trails Plan and his trail development in Contra Costa County served as a model for the California State Riding and Hiking Trails Act of 1945, and the California Recreational Trails Act of 1974. In 1968 he was instrumental in drafting the National Trails Act,

and was invited to the bill signing by President Lyndon Johnson. George insisted on the inclusion of the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail into the National Trails Act as a sister trail to the Appalachian Trail in the east.

George Cardinet initiated the establishment of the Juan Bautista De Anza National Historic Trail which was secured by law in 1990. He worked on the management plan and was Chairman of the Board of Amigos De Anza support group for the trail. He was honored at the American Trails Conference in November, 1998, by John Horsly, Deputy Director of the Department of Transportation, for his initiative in organizing an international relay on horseback to highlight the De Anza Trail. Later under George's leadership, the De Anza Trail was designated a Millennium Trail and he was again invited to the White House. In appreciation of his efforts, First Lady Hillary Clinton presented him with a certificate that stated, in part, ''Cardinet's leadership will play an important role in achieving the goal of a nationwide network of trails that preserve open spaces, interpret history and culture, and promote alternative transportation routes as well as recreation and tourism.''

George Cardinet worked with the East Bay Regional Park District to annex portions of Contra Costa County with the park district to establish trail links between East Bay Regional Parks and Mt. Diablo State Park. For his longstanding and sustained advocacy of trails, George has become known as the Father of California Trails by the California State Horsemen's Association, and the Grandfather of the Juan Bautista de Anza Historic Trail as well as the Grandfather of National Trails by the National Park Service.

Mr. Cardinet is survived by a brother, Walter M. Cardinet of Auburn, a son, Dr. George H. Cardinet III and daughter-in-law, Claudia Cardinet of Winters; and daughters Maureen Casteel and Michele Tomasulo and sons-in-law, Gary Casteel and Anthony Tomasulo, all of Concord.

Madam Speaker, because of George Cardinet's countless contributions as an open space and trail advocate, it is appropriate for us to honor him today.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LIFE OF JALESSA CLEMENTS

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, Ms. Jaleesa Clements, a 16-year-old constituent of mine from Tuskegee, Alabama, tragically passed away recently.

According to those who knew her, Jaleesa was a highly intelligent young woman with a bright future. At school, she was recognized for her accomplishments as Miss Tuskegee Institute Middle School. Jaleesa had many talents, and also dedicated her time to serving in the Booker T. Washington High School Marching Aristocrats, where she served as the Majorette Captain. She was also a young woman with a strong faith, and contributed to her community by being an active member of St. James AME Church in Tuskegee, Alabama.

It is a tragedy indeed that a young person filled with such promise was taken from us at such an early age. She will be missed dearly. On this mournful occasion, I ask that we all remember Jaleesa, and pray for her loved ones, her family, and her community as they grieve for her passing.

RECOGNIZING HJALMA E. JOHNSON OF PASCO COUNTY, FLORIDA

HON. GINNY BROWN-WAITE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Hjalma E. Johnson, the recipient of the 4TH Annual Lincoln Heritage Award presented by the East Pasco Political Club. This prestigious award was established to recognize an outstanding community member for his or her commitment to the principles practiced and espoused by Abraham Lincoln, as well as for their humanitarian services to the community and to Pasco County.

An unassuming country boy whose reputation precedes him in the global marketplace, Mr. Johnson is President of Investment Advisors, Inc., and Triple J. Ranch, Inc. He currently serves on the Board of Directors of Hyde Park Capital's Advisory Board, Moore, Clayton LLC, a London based merchant bank and Crews Banking Corp., Wauchula, Fl. He is also a past President of the Florida Bankers Association and the American Bankers Association.

Mr. Johnson graduated from the University of Florida with a Bachelor's in Industrial Engineering with High Honors in 1958. A U.S. Army veteran, Mr. Johnson served as a Counter-Intelligence Officer at the U.S. Army's European Headquarters in Heidelberg, Germany. He received a Juris Doctorate from Birmingham School of Law in 1965, is a member of the Alabama Bar, and is admitted to practice before the United States Supreme Court. He is a 1968 graduate of the Stonier Graduate School of Banking, Rutgers University. In addition, he served on the University of Florida's Warrington College of Business Advisory Council and is the immediate past President of the University of Florida Gator Boosters.

A former Chairman of the Trustees of Saint Leo University, St. Leo, FL, Mr. Johnson served on the Salvation Army Service Committee, was inducted into the Tampa Bay Business Hall of Fame, and was a board member of the Fannie Mae National Advisory Council.

Mr. Johnson recently celebrated his fiftieth wedding anniversary with his high school sweetheart, Laura. Their son, Len, is a practicing attorney in Dade City, FL, where he resides with his wife, Nancy. Mr. Johnson's grandson, Brock, is a senior at the University of Florida, and his granddaughter, Paige, is a freshman at the University of Alabama.

Madam Speaker, Hjalma Johnson is well known for his compassion for others and for his commitment and passion to his community and profession. I am proud to honor him as an exemplary executive, husband, father and grandfather in Florida's 5th Congressional District, and as the 2007 recipient of the Lincoln Heritage Award from the East Pasco Political Club.

HONORING ROGER CARTER, NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF THE RURITAN CLUB

HON. DAVID DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Roger Carter, a resident of the First Congressional District of Tennessee, who has recently been elected one of 7 National Directors for the Ruritan Club.

Roger Carter led the ticket in votes by garnering 503 of 666 ballots issued at the 76th Annual Ruritan National Convention held in Louisville, Kentucky.

Roger Carter is a member of the Ottway Ruritan Club where he has served as President, Vice President, Board of Directors and all Service Committees. The awards he has received: Club Ruritan of the Year, Outstanding President's Award, National President's Golden Key Award, and National President's VIP Award. He also has received the Tom Downing Fellow the highest award that a member can receive.

Roger Carter has served as President and Vice President of the Greene County Council of Ruritans.

Roger Carter is a resident of Afton, Tennessee, where he and Kimberly, his wife reside.

Roger Carter is a Transportation Technician 1 Roadway Inspector for the Tennessee Department of Transportation.

Roger also is a member of: Greeneville Optimist Club, United Volunteer Fire Department, Greeneville Moose Lodge #692, Greene County Agriculture Advisory Committee and Union Freewill Baptist Church.

Madam Speaker, I ask you and my fellow members to join me in honoring Roger Carter, a true servant of community, whose commitment and unwavering determination continue to make a lasting impact all throughout East Tennessee.

RETIREMENT OF MR. RICHARD J. CONNELLY OF THE DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Mr. Richard J. Connelly. Having served his country for more than 38 years, he retired from the Federal Government on January 3, 2007. His record of achievement during this period reflects great credit upon himself and upon the organizations with which he has served.

Mr. Connelly is a member of the Senior Executive Service and has received numerous awards over his career including a 2003 Presidential Rank Award of Meritorious Executive. Beginning his Federal career as an Army Signal Officer in 1968, Mr. Connelly joined the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) in 1972 as a management intern in the budget office. In 1986, he was appointed to the Senior Executive Service and was named the chief of the

budget division. He later served as DLA Comptroller, as Administrator of the Defense National Stockpile Center, and as the Director, DLA Support Services.

Mr. Connelly grew up in Boston and graduated from Boston College in 1968. He attended Officer Candidate School at Fort Sill, Oklahoma where he was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Signal Corps, and served one year in Vietnam. Mr. Connelly attended Stanford University Graduate School of Business as a Sloan Fellow and received a Master of Science degree in management in 1978.

Mr. Connelly became Director of Defense Energy Support Center (DESC) on November 3, 2003, directing the Department of Defense organization that is responsible for purchasing and managing all petroleum resources used by the United States military. In addition, Mr. Connelly has guided the growing mission of total energy support by developing strategies to buy and sell deregulated electricity and natural gas to federal agency customers.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Richard J. Connelly on his retirement from Federal Civil Service. He epitomizes the dedication and professionalism that make our Federal government a model all over the world.

INTRODUCTION OF THE TROOPS TO TEACHERS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2007

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, today, I am reintroducing the Troops to Teachers Improvement Act to improve opportunities for veterans to transition into second careers in teaching. I am pleased to once again be joined in this effort by Congresswoman DORIS MATSUI. I have been a supporter of the Troops to Teachers program since its authorization, and I am proud of its success over the last decade. Since 1994, this program has placed nearly 10,000 veterans in our nation's classrooms.

Troops to Teachers is a unique program that provides retiring military with a $5,000 stipend to help cover the costs of teaching certification in exchange for three years service in a high-need school, which until recently was defined as receiving grants under part A of Title I. To further encourage participants to teach in schools with the greatest need, a $10,000 bonus is offered to those who agree to teach for three years in a school with 50% of students below the poverty level.

This structure has proven very effective in transitioning qualified retiring military personnel into second careers in teaching. Indeed, Troops participants fill several critical needs among educators: eighty-two percent are male, over one-third ethnic minorities, and a majority bring an expertise in science and math to the classroom. In an increasingly globalized economy, these valuable characteristics provide a vital resource for schools across the country.

However, this success is now in jeopardy due to a drafting error in the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act which has inadvertently restricted the number of schools at which participants may fulfill their service. The applicable definition for ''high-need local education agencies'' for Troops to Teachers was inadvertently changed as it was included in the section of the legislation regarding other alternative programs that had a different definition. This stricter definition requires a higher threshold for ''high-need,'' requiring the school to have either 10,000 students or 20% of students from families below the poverty level. However, the original Title I definition of high-need was also retained in the law in the section specifically detailing the Troops program. Essentially, Congress inadvertently created two conflicting definitions of ''high-need'' with regard to this program.

Early on, the Department of Education and the Troops to Teachers program recognized this unintended change in law and worked together to address it. From 2003–2005, while discussions were being held on how to reconcile this discrepancy, the program continued to operate under the original and intended definition. However, after the completion of a negotiated rulemaking process in September 2005, the Department issued a regulation stating that the new, stricter definition was not an error but congressional intent. As one of the leading supporters of this program during the drafting of No Child Left Behind, I can assure my colleagues that this was clearly not the intent of the supporters of the program.

Madam Speaker, the unfortunate result of this, aside from limiting the number of schools at which veterans may teach and honor their obligation of three-years service, is that it has disproportionately impacted western and rural states. In my home state of Wisconsin, the number of eligible school districts has been reduced from approximately 400 to 11. Not surprisingly, participation in the program has fallen significantly since the implementation of the new definition last year. This decision, although understandable given the conflicting definitions contained in the law, is a disservice both to veterans wishing to continue their service to our nation as educators as well as children who stand to benefit from their unique expertise.

The bottom line is that we are losing out on great teachers because they cannot accept the certification stipend due to a lack of schools meeting the higher needs threshold in their community. The more we restrict opportunities for participation, the fewer teachers we will be able to bring into public education, and the fewer teachers we will eventually be able to attract to the schools with the greatest need. Further, given the President's recent focus on the need for more math and science teachers, as well as his support for adjunct and alternative routes to teaching programs, we should be removing, not creating, restrictions that prevent qualified teachers in these areas from teaching in our Nation's classrooms.

Madam Speaker, with Troops to Teachers, the Department already has an established program that is well-funded and successful. Rather than restricting it, we should be maximizing this program's potential. This bill would still require participants to teach in high-need schools, as defined by the Department, but if no such school exists within a 50-mile radius of the participant, that participant will be eligible to fulfill the obligation in a school that serves low-income students under the original definition. This ensures that Troops participants teach in high-need schools first and foremost, but are not locked out of the program based on the demographic make-up of their communities.

This is a pragmatic solution that is perfectly consistent with the spirit of No Child Left Behind while also supporting our veterans and students by maximizing opportunities for participation. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this successful program and restoring the opportunity to ''serve again'' to our Nation's veterans.

TRIBUTE TO FIRST GRADE CLASS AT RACCOON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the first-grade students at Raccoon Elementary School in Centralia, Illinois. In just 2 weeks, these young boys and girls raised $111 to buy care packages for local soldiers serving in the Middle East.

With the guidance of their teachers, Wendy Bookhout and Amy Verble, the first-graders were the first participants in the Raccoon PRIDE program. This character building education plan challenges students to praise, encourage, and respect others as well as to get involved in their community, help others, and to do the right thing.

The students donated the money they raised to Steve Smith's Second Soldier Christmas Drive. Mr. Smith then sent the care packages containing quilts, phone cards, bibles, cookies, and socks, as well as many other items for the holidays.

I am pleased to congratulate the following Raccoon first-grade class for their hard work and dedication to helping others. God bless them for their service.

Jimmy Dale Allison, Dillion Michael Adams, Abraham August Applegate, Jonathan Altom, Jeremy Joseph Cameron, Mara Kalyn Bookhout, McKenzie Christine Card, Timothy Tyler Donoho, Paige Danielle Gooden, Anna Draper, Abbie Elaine Harris, Alyssa Finley, Skylar Elizabeth Keele, Autumn Dawn George.

Devon Michael Dwain Milburn, Cameron Tyler Hoard, Anastasia Marie Moistner, Kelsey Marie Littleton, Caleb Emmerson Michael Page, Valarie Marie Meadows, Shianne Alexis Smith, Shawn M. Morton, Molly Ann Thompson, Barbara Shiann Pauley, Justin Kyle Tindall, Rex Nicholas Rexilius, Katlyn Paige Whipple, Ryan Lloyd Tate, and Carter John Wilson.

TRIBUTE TO BARBARO

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to remember the brave and heroic life of Barbaro. This magnificent racehorse connected with so many Americans because of his drive and determination.

A Rocky Balboa figure, Barbaro continued to fight even when the odds were strongly stacked against him. While many veterinarians said that a horse could not survive with the type of injuries Barbaro sustained at the Preakness, he fought for over 8 months, greatly exceeding expectations. What followed the injury was an outpouring of support not frequently seen in our world today. Letters, donations and gifts came in from all over the world, all because of what this wonderful horse embodied.

Barbaro had a strong connection to my home State of Delaware as he raced at Delaware Park and was trained by local trainer Michael Matz. The Barbaro story is an inspirational tale that will be remembered for generations. While a racing champion many times over, Barbaro's greatest talent was bringing people together and inspiring them.

IN HONOR OF MICHAEL L. PHILLIPS

HON. BRAD ELLSWORTH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Michael Leo Phillips, a man who spent the past 37 years serving the students of Indiana State University, ISU, in Terre Haute. Mr. Phillips passed away on January 18, 2007 at the age of 60.

After graduating from ISU in 1969, Mr. Phillips remained in Terre Haute to work in the university's financial aid office, of which he would later become director. In 1995 Phillips became the student ombudsman at his alma mater, a role which allowed him to personally interact with and assist students.

Beyond all of his hard work at ISU, Mr. Phillips was actively involved in the Terre Haute community. He served as trustee and treasurer for the Spruce Street AME Church. His community involvement included serving as president of the Young Men's Civic Club; membership in the NAACP, I–Club, and 100 Concerned African American Men; and volunteering with the Vigo County Youth Football League, and Bambino youth baseball. He served on the board of directors of the Boys and Girls Clubs of America and as a trustee of the Stewart Lawn Cemetery Association. He was an adviser to many student organizations at ISU and a mentor to students at Sarah Scott Middle School.

In college Phillips played both basketball and baseball. He was on the 1967–68 Sycamores basketball team, which reached the NCAA Tournament championship game and was inducted into the ISU Athletics Hall of Fame in 2005.

Michael Phillips will be greatly missed by his wife Rita, four children, and his many friends and family in Terre Haute and beyond. Mr. Phillips will be remembered as a dedicated advocate for students, a community leader, an accomplished student-athlete, and a loving family man.

IN HONOR OF CHIEF ERNEST MENDOZA

HON. NICK LAMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Speaker, I stand here today to pay tribute to the life of Chief Ernest Mendoza. Chief Mendoza was a dedicated public servant, whose spirit and drive impacted the lives of all of those he encountered. On January 19th Chief Mendoza was on his way home from work when he was killed by a drunk driver. His sudden and tragic death has brought sadness and sorrow not only to his family but also to the students and staff of the Needville Independent School District and the communities of Fort Bend and Wharton Counties.

This 54-year-old father of seven was a Christian and military veteran who led an honorable life. As a part of the Needville Independent School District Police for the past 10 years, and a law enforcement officer for 25, Chief Mendoza's drive and passion for public safety touched many of his fellow officers on the police force. Students and teachers in Fort Bend County will always remember his welcoming smile and that he protected them with care.

His family has established The Ernest Mendoza Law Enforcement Scholarship Fund in his honor. This fund is representative of the commitment and sacrifice which characterized Chief Mendoza's years of service, his character, and integrity. In death, as in life, he and his family continue to be dedicated to educating our Nation's youth in safe and adequate public schools.

My sincerest condolences go to the family, friends, and colleagues of Chief Ernest Mendoza. May God provide peace and comfort to his loved ones, and to those he protected.

I ask you, Madam Speaker, to join me in honoring Chief Mendoza and his family by entering his name and legacy into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FULLY FUNDING IMPACT AID

HON. MARK STEVEN KIRK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce The Government Reservation Accelerated Development for Education Aid Act, GRADE–A, H.R. 701, a bill to ensure the Federal government fully funds the Impact Aid program.

In 1950, President Harry Truman established the Impact Aid program to meet the revenue shortfalls in school districts and communities that occur in districts with federally owned land, which are exempt from State and local property taxes. Public schools are required by law to accept all children from military families, Native American reservations or other Federal establishments. This puts a severe financial burden on school districts that educate a significant number of federally connected children, diminishing the overall quality of education, and increasing the funding burden on local taxpayers.

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. GRADE–A has garnered bipartisan support and offers the opportunity to reverse this negative trend.

Earlier this Congress I introduced H.R. 12, in order to ensure that students in my district continue to receive the resources needed to succeed. I introduced this bill to help North Chicago continue to qualify as ''heavily impacted'' and therefore, receive maximum funding, and to ensure that Glenview and Highland Park receive fair compensation.

I believe that it is crucial for schools outside of my district that are affected by the presence of the Federal government to receive support from the Impact Aid program as well. This funding is necessary to maintain school quality, protect surrounding communities from financial burden and to fulfill an obligation to our men and women serving overseas, by caring for their families at home.

TRIBUTE TO JIM HAMILTON

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a legend in South Carolina aviation, community activist, and real humanitarian, Jimmie L. ''Jim'' Hamilton. Jim is a true friend to me and to many other South Carolinians whose lives he has touched through his work and his service.

Although Jim Hamilton has been recognized as South Carolina Aviator of the Year, been awarded the Order of the Palmetto, the highest civilian honor in South Carolina; and received the Shrine Bowl of the Carolinas Walt Disney Award, he remains a humble man whose big heart and bigger personality mask the adversities he has faced.

The son of a commercial fisherman and ship maintenance father, Jim grew up in Florida's Lower Matecumbe Key, where he was the only school-aged child. He took a boat to school, until his family relocated to Miami, where he attended high school. After graduation, he enlisted in the U.S. Army.

Jim's career in the military would change the course of his life. He became a paratrooper in the 82nd Airborne Division, but he always wanted to be a pilot. Since the Army required officers to fly, Jim applied to officer training school and was sent to Fort Sill, Oklahoma. From 1949–1958, he flew spotter planes for the Army. Jim maintains that learning to fly shaped his character and taught him honor and determination.

When Jim left the Army in 1958, he became a flight instructor and Jack-of-all-trades with Aircraft Sales and Service at the Metropolitan Airport in Columbia, South Carolina, but he always wanted to own his own business.

In 1961, Jim's life changed completely when his wife, Geraldine, died in a car accident. He was left to care for 3 young boys. His mother moved to Columbia from Florida to manage the household, and just a few months later, Jim was managing Owens Field airport.

The next year, he opened Midlands Aviation in a 1-room office in the Five Points area of

Columbia. He got a contract selling Cessna airplanes, and when he sold the 50,000th plane Cessna manufactured, his fledgling company got a lot of attention in the trade publications. This launched his business to new heights.

From the early days of his business, Jim realized there was a need for support of private airplane owners in Columbia. He had to pay to keep his stock of Cessnas at Owens Field, and he had to transport them to Aiken to be serviced. So in 1964, Jim moved Midlands Aviation onsite at Owens Field. He used a trailer as his office and installed fuel tanks nearby. Later he was able to purchase the building that once housed the South Carolina Aeronautics Commission.

For 44 years, Jim provided fuel, parts and service at Owens Field, a contract that he sold in October 2006. He has also managed the county-owned airport since 1961, and continues to do so earning a salary of $1 per month. One could say that Owens Field is Jim Hamilton's life. However, there is so much more to Jim Hamilton.

In 1974, he started the Jamil Flying Fezzes, which provides free flights for handicapped or burned children to specialty hospitals. He mentors fourth graders through the Rotary Club, helps the Salvation Army recruit bell ringers at Christmas, and for the last 10 years he has driven ladies in a local retirement home on weekly shopping trips. He has also been a member of the South Carolina Board for Mental Retardation and the Babcock Center Board.

Jim has served 3 4-year terms on the South Carolina Aeronautics Commission, and served as its Chairman twice. He has served 2 terms as President of the South Carolina Aviation Trades Association. He was elected Governor and Key man of the Columbia Hangar ''Quiet Birdmen.'' And he has dedicated much of his spare time to educating young people about the adventures of flying.

Jim has been married to his second wife, Patricia, since 1966, and between them they have 5 children. Jimmie Jr., his oldest son and a talented airplane mechanic, tragically drowned in 2000. Despite the difficulties and tragedies in his personal life, Jim has always put others needs ahead of his own.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me today in recognizing the extraordinary contributions of Jim Hamilton. He is an outstanding businessman and community leader, who has overcome many challenges in his life and still put others first. He says that flying taught him honor and dedication, and there are many people today who thank Jim Hamilton for passing those qualities along to them.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMBERS OF PREUSS SCHOOL UCSD ROBOTICS TEAM

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mrs. DAVIS of California, Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the members of the Preuss School UCSD robotics team. Team 812, known as the Midnight Mechanics, have competed in the FIRST Robotics Competition—an annual robot design and construction contest that draws over 20,000 participants from all over the world—for the past 5 years.

For 2 years in a row, Team 812 has won the Regional Chairman's Awards for the Southern California Region. During the 2003–2004 competition, the Midnight Mechanics won the National Engineering Inspiration Award.

But Team 812's accomplishments do not end outside the engineering lab or the construction shop. The team has initiated the FIRST BUDDY program to mentor disadvantaged students in math and science and established the FIRST STEPS program to reach out to inner-city high school students and share with them their zeal for science.

Team 812 has also brought their passion into the classrooms and corridors of 10 other high schools in the San Diego area and has helped them field robotics teams of their own. Together the Midnight Mechanics and these 10 newer teams have formed the Team San Diego FIRST Robotics Coalition, a coordinating organization to build new partnerships in the community and recruit more high schools to field robotics teams.

I am proud to report that through the hard work of the Midnight Mechanics and the Team San Diego FIRST Robotics Coalition, the City of San Diego will be hosting its inaugural FIRST Regional Competition this coming March.

At a time when our country's young people are falling farther and farther behind those of other industrialized nations in math and science, I want to commend the members of Team 812, for their dedication to their craft, for their excellence in their efforts, and for their ability to instill a love of science in fellow young people. Not only are the Midnight Mechanics firstrate competitors, they are also true servants of the community. We need more role models like these to inspire our younger children.

Finally, I want to recognize Paul Tran, the dedicated young man who first brought Team 812 to my attention. Paul wrote the following to me in a letter:

We need your help to assist us in instituting FIRST Robotics in every high school in San Diego, in California, and essentially, the United States . . . We need your help to bring FIRST to the attention of the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate.

Madam Speaker, dear colleagues, I hope you will help me fulfill Paul's request and spread the word about this wonderful program to all comers of our country.

MOROCCO: A MODEL OF MUSLIM-JEWISH TIES

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. ACKERMAN. Madam Speaker, I respectfully request that Serge Berdugo's recent op-ed, ''Morocco: A Model of Muslim-Jewish Ties'', as published in the January 9 issue of The Christian Science Monitor, be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Berdugo, the president of Morocco's Jewish Community Council, outlines the history of Muslim-Jewish relations in Morocco, where Jews and Muslims have peacefully lived as neighbors for hundreds of years. I commend this work to all who want a lasting peace between Jews and Muslims across the world, and everyone who wishes to see the State of Israel and its neighbors coexisting harmoniously.

CASABLANCA, MOROCCO.—As the flames of anti-Semitism continue to be fanned across much of the Islamic world, there is a risk that today's youth will grow up believing that Arabs and Jews were simply not meant to coexist, let alone thrive together.

That idea conflicts with history—and is a falsehood today. My country, Morocco, illustrates the viability and vitality of a Jewish community—my community—in an Arab country. It's a model of harmony other Muslim nations should follow.

The Jewish people have been a presence in Africa's Maghreb region for more than 2,000 years. North African Jews and Muslims traveled north and thrived together in southern Europe for more than 700 years. In 1492, when we refused to convert to Christianity, we were expelled—together—from Spain. And together we successfully sought refuge in Morocco, which accepted us into its society and institutions.

Morocco's leaders have always made the well-being of the Jewish people a top priority. During World War II, when the Vichy government of occupied France announced that it had prepared 200,000 yellow stars for the Jews of Morocco, King Mohammed V replied that he would need 50 more for him and his family. He refused to make any distinction between his citizens.

The importance of a nation's leader setting the tone for recognition, respect, and treatment of minority faiths cannot be overstated. Today, King Mohammed VI has declared his religious, historical, and constitutional obligation to protect the rights, liberties, and sacred values of the Jews in Morocco.

This commitment dramatically affected Morocco's reaction at moments of great challenge. After May 16, 2003—the Moroccan 9/11, when five terrorist bombs exploded, three directed at Jewish targets—King Mohammed VI expressed condolences at a Jewish Center, condemning the criminal acts and reaffirming his determination to protect Jews and all Moroccan citizens.

In doing so, he defined the attack as one upon all Moroccan society, awakening the national conscience and strengthening the bonds between us. Moroccans of all faiths responded with candlelight vigils at bombing sites and demonstrations attended by nearly 1 million participants.

Many Moroccan Jews have emigrated to Israel and elsewhere, but the attachments to our homeland are unique. ''Morocco never loses a Jewish citizen—we gain an ambassador,'' Mohammed VI's predecessor, King Hassan II, once said. Today, there are 1 million such ''ambassadors'' all over the world and 600,000 in Israel alone.

We Jews who call Morocco home have a vibrant community that includes 30 functioning synagogues and three school networks, which many influential Muslim families choose for their own children. Moroccan Jews serve as counselors to the king, ministers, colonels, members of parliament, judges, and ambassadors. On Jewish holy days, Muslim authorities, out of respect, attend our services.

With help from the Moroccan government, we started a foundation to preserve Jewish historical sites. And we support research on our community—including 30 doctoral dissertations presently under way by Muslim candidates.

Are we an isolated society? Hardly: Moroccans young and old have access to as wide an array of media and ideological diversity as

anywhere in the Islamic world. Yes, the extremists' call is heard here, too, but make no mistake—it's the response that differs. The tones of tolerance, trumpeted by a government that believes that Moroccan Judaism is an intrinsic and permanent part of the national culture, overwhelm the extremists' siren song.

Are we a historical accident or the path forward? Perhaps the answer is that our historical good fortune now has to be transformed into a model for others. We are more relevant outside our border than ever before.

Other world leaders must realize that the path forward lies not in fanning the fires of the moment, but in setting a tone of authentic coexistence that will endure.

TRIBUTE TO PHILLIP ANDREW STOUT

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 2007

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a South Carolina businessman, who has been honored by his peers for his extraordinary work. Phillip Andrew ''Andy'' Stout owns and operates the Shoney's restaurant just minutes from my Santee, South Carolina office, and he has been recognized as the Shoney's 2006 Franchisee of the Year.

Andy Stout operates five Shoney's in South Carolina, and owns three of them. In addition to his recognition as Franchisee of the Year, two of Mr. Stout's restaurants were honored for their outstanding sales. This recognition did not come easily. Mr. Stout learned to excel in his profession by starting at the ground level and working his way up.

As a teenager, he began working as a busboy in his stepfather's Shoney's restaurant in Sumter, South Carolina. Two years later, he moved up to become Kitchen Manager. Mr. Stout then took a short break from Shoney's to serve as General Manager of a Captain D's restaurant. However, he took that experience and used it to become General Manager of Shoney's in Sumter.

His years of hard work and training paid off in 1994, when he formed P.A.S. Enterprises and purchased his first Shoney's in Manning, South Carolina. He added to his holdings in 2003 and 2005 by purchasing Shoney's in Santee and Dillon respectively. Mr. Stout continues to oversee the daily operations of the Sumter Shoney's and is a partner in the Shoney's in Walterboro.

Mr. Stout has received numerous awards for the performance of his Shoney's restaurants in addition to his 2006 Franchisee of the Year award. He also takes time to serve on the Board of Shoney's Franchise Advisor Council, and he serves his community on the Board of Trustees at Thomas Sumter Academy.

He is married to Donna L. Stout and together they have six children, Nicole, Rina, Austin, Elizabeth, Olin and Rebekah Ann.

I speak often of the need to improve the plight of counties along the I–95 corridor, and I commend Mr. Stout for the example he sets in running these successful businesses along I–95. His story shows that hard work and initiative can create opportunities for oneself and for one's community.

Madam Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in applauding Andy Stout for his entrepreneurial spirit and his leadership in the Shoney's organization and the community. I have been a customer in several of his restaurants and can attest to the quality of service they provide. I wish him continued success and Godspeed.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, January 30, 2007 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 31

9:15 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To continue hearings to examine securing America's interests in Iraq, focusing on the remaining options in Iraq in the strategic context.

SH–216

9:30 a.m.

Rules and Administration

Organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures for committee operations, committee's rules of procedure for the 110th Congress, and subcommittee assignments.

SR–301

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine ensuring the economic future by promoting middle-class prosperity.

SD–106

9:45 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures for committee operation; to be followed by a hearing to examine the roles of Federal food assistance programs in family economic security and nutrition.

SR–328A

10 a.m.

Armed Services

To receive a closed briefing regarding the Iraq ''surge'' plan.

SR–222

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures for committee operations, committee's rules of procedure for the 110th Congress, and subcommittee assignments; to be followed by a hearing to examine the Department of the Treasury's report to Congress on International Economic and Exchange Rate Policy (IEERP) and the U.S.-China strategic economic dialogue.

SD–G50

Budget

To hold hearings to examine solutions to long-term fiscal challenges.

SD–608

Finance

Organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures for committee operations, subcommittee assignments, and the nominations of Michael J. Astrue, of Massachusetts, to be Commissioner of Social Security, and Dean A. Pinkert, of Virginia, and Irving A. Williamson, of New York, each to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission.

SD–215

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures for committee operations, committee's rules of procedure for the 110th Congress, and subcommittee assignments; committee will also consider the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act.

SD–430

Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the Iraq Study Group, focusing on recommendations for improvements to Iraq's police and criminal justice system.

SD–226

Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine Federal small business assistance programs for veterans and reservists.

SR–428A

10:30 a.m.

Aging

To hold hearings to examine if Medicare Part D is working for low-income seniors.

SD–562

11:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting to consider S. 202, to provide for the conveyance of certain Forest Service land to the city of Coffman Cove, Alaska, S. 216, to provide for the exchange of certain Federal land in the Santa Fe National Forest and certain non-Federal land in the Pecos National Historical Park in the State of New Mexico, S. 220, to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the A&B Irrigation District in the State of Idaho, S. 232, to make permanent the authorization for watershed restoration and enhancement agreements, S. 235, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain buildings and lands of the Yakima Project, Washington, to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District, S. 240, to reauthorize and amend the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992, S. 241, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements to protect natural resources of units of the National Park System through collaborative efforts on land inside and outside of units of the National Park System, S. 245, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the President William Jefferson Clinton Birthplace Home in Hope, Arkansas, as a National Historic Site and unit of the National Park System, S. 255, to provide assistance to the State of New Mexico for the development of comprehensive State water plans, S. 260, to establish the Fort Stanton-Snowy River Cave National

Conservation Area, S. 262, to rename the Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area in the State of Idaho as the Morley Nelson Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area in honor of the late Morley Nelson, an international authority on birds of prey, who was instrumental in the establishment of this National Conservation Area, S. 263, to amend the Oregon Resource Conservation Act of 1996 to reauthorize the participation of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Deschutes River Conservancy, S. 264, to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to participate in the rehabilitation of the Wallowa Lake Dam in Oregon, S. 265, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, to conduct a water resource feasibility study for the Little Butte/Bear Creek Subbasins in Oregon, S. 266, to provide for the modification of an amendatory repayment contract between the Secretary of the Interior and the North Unit Irrigation District, S. 268, to designate the Ice Age Floods National Geologic Trail, S. 275, to establish the Prehistoric Trackways National Monument in the State of New Mexico, S. 277, to modify the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park to include certain land within the GT Park Subdivision, S. 278, to establish a program and criteria for National Heritage Areas in the United States, S. 283, to amend the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003, S. 320, to provide for the protection of paleontological resources on Federal lands, H.R. 57, to repeal certain sections of the Act of May 26, 1936, pertaining to the Virgin Islands, and S. 200, to require the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation and the United States Geological Survey, to conduct a study on groundwater resources in the State of Alaska.

SD–366

2:30 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business; to be followed by a hearing to examine economic and security concerns relating to promoting travel to America.

SR–253

Armed Services

Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee

To resume hearings to examine abusive practices in Department of Defense contracting for services and inter-agency contracting.

SR–222

Judiciary

Terrorism, Technology and Homeland Security Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine challenges and strategies for securing the U.S. border.

SD–226

FEBRUARY 1

9:15 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To continue hearings to examine securing America's interests in Iraq, focusing on the remaining options in Iraq in the strategic context.

SH–216

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Gen. George W. Casey Jr., USA, for reappointment to the grade of general and to be Chief of Staff, United States Army.

SR–325

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine accelerated biofuels diversity, focusing on how home-grown, biologically derived fuels can blend into the nation's transportation fuel mix.

SDG–50

Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Carl Joseph Artman, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs; to be followed by a business meeting to consider the nomination.

SR–485

10 a.m.

Budget

To hold hearings to examine the current account deficit and the foreign debt of the United States.

SD–608

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine a view from the Federal Communications Commission relating to assessing the communications marketplace.

SR–253

Finance

To hold hearings to examine improving the health of America's children relating to the future of Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP).

SD–215

2:30 p.m.

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine privacy implications of the Federal government's health information technology initiative relating to private health records, focusing on the efforts of Department of Health and Human Services to integrate privacy into the Health Information Technology national infrastructure and Office of Personnel Management's efforts to expand the use of Health Information Technology through the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program and the impact such actions have on Federal employees' health information privacy.

SD–342

Intelligence

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of J. Michael McConnell, of Virginia, to be Director of National Intelligence.

SD–106

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

FEBRUARY 5

2 p.m.

Judiciary

Human Rights and the Law Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine genocide and the rule of law.

SD–226

FEBRUARY 6

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the President's budget request for fiscal year 2008 and the fiscal years 2007 and 2008 war supplemental requests in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2008 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SH–216

10 a.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine judicial nominations.

SD–226

FEBRUARY 7

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2008 for the Department of Energy.

SD–366

Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine if the Department of Justice is politicizing the hiring and firing of U.S. attorneys relating to preserving prosecutorial independence.

SD–226

10 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine climate change research and scientific integrity.

SR–253

FEBRUARY 8

9 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the President's foreign affairs budget.

SD–106

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine issues relating to labor, immigration, law enforcement, and economic conditions in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

SD–366

10 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the present and future of public safety communications.

SR–253

Judiciary

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD–226

FEBRUARY 13

10 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the ''Stern Review of the Economics of Climate Change'' examining the economic impacts of climate change and stabilizing greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

SD–106

FEBRUARY 15

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2008 for the Department of the Interior.

SD–366

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1255–S1297

Measures Introduced: Twelve bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 415–426, and S. Res. 45. **Pages S1283–84**

Measures Reported:

S. Res. 45, authorizing expenditures by the Special Committee on Aging. **Page S1283**

Measures Passed:

National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Women's Volleyball Championship: Committee on Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 44, commending the University of Nebraska-Lincoln women's volleyball team for winning the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Women's Volleyball Championship, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Pages S1296–97**

Fair Minimum Wage: Senate resumed consideration of H.R. 2, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S1267–77**

Pending:

Reid (for Baucus) Amendment No. 100, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1267**

McConnell (for Gregg) Amendment No. 101 (to Amendment No. 100), to provide Congress a second look at wasteful spending by establishing enhanced rescission authority under fast-track procedures. **Page S1267**

Kyl Amendment No. 115 (to Amendment No. 100), to extend through December 31, 2008, the depreciation treatment of leasehold, restaurant, and retail space improvements. **Page S1267**

Enzi (for Ensign/Inhofe) Amendment No. 152 (to Amendment No. 100), to reduce document fraud, prevent identity theft, and preserve the integrity of the Social Security system. **Page S1267**

Enzi (for Ensign) Amendment No. 153 (to Amendment No. 100), to preserve and protect Social Security benefits of American workers, including those making minimum wage, and to help ensure greater Congressional oversight of the Social Security system by requiring that both Houses of Congress approve a totalization agreement before the agreement, giving foreign workers Social Security benefits, can go into effect. **Page S1267**

Vitter/Voinovich Amendment No. 110 (to Amendment No. 100), to amend title 44 of the United States Code, to provide for the suspension of fines under certain circumstances for first-time paperwork violations by small business concerns. **Page S1267**

DeMint Amendment No. 155 (to Amendment No. 100), to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for cooperative governing of individual health insurance coverage offered in interstate commerce, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 regarding the disposition of unused health benefits in cafeteria plans and flexible spending arrangements and the use of health savings accounts for the payment of health insurance premiums for high deductible health plans purchased in the individual market. **Page S1267**

DeMint Amendment No. 156 (to Amendment No. 100), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 regarding the disposition of unused health benefits in cafeteria plans and flexible spending arrangements. **Page S1267**

DeMint Amendment No. 157 (to the language proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 100), to increase the Federal minimum wage by an amount that is based on applicable State minimum wages. **Page S1267**

DeMint Amendment No. 159 (to Amendment No. 100), to protect individuals from having their money involuntarily collected and used for lobbying by a labor organization. **Page S1267**

DeMint Amendment No. 160 (to Amendment No. 100), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow certain small businesses to defer payment of tax. **Page S1267**

DeMint Amendment No. 161 (to Amendment No. 100), to prohibit the use of flexible schedules by Federal employees unless such flexible schedule benefits are made available to private sector employees not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007. **Page S1267**

DeMint Amendment No. 162 (to Amendment No. 100), to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 regarding the minimum wage. **Page S1267**

Kennedy (for Kerry) Amendment No. 128 (to Amendment No. 100), to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a pilot program to provide regulatory compliance assistance to small business concerns. **Page S1267**

Martinez Amendment No. 105 (to Amendment No. 100), to clarify the house parent exemption to certain wage and hour requirements. **Page S1267**

Sanders Amendment No. 201 (to Amendment No. 100), to express the sense of the Senate concerning poverty. **Page S1267**

Gregg Amendment No. 203 (to Amendment No. 100), to enable employees to use employee option time. **Page S1267**

Burr Amendment No. 195 (to Amendment No. 100), to provide for an exemption to a minimum wage increase for certain employers who contribute to their employees health benefit expenses. **Page S1267**

Chambliss Amendment No. 118 (to Amendment No. 100), to provide minimum wage rates for agricultural workers. **Page S1267**

Kennedy (for Feinstein) Amendment No. 167 (to Amendment No. 118), to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States. **Page S1267**

Enzi (for Allard) Amendment No. 169 (to Amendment No. 100), to prevent identity theft by allowing the sharing of social security data among government agencies for immigration enforcement purposes. **Page S1267**

Enzi (for Cornyn) Amendment No. 135 (to Amendment No. 100), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the Federal unemployment surtax. **Pages S1267, S1271**

Enzi (for Cornyn) Amendment No. 138 (to Amendment No. 100), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand workplace health incentives by equalizing the tax consequences of employee athletic facility use. **Pages S1267, S1271**

Sessions (for Kyl) Amendment No. 209 (to Amendment No. 100), to extend through December 31, 2012, the increased expensing for small businesses. **Page S1267**

Division I of Sessions (for Kyl) Amendment No. 210 (to Amendment No. 100), to provide for the permanent extension of increasing expensing for small businesses, the depreciation treatment of leasehold, restaurant, and retail space improvements, and the work opportunity tax credit. **Page S1267**

Division II of Sessions (for Kyl) Amendment No. 210 (to Amendment No. 100), to provide for the permanent extension of increasing expensing for small businesses, the depreciation treatment of leasehold, restaurant, and retail space improvements, and the work opportunity tax credit. **Page S1267**

Division III of Sessions (for Kyl) Amendment No. 210 (to Amendment No. 100), to provide for the permanent extension of increasing expensing for small businesses, the depreciation treatment of leasehold, restaurant, and retail space improvements, and the work opportunity tax credit. **Page S1267**

Division IV of Sessions (for Kyl) Amendment No. 210 (to Amendment No. 100), to provide for the permanent extension of increasing expensing for small businesses, the depreciation treatment of leasehold, restaurant, and retail space improvements, and the work opportunity tax credit. **Page S1267**

Division V of Sessions (for Kyl) Amendment No. 210 (to Amendment No. 100), to provide for the permanent extension of increasing expensing for small businesses, the depreciation treatment of leasehold, restaurant, and retail space improvements, and the work opportunity tax credit. **Page S1267**

Durbin Amendment No. 221 (to Amendment No. 157), to change the enactment date. **Page S1275**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at 11:00 a.m. on Tuesday, January 30, 2007; that the time until 12:15 p.m., be equally divided and controlled between the Majority and Republican Leaders, or their designees; that the time from 11:55 a.m. until 12:05 p.m., be under the control of the Republican Leader and the time from 12:05 p.m. until 12:15 p.m., be under the control of the Majority Leader; that at 12:15 p.m., Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Reid (for Baucus) Amendment No. 100 (listed above); provided further, that Members have until 11:00 a.m. to file any second-degree amendments. **Page S1297**

Appointments:

Mexico-United States Parliamentary Group: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h–276k, as amended, appointed the following Senator as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group during the 110th Congress: Senator Dodd. **Page S1296**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

James R. Clapper, Jr., of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence.

William Herbert Heyman, of New York, to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation for a term expiring December 31, 2008.

32 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

1 Army nomination in the rank of general. **Page S1297**

Executive Communications: Pages S1281–83
Executive Reports of Committees: Page S1283
Additional Cosponsors: Pages S1284–85
Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S1285–93
Additional Statements: Page S1281
Amendments Submitted: Pages S1293–96
Notices of Hearings/Meetings: Page S1296
Privileges of the Floor: Page S1296

Adjournment: Senate convened at 2:00 p.m., and adjourned at 5:32 p.m., until 10:00 a.m., on Tuesday, January 30, 2007. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1297.)

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 20 public bills, H.R. 698–717; and 5 resolutions, H.J. Res. 20; H. Con. Res. 46; and H. Res. 102–104 were introduced. Pages H986–87

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H987–88

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Con. Res. 34, honoring the life of Percy Lavon Julian, a pioneer in the field of organic chemistry research and development and the first and only African American chemist to be inducted into the National Academy of Sciences (H. Rept. 110–4) and

H. Res. 59, supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week (H. Rept. 110–5). Page H986

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Baird to act as Speaker Pro Tempore for today. Page H947

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Lane Evans Post Office Building Designation Act: H.R. 521, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2633 11th Street in Rock Island, Illinois, as the "Lane Evans Post Office Building," by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 405 yeas to 3 nays, Roll. No. 58; Pages H948–54, H958–59

Gerald R. Ford, Jr. Post Office Building Designation Act: H.R. 49, 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," by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 409 yeas with none voting "nay," Roll No. 59; Pages H954–55, H959–60

Gale W. McGee Post Office Building Designation Act: H.R. 335, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 152 North 5th Street in Laramie, Wyoming, as the "Gale W. McGee Post Office"; Pages H955–56

Congratulating the University of California at Santa Barbara men's soccer team: H. Res. 70, amended, to congratulate the University of California at Santa Barbara men's soccer team, the 2006 National Collegiate Athletic Association Champions; and Pages H956–57

Commending the University of Louisville Cardinals football team: H. Res. 82, amended, to commend the University of Louisville Cardinals football team for their victory in the 2007 Orange Bowl, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 408 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 60. Pages H957–58 H960

Recess: The House recessed at 3:03 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. Page H958

United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House of Representatives, in addition to Representative Tanner, Chairman, to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly: Representative Tauscher, Vice Chairman; Representatives Ross, Chandler, Larson (CT), Meek (FL), Scott (GA), and Bean. Page 958

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H948.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H958–59, H959–60 and H960. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 2:00 p.m. and adjourned at 11:03 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, JANUARY 30, 2007

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Admiral William J. Fallon, USN, for reappointment to the grade of admiral and to be Commander, United States Central Command, 9:30 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on the Budget: to hold hearings to examine long-term fiscal challenges, 10 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the status of Federal land management agencies' efforts to contain the costs of their wildlife suppression activities and to consider recent independent reviews of and recommendations for those efforts, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine transportation sector fuel efficiency, including challenges to and incentives for increased oil savings through technological innovation including plug-in hybrids, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures for committee operations; to be followed by a hearing to examine Senators' perspectives on global warming, focusing on Senators' views on global warming and what each Senator believes the Nation's response should be to the issue, 9:05 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of John D. Negroponte, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of State, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Full Committee, to resume hearings to examine securing America's interests in Iraq, focusing on the remaining options, alternative plans and the Iraq Study Group, 1 p.m., SH–216.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine exercising Congress' constitutional power to end a war, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: closed business meeting and hearing regarding certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, on 5- and 10-year Homeland Security Goals: Where We Need To Be as a Nation and How We Judge Progress, 10 a.m., and 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, hearing on Security and Stability in Afghanistan: Challenges and Opportunities, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing on examination of the force requirements determination process, 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, hearing on the Congressional Budget Office's Budget and Economic Outlook, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor and Pensions, hearing on Protecting Workers from Genetic Discrimination, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Continuing Security Concerns at Los Alamos National Laboratory,'' 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, hearing on allegations of political interference with the work of government climate change scientists, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, to consider a House Joint Resolution making Continuing Appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, 3 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science and Technology, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing on H.R. 547, Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, oversight hearing of the Coast Guard Integrated Deepwater System, 11 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials, hearing on Reauthorization of the Federal Rail Safety Program, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to meet for organizational purposes, 2 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, hearing on Trade and Globalization, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures, to meet for organizational purposes, 4 p.m.,. B–318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Trade, to meet for organizational purposes, 3 p.m., 1105 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

10:00 a.m., Tuesday, January 30

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 60 minutes) Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 2, Fair Minimum Wage, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Reid (for Baucus) Amendment No. 100 at approximately 12:15 p.m.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

10:30 a.m., Tuesday, January 30

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of the following suspensions: (1) H. Res. 24—Establishing the House Democracy Assistance Commission for the One Hundred Tenth Congress; (2) H. Con. Res. 20—Calling on the Government of the United Kingdom to immediately establish a full, independent, and public judicial inquiry into the murder of Northern Ireland defense attorney Patrick Finucane, as recommended by Judge Peter Cory as part of the Weston Park Agreement, in order to move forward on the Northern Ireland peace process; (3) H. Res. 59—Supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week; (4) H. Con. Res. 34—Honoring the life of Percy Lavon Julian, a pioneer in the field of organic chemistry research and development and the first and only African American chemist to be inducted into the National Academy of Sciences; and (5) H. Con. Res. 5—Expressing support for the designation and goals of ''Hire a Veteran Week'' and encouraging the President to issue a proclamation supporting those goals.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Ackerman, Gary L., N.Y., E205
Brown-Waite, Ginny, Fla., E201, E202
Carney, Christopher P., Pa., E200
Carson, Julia, Ind., E196, E197
Castle, Michael N., Del., E195, E197, E203
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E204, E206
Davis, David, Tenn., E202
Davis, Susan A., Calif., E198, E205
Ellsworth, Brad, Ind., E204
Emanuel, Rahm, Ill., E195, E196, E197
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E198
Hooley, Darlene, Ore., E198
Kirk, Mark Steven, Ill., E204
Lampson, Nick, Tex., E204
Miller, George, Calif., E200, E201
Moran, James P., Va., E202
Pascrell, Bill, Jr., N.J., E199
Petri, Thomas E., Wisc., E203
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E195, E196
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E201, E202
Ruppersberger, C.A. Dutch, Md., E198
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E200
Shimkus, John, Ill., E203
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E199
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E199

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.