

have the constitutional right to do what they are doing right now?

You know, it is not enough to say that it is efficient. It is not enough to say that it is not duplicating services someplace else. It has to be legal in what it is doing. When Members of Congress come to vote each day on floor, we bring out these little cards, and we put them in the little slot here. I think every Member of Congress every time he votes should be asking that question: Is it legal, is it constitutional? And that is exactly what the Sunset Commission should be doing as well.

I will just conclude on this, Mr. Speaker. A former Member from years ago, Barry Goldwater, came to speak once, and he said that when he came to Washington, he did not come to Washington to make it more efficient or to streamline it. He came to Washington to eliminate it. The Founding Fathers had the exact same idea. They did not mean that our Federal Government should be simply an inefficient government of exceeding abilities of powers, but should be a limited one by our Constitution. That is what the Constitutional Caucus is all about. That is what the Sunset Commission can do as well. I applaud the Member for advocating that and moving along with that legislation.

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.)

PROPER BALANCE BETWEEN STATE AND FEDERAL POWERS

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Justice Brandeis, as we have talked once before, has said States are the ideal laboratory for democracy, for indeed they have the better ability of being creative, and, if the creation goes wrong, can move back from that, from the Federal Government. For indeed when we try to be creative, and it goes wrong, the entire Nation has an impact with it.

The idea of a Sunset Commission is one which has been experimented on by various States, various times for a several or a few years now. As our good friend Mr. BRADY from Texas clearly said, it has proven effective in cutting away bureaucracy, eliminating inefficient agencies, letting go of outdated programs, and also saving the taxpayers money.

Another way of saying that is this Commission can make citizens of America more free, can keep government within its proper bounds and help us to keep more of our own money and

rule our own lives, which is another reason why the Constitutional Caucus is supporting the creation of this Sunset Commission.

The administration actually started this ball rolling several years ago with the introduction of their Program Assessment Rating Tool, or PART, the results of which have been the basis of administrative decisions on budget proposals every year now. The key now is to give these recommendations some legislative teeth, which is something that the former Director, as well as the Budget Director of OMB, has urged us.

He wrote, one time, we need to involve Congress more directly in holding agencies and programs accountable for their performance through a Sunset Commission which provides regular formal scrutiny of Federal programs. This bipartisan Commission would review each Federal program on a schedule established by Congress to determine whether it is producing results and should continue to exist. Programs would automatically terminate according to the schedule, unless the Congress took action to continue them.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest also that one of the things we might want to do is expand it to one other role. Many States, including mine, have a regulatory oversight committee, which means a committee of the legislative body which meets on a regular basis to review all rules that are established and step in where rules established by the bureaucracy become egregious.

Let's face it. All legislative bodies are sometimes sloppy. Sometimes we have a grand idea, and then we will empower an agency to implement that idea. Oftentimes those implementations, those rules and regulations, they go awry. When there happens to be nobody directly accessible or accountable to citizens who can then go to that and attack and change that rule, well, that is when problems develop. That is why we need to have legislative bodies who could step in and set things right.

Much of the erosion of States rights in our country's history has come from unaccountable Federal agencies that grow and then wrap their arms around States and people and don't ever want to let go. Congress has certainly done its part to ignore 10th amendment issues. Courts have also siphoned off some power. But a slow and insidious encroachment of Federal agencies is perhaps the worst of these influences.

A Sunset Commission would put us on the road to solving this. It would force every Federal agency to its usefulness, review its own mission, justify its own existence, or face some kind of elimination. It would also allow a review of regulations and standards to make sure they are logical, legitimate, and within the scope of the legislative empowerment that created them in the first place.

I appreciate the opportunity being here on the same evening when Mr. BRADY, the gentleman from Texas, re-introduced his bill to the American

people of having a Sunset Commission. I appreciate also being here when the gentleman from New Jersey Mr. GARRETT talks about the Constitutional Caucus and the effort it is to try to re-establish the right and proper balance between government; for indeed the purpose of that is to ensure that the power belongs to people to rule their own lives, to States to be in their sphere of government, and the Federal Government to maintain its balance and its purpose where it was constitutionally designed to be.

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

(Mrs. MALONEY 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 Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

GENOCIDE IN SUDAN

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to condemn the genocide that is taking place in Darfur, Sudan and to voice my support for the individuals and organizations throughout the United States who work tirelessly to stop this crime against humanity. I would like to recognize the "Teens Against Genocide" organization—also known as "TAG," in particular, for its efforts in Los Angeles, California.

Among many other events, TAG has joined with religious, advocacy, and charity groups in the area to organize "Camp Darfur." Camp Darfur is an "interactive awareness and education event that [brings] attention to the ongoing genocide in Darfur and [gives] individuals the opportunity to discover their own power to make a difference."

On April 7, 2006, Camp Darfur first opened in Lennox, California, on the sports field of Lennox Middle School adjacent to LAX. In addition, TAG organized a rally and brought Camp Darfur to Westwood, California last Sunday, April 23, 2006. Through candlelight vigils, interactive presentations, video, photography, speeches from experts, legislators, and educators, simulated refugee camp exercises, the groups joining TAG are expanding the awareness of the atrocities taking place in Sudan to bring about peace. It is even more significant that teens are undertaking such mature efforts of advocacy for issues in which they truly believe.

I applaud these young adults and organizations and would like to let the American people know that Camp Darfur will be brought from Los Angeles to Washington, DC in the near future. We must offer our continued support for these efforts and others in order to bring about action. In fact, this coming Sunday, April 30 at 2:00 p.m. in front of the Capitol, the "Save Darfur Coalition" will hold the

“Rally to Stop Genocide.” The murder, rape, and torture that have occurred—and still occur—in Sudan must stop.

In July of 2004, the House of Representatives and the Senate declared that the atrocities occurring in the Darfur region of Sudan constituted genocide. On September 9, 2004, Secretary of State Colin Powell declared that “genocide has been committed in Darfur, and that the government of Sudan and the Janjaweed bear responsibility.” It is estimated that 200,000 people were killed by government forces and militias from 2003 through 2004, and an additional 200,000 people died as a result of the deliberate destruction of their homes and livelihoods.

Nevertheless, almost two years later, these atrocities continue unabated. The government of Sudan continues to carry out air strikes against civilians in Darfur, and the Janjaweed militias, with the support of the government, continue to terrorize the people of Darfur.

Earlier this year, I traveled to Sudan as part of a bipartisan congressional delegation led by my good friend from California, Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi. We visited the camps. As far as the eyes could see, there were crowds of displaced people who had been driven from their homes, living literally on the ground with little tarps just covering them. It is unconscionable that this should continue.

Our delegation also met with Sudanese Vice President Taha. He was unapologetic, he was arrogant, and he was uncompromising on their position in Darfur. Sudanese government officials don't like the use of the word “genocide,” but Vice President Taha admitted that they had funded the Janjaweed in order to retaliate against the rebels of the south who were resisting the Sudanese government.

There can be no doubt that what is taking place in Darfur is genocide, and the government of Sudan is responsible. There are two million displaced people in camps in Darfur and another 200,000 in camps in neighboring Chad. Each month, it is estimated that another 6,000 people die.

On April 5, 2006, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 3127, the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act. This bill imposes sanctions on the government of Sudan and blocks the assets and restricts travel for individuals who are responsible for acts of genocide, war crimes or crimes against humanity in Darfur. I urged my colleagues to support this bill, which passed the House by an overwhelming vote of 416 to 3. This legislation was long overdue.

The world stood by and watched the genocide that occurred in Rwanda. The world has noted over and over again the atrocities of the Holocaust. Yet we cannot seem to get the international community to move fast enough to stop the genocide that is taking place in Darfur.

The world cannot continue to turn a blind eye to genocide when it is staring us in the face. We must put an end to these atrocities, or millions more will die.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to encourage and support the work done by advocacy groups such as Teens Against Genocide and to continue legislative action to stop these crimes against humanity.

ENERGY PRICES IN AMERICA

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

uary 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the privilege to address you. In addressing you, I recognize the American people's ears are tuned as well. It is a precious right we have, our freedom of speech we have in this country, and we exercise it on the floor of this Congress on a regular basis, and I appreciate it on both sides of the aisle.

I came to the floor this evening, Mr. Speaker, to address the energy situation that we have in the United States of America. We have watched our gas prices go up to \$3 a gallon and more in the last few weeks. There was a time when it was headed in that direction, and it headed back down again, and now it is back up, and who knows where it is going to stop. We never know where it is going to stop.

The American people are concerned about this, Mr. Speaker, and they should be. We have debated energy on this floor many, many times, and we have kicked back and forth issue after issue that has to do with how we are going to provide an adequate energy supply to keep this economy churning.

This economy is churning, Mr. Speaker. It is churning consistently. It has got some really unprecedented growth. Ten of the last eleven succeeding quarters have had more than 3 percent growth in our gross domestic product. That is a growth rate that one has to go back to the early Reagan years to match.

Yet this growth rate that we have in this environment, this more than 3 percent growth of our gross domestic product for 10 of the last 11 succeeding quarters, or preceding quarters, is matched back to those Reagan years. But in those years, we were under high inflation, high unemployment and high interest rates.

□ 1900

It was a lot harder to make a predictable profit back in those early years than it is in this environment. Today, this is 3 percent growth-plus. It is more than 3 percent growth, but we are doing this in an environment of relatively low interest rates and lower unemployment rates and lower inflation rates. So this economy has had perhaps the longest run and been the healthiest economic environment I have seen in my lifetime.

I am thankful President Bush stood up and took the lead after the bursting of the dot-com bubble, which sent the United States toward a recession. As the dot-com bubble burst, we had speculators that were investing in our new technological ability to store and transfer information faster than ever before without regard to what that value was worth in the marketplace. And so the economy, the dot-com bubble burst, and that sent us towards a recession, and some will say in a recession.

And then right in that recession we saw the September 11 attack on the United States, on our financial centers, on the Pentagon, and of course on the plane that crashed in the field in Pennsylvania. And that was an attack, again, on our financial centers with an attempt to cripple our economy. Well, not only did it hit a difficult hard blow to our economy but, at the same time, this Congress made the decision to spend hundreds of billions of dollars in homeland security, so we also had to spend hundreds of billions of dollars in our Department of Defense funding to carry out this global war on terror.

So we increased our spending in defense, we created a Department of Homeland Security, and we dramatically grew the spending in homeland security all at the time when our economy was being compressed and reduced because of the hit on our financial centers of September 11 and because of the bursting of the dot-com bubble. And the vision of President Bush was that we had to cut taxes to stimulate the economy, and so we did that.

We did that in two rounds here in this Congress, Mr. Speaker. And we said today that last year our revenue increase by 14½ percent greater than anticipated, and this year it is going to be double digits again, greater than anticipated. These tax cuts have worked. They have brought us out of this recession that was caused by the bursting of the dot-com bubble and the September 11 attacks.

But into the middle of all of this we have the energy issue, the energy issue that has gas prices up to \$3 a gallon or more as it becomes closer and closer, potentially, to an energy crisis. Now, someone once asked, what is the solution to \$3 gas? All of America is asking that question today. What is the solution to \$3 gas? And some wag responded, well, \$3 gas is the solution to \$3 gas. Now, I am not sure that \$3 gas brings us the answer to this, but I do believe \$4 or \$5 or \$6 gas will bring solutions to a lot of our energy problems in this country and energy problems around the world.

We have been, really, beneficiaries of a fairly cheap fuel over the years. We have had good access to resources here in the United States; and our oil companies, especially American oil companies, have gone overseas, developed the oil supplies in the Middle East, for example, the Libyan oil fields and the Iraqi and Iranian oil fields, and the list goes on. Our American companies have been integral to the development of the oil supply that is coming to the United States today, and that oil is coming out of the ground cheap, and it came to the United States cheap.

Not very long ago we had gas at a \$1.07. I don't remember anyone in America saying since we have such cheap gas prices, we ought to pay a little extra to these oil companies that have invested their capital to go out and drill and explore around the world so that we have an adequate supply of