His response to that question was: as soon as the Constitution is amended to include language giving us that power, we will be involved in education. Of course, the Constitution has never been amended to allow the Federal Government to involve itself in education. Neither the word ''education'' nor ''school'' is anywhere in the U.S. Constitution.

With that being said, no one here, not the gentleman from Utah, the gentleman from Texas, nor the gentlewoman from North Carolina would ever make the statement that education is not important. We all agree about the importance of quality education in all 50 States. We just believe there is a better way, and that is return control of education to the local authorities, local school boards, and to the parents.

One of the problems when we look at the issues out there, people put a test of importance on the issue. Just because an issue is important, does that mean that the Federal Government should become involved? Again, I would look back to what the Founders said. There was never a test of importance by the Founding Fathers as far as the Constitution is concerned. They did not say if something is important, therefore the Federal Government should become involved. Rather, is it constitutional?

Each night here, when we pull out our card to vote, we should ask ourselves: Is it in the Constitution? Is it constitutional?

In the area of education, it is not. We have lost control of education from the State level to the Federal level. Lest anyone think that we are doing a better job of this, I refer them back to the 1960s when the ESEA, Elementary Secondary Education Act, was first put into place, when education standards in this country were some of the highest. Since that time, the Federal Government's role has increased dramatically, and we have seen where that has brought us. The level of education in this country, unfortunately, has gone down.

That is why I am a proud supporter of H.R. 3499. It will return control to the people who are in the best position to exercise that authority: parents, local school boards, localities, and the States. I know also when you talk to those people who are on the front line, they will tell us of all of their frustration they have dealing with Federal mandates and with all of the Federal strings and controls.

In New Jersey, I asked exactly how much money are you getting from the Federal Government. In our State, I don't know how it is in other States, we get around three cents on the dollar from the Federal Government. In return for those three pennies, the Federal Government is basically exercising all of this control, all of this regulation that the local school board must comply with or else. And that is why H.R. 3499 is so important. H.R. 3499 will return that authority back to the local school board.

They will be in the position to say do we have to comply with these Federal regulations or not. I would hazard to guess in many instances local school boards will tell their legislators, we do not want to have to comply with all these Federal regulations. We do not want the legislation to go in that direction.

I conclude by reminding this House and the Federal Government that we should look to the U.S. Constitution for direction, is it constitutional in the area of education, and leave it to the appropriate parties. I again commend the gentleman from Texas for his excellent work in moving in that direction.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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, May 4, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under Clause 2(g) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I herewith designate Ms. Marjorie C. Kelaher, Deputy Clerk, and Mr. Jorge E. Sorensen, Deputy Clerk, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which they would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

These designations shall remain in effect for the 109th Congress or until modified by me.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

VACATING 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the order of the House providing the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) a 5-minute Special Order speech is vacated.

There was no objection.

ISSUES FACING CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, tonight I think it is important that we reflect on what is happening here in Washington, D.C. Here in this House we have enormous issues that are facing us as a legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, I believe as American people and their representatives, we are still wrestling with those issues that every American is wrestling with. There are a lot of challenges. We want to keep our economy moving, and I think there is agreement here in Washington, D.C. as the people's representatives that we want to make sure that we have governmental policies that aid in that, not hinder that.

Mr. Speaker, we also have an enormous debate about energy and the rising cost of energy facing every American. I drive my automobile just like everyone else drives their automobile, and I still pay at the pumps. I guess some Americans would laugh and think I guess these highfalutin Members of Congress do not even pump their own gasoline, but we do. I do.

I face the same burden that all Americans are facing with the high price of gasoline, the high price of electrical energy, the high price of natural gas. And it has a ripple effect on the economy in terms of jobs and job creation. It has a ripple effect on what the American people think about the direction of our country based on what we pay at the pumps, what we pay for energy. And we here in this Congress are wrestling with that issue, as well as how to get energy prices down for the American people.

There are a lot of other issues we are wrestling with, but there is a clear difference between the philosophies of those on my side of the aisle, the Republican side of the aisle, the majority in the House, and the philosophy that governs those on the other side of the aisle, the liberals, the Democrats, those in the minority.

We have a clear difference of opinion on how to tackle these tough issues, and so let us first begin with economic policy.

President Bush came to office and during the late stages of 2000, the economy turned down. We had a recession. We had a recession in late 2000 through early 2001. As President Bush came to office, the economy was in recession and the President made a bold statement, a commitment to the American people, that he would cut taxes to reinvigorate the economy. He did just that.

President Bush's tax cuts of 2001 and again in 2003 after the devastating attacks of 9/11, these two tax cuts were

the biggest since Ronald Reagan's first term. As a result, 109 million American taxpayers have seen their taxes decline by an average of $1,544 per individual, per worker. That is, 109 million Americans are paying less in taxes to the tune of $1,544 a person. That is a positive effect; and as a result, the economy began to move.

A family of four making $40,000 received tax relief of $1,933; nearly $2,000 of tax reduction on a family of four making $40,000.

□ 1545

Now that is not a tax cut for the rich. That is a wonderful impact on working men and women that are trying to provide for themselves and for their children. It enables them to actually pay for school uniforms, enables them to pay for their children's education. Forty-two million families with children received a tax cut of $2,067. That is positive. One hundred and twenty-three million elderly individuals received a tax cut of $1,795. Lots of numbers to talk about. But what does this do for the economy?

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, here we have a chart showing that tax relief has spurred business investment. You can see the negative investment of late 2000 through 2003, and that is because of the recession. Businesses were not able to reinvest.

What happened with the tax cuts of 2001 and again in 2003, you see a very strong stimulus on business investment. When businesses invest, more people are employed. When businesses invest, there are more taxes paid into the government. And when people are employed, they don't take from government. They don't require government assistance. They actually pay income taxes.

So let's see what the tax cuts have done to job growth.

Here again, you see unemployment go down with this red line, and job growth go up because of President Bush's stimulus package we put in place. Twenty-five million small business owners saved, on average, $2,800; 4.7 million new jobs created in the last 29 months; 17 straight quarters of economic growth; and an unemployment rate under 5 percent. Now that is a stronger unemployment rate than all the '90s, all of the '80s, all of the '70s, all of the '60s. That is a very positive thing.

Over 60 percent of Americans that received dividends and capital gains, they are under $100,000-a-year earners. That is not a sop to the rich. It is middle-class individuals that received this stimulus package and this benefit that we Republicans, and our President, put in place.

In my State of North Carolina, in the next 6 years, we are projected to grow 22,000 new jobs; and in my home district, unemployment has been reduced significantly in the last 5 years.

Now we still have our challenges in the 10th District of North Carolina, Mr. Speaker, but we are seeing savings grow. We are seeing people going back to get the training they need to compete in a new job. We are seeing a real turnaround in the economy, and it is because people get to keep more of what they earn instead of paying it into the government.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very basic concept that we, as conservatives, believe and that is that individuals can make better choices. Individuals can stimulate the economy. Government does not. Therefore, the more money we allow people to keep, the more of their own hard-earned dollars that they are able to keep, the more they can do in their communities, the more they are able to do to benefit their schools, Mr. Speaker.

But, you know, there are those on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats in this institution, that don't want to continue President Bush's tax cuts. They say, roll back the Bush tax cuts. That is what they scream. The government needs more money.

Well, I will tell you, the receipts to government have gone up in the last 5 years because more people are working, businesses are growing, businesses are investing in individuals, and you are seeing a turnaround in our economy. And the turnaround in our economy leads to more government income.

And you know what? If we do not continue the Bush tax cuts and make them permanent, you will see job losses. You will see a hundred billion less in economic output next year, and you will see slower wage growth and salary growth. And you will also see low-income workers have to pay more in taxes.

President Bush cut the tax rate of the lowest earners from 15 percent to 10 percent. And if we roll back the Bush tax cuts, what we will do is increase their taxes by nearly 50 percent, because they will have to go back up to the 15 percent rate. By 50 percent, I should say.

Taxpayers with children will lose 50 percent of the child tax credit under their plan, and you will see the Federal death tax being reinstated after 2011.

That is their economic policy. It is a big no to our optimistic version of reality. We view America as being better and brighter the less Americans have to pay in taxes. We see Americans being able to do better things with their money than a bureaucrat in Washington, D.C., can do.

But what is the Democrats' plan when it comes to energy? I will show you the Democrat plan when it comes to energy. The Democrats' agenda on energy is right here outlined on this white sheet of paper. That is the Democrat plan when it comes to energy policy in the United States. Nothing. They have nothing to offer. They have offered nothing except demagoguery. That is all they have offered.

As Republicans put forth serious energy policies, the Democrats have voted no. As Republicans have tried to come up with a compromise so that we can increase production here at home so we are not more dependent on foreign oil, the Democrats have said no. This is the Democrat plan when it comes to gas prices. This is the Democrat plan when it comes to energy policy. Nothing.

But let's look at their votes. Let's look at their votes, Mr. Speaker. Here we see the Energy Policy Act of 2004, to enhance energy conversation and research and development and provide for security and diversity in our natural resource and natural energy supply. The roll call vote, 152 Democrats voted no. We still passed the legislation.

One hundred and twenty-four Democrats voted against the Energy Policy Act of 2005 conference report, the final product, to provide $14.5 billion in tax incentives to improve energy production so that we could actually have more, larger energy supply as consumers, to improve the transportation of energy to the marketplace so we could actually consume it, and the efficiency of energy production so we could have more of it again. They voted no; 124 voted no. Well, that is a pickup of a few, at least. But still not a responsible vote.

One hundred and fifty-four Democrats voted against the Energy Conservation, Research and Development Bill in 2003. We have a series here of votes in 2003, 2004 and 2005, and the Democrats said no. That is their energy policy, a big no.

Let's also continue with this stream of consciousness here.

Democrats voted against the Energy Conservation Research and Development Act of 2003, 157 votes. A different vote. But they again said no.

One hundred and seventy-two Democrats voted against Securing America's Future Energy Act in 2001 to foster conservation, improve energy efficiency, increase domestic energy production and expand the use of renewable energy sources.

Do we see a theme here? We can go back 5, 6 years, just in this decade. The Democrats have repeatedly said no to an energy policy for the United States.

One hundred and sixty-six Democrats voted against ANWR exploration.

Now, look. 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, I can show you these in the charts. They have repeatedly said no to an energy policy here in the United States; and, as a result, we were not able to enact an energy law, an energy act for this country until just last year. Over their objections, over that party's objections, the liberals' objections, we passed an energy policy that was far, far, far and away a reasonable approach to get more energy production on-line, to increase the supply and, therefore, lessen the burden of expense on every American. You see that they said no repeatedly to an energy policy.

What do we have today? We have oil that costs $73 per barrel and going up. We have refineries that can't meet the demands the American people need to

fuel their automobiles. We have high natural gas prices. We have a Senator in the other Chamber from Massachusetts who says that we cannot have wind energy production in his State because he doesn't like the way it looks.

Then we have those that say, do not explore for new natural resources. They are all part of the left wing agenda of the opposition party in this Chamber. They want to say no to energy production. They want to say no to refining. They want to say no to exploration.

And then what do we have as a result? High energy prices.

I go back to originally what I said. The Democrat agenda, nothing.

Maybe I am wrong, though. Maybe they do have an energy policy. Maybe they do have a tax policy. The tax policy is pretty simple. We want you to pay more, Americans. We want more money for the Federal Government. Maybe their energy policy is we want you to pay more. That is how their votes have lined up.

When Republicans come forward and say we have alternative energy that we are trying to push through tax incentives, they said, no, it is a sop to the energy companies. No, it is an incentive for research and development of alternative energies so we are not more dependent on foreign oil.

When we come forward and say let's explore for natural resources, for oil here at home, what do they say? No.

Do you see where I am going, Mr. Speaker, with this?

Their policy is no. If not no, then more. We want you to pay more.

It was about a decade ago that Senator KERRY said that he looked forward to the day when gas cost $3 a gallon. I thought it was surprising then. Perhaps his votes line up with his philosophy. Perhaps his votes line up with his goal. Because we are there. We have gas at $3 a gallon.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is very disheartening when you see the Democrats consistently vote against reasonable approaches to increase the supply of energy for Americans. Because all Americans know that the law of supply and demand is a very strong force. It is the basis of our economy. And when the supply is constricted and the demand keeps rising, the prices rise with the demand.

The Democrats' policies have constricted oil production and refining, energy production and marketing; and, therefore, as the demand goes up, the cost naturally follows the demand. So when you talk about the oil companies raising the price of gasoline, the refineries raising the price of refining, the only reason why they are able to do that is because of a market economy that we have here in the United States.

□ 1600

And that market economy relies on supply and demand to dictate price. And when we put in place government policies that say that we cannot take oil out of the ground that we know is there or natural gas that is in the ground and we know is there, that we cannot actually produce refineries to refine that fuel, when we cannot put on more nuclear reactors and nuclear energy production on line, naturally by constricting that supply, the prices will go up.

And as a conservative, my alternative is pretty simple: we get more production online, we get more competition in the energy marketplace through alternative fuels, through alternative energy, through incentives to move to alternative energy, you will see the oil companies begin to compete for our dollars. Right now because the supply is so constricted, they can charge us whatever they possibly can, whatever they think they can get away with. So my answer is pretty simple. As a public policymaker, if we put another tax on the oil companies, the oil companies will pass it right on to us as consumers because that is what corporations do with taxation and regulatory burdens. They pass that expense to the consumers.

So my philosophy is pretty simple: you get more competition in the marketplace, you open up the supply, and that cost will come down. And that is what we are trying to do with a coherent energy policy here in the United States, and that is what Republicans are trying to do here in Congress.

So I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join with us to increase that supply of energy into the marketplace, to increase research, to increase development of alternative energy sources as well, but to also listen to the American people and their demands. And their demands are very clear: we want relief and we want it now.

Well, I have got news, Mr. Speaker, for the American people. We Republicans in Congress are taking on this challenge, and we will get more production online. We will relieve the regulatory burden for getting new energy sources into the marketplace, but we also will continue economic growth here in the United States. And the way we do that is by getting the government off the backs of the American people, the working Americans, that are trying to help their families, trying to grow their communities, and trying to do what is right on the local level.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, there is a lot of rhetoric going on here in Washington, DC that the other side of the aisle refers to as ''a culture'' here in Washington, DC. And there is a culture. It is a culture of more spending, higher taxes, left-wing environmentalist groups writing policy for our United States Government. And we are trying to break that as conservatives, as Republicans. We are trying to break that cycle, that culture, here in Washington.

The Democrats want to take us back. They do not want to look at new ways of doing things. They want to take us back to how they ran this institution for 40 years, how they kept increasing the size and scope of government over decades. Well, the American people want an optimistic alternative, a positive agenda. They actually want an energy policy. They actually want a progrowth economic policy as well that allows people to keep more of what they earn. They also want a government that is responsive and not intrusive. And that is what we are trying to provide as conservatives. I think that is what the American people want.

And I am very proud to be part of the majority party, very proud to be a Republican, working hard for the American people to do what is right, to do what is necessary to make sure that we are safe, secure, energy independent, economically independent, and a dominant factor in this world that we live in that is dangerous, highly competitive, but ever changing. And we are trying to embrace those changes and compete in this tough world that we live in.

Mr. Speaker, we Republicans have an agenda, an optimistic agenda, about how to change America, how to reduce the size and scope of government, how to enable people to keep more of what they earn and make us independent in terms of our energy policy.

The Democrats, they have a simple alternative, and it is their agenda here: nothing. They have yet to put out an agenda. They have yet to talk in proactive ways. They have yet to lead.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that we Republicans are leading to make America safe, secure, and economically strong.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE TO BE AVAILABLE TO SERVE ON INVESTIGATIVE SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5(a)(4)(A) of rule X, and the order of the House of December 18, 2005, the Chair announces that the Speaker named the following Members of the House to be available to serve on investigative subcommittees of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for the 109th Congress:

Mr. ENGLISH, Pennsylvania
Mr. LUCAS, Oklahoma
Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, Florida
Mrs. BLACKBURN, Tennessee
Mr. SIMPSON, Idaho
Mr. BONNER, Alabama
Mr. BACHUS, Alabama
Mr. CRENSHAW, Florida
Mr. LATHAM, Iowa
Mr. WALDEN, Oregon

THE EFFECTS OF MULTICULTURALISM AND ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION ON OUR NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to come to the