

Mr. Speaker, it is reported they are not even counting deaths from car bombs. We read about deadly car bombs in Iraq nearly every day, and these deaths are not being counted by this administration.

I'm also greatly concerned about the Defense Department adjusting its figures for sectarian killings in the 5-month period before the surge began. There's a major discrepancy between the data on the March 2007 report and the June 2007 report for this period. The original number of approximately 5,500 deaths was increased to 7,400, offering the appearance of significantly decreased violence since the troop surge began.

I must ask, why is this administration working so hard to create the appearance of success in Iraq? Is it to justify the more than \$368 billion we have spent since the inception of Operation Iraqi Freedom? Is it to rationalize the staggering \$10 billion a month we continue to spend in Iraq while we put the lives of our brave soldiers at risk?

During every month of 2007 there have been more U.S. military fatalities than in the same month of 2006. How can anyone possibly say that this new surge is working?

Mr. Speaker, I was hopeful that the administration had perhaps begun listening to the cries of the American people to bring our troops home when reports over the last couple of weeks indicated that General Petraeus was considering a draw down of our current troop levels.

Unfortunately, we learned today that our hopes of redeployment of our military servicemembers will continue to fall on deaf ears, as General Petraeus announced earlier today that he has no intention of scaling back our troop levels in Iraq. In failing to do so, this Nation's attention will remain distracted from adequately protecting the home front, building an adequate health care system, reforming Social Security and decreasing the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush loves to talk about the success of the al Anbar province where he made a surprise visit for a photo opportunity on Labor Day. But there are many conflicting opinions about why violence has decreased, whether or not this is the result of the troop surge, and whether the success in this region is indicative of success in other more complex regions of the country.

Many believe this success may be the result of multilayered issues. It may be an indication that ethnic cleansing has been completed in many neighborhoods and that there are just not as many people left to kill. It may be the result of militants moving to other regions of the country where violence has increased. It may be the result of Sunnis befriending the United States simply as a means to accomplish a larger goal of stepping back into power. It may be the result of Sunnis finally rejecting the routine abuse by al Qaeda. It may be a combination of all of these.

Regardless, we cannot ensure that any success in al Anbar is a result of the troop surge, nor can we ensure that this success can be transferred to other parts of the country. In fact, the overriding component of ensuring success in Iraq is political reconciliation, as pointed out by the GAO and the Jones Commission before the House Armed Services Committee this week.

Military and security progress cannot be made without political reconciliation, which will open the door to resolving the underlying issues that have caused sectarian violence in Iraq.

President Bush has yet to discuss the failing grade given by the GAO to Iraq on political reconciliation.

Mr. Speaker, ignoring reports and underreporting violence is not the answer. This administration has misled the American people for far too long. Enough is enough.

IN GOD WE TRUST

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues can understand me. I've got a little bit of laryngitis.

Mr. Speaker, directly across from me, at the top of the Chamber is a depiction of Moses, and behind me, above the Speaker's rostrum is words, "In God We Trust."

There are a lot of people in this country who have tried to get all symbols of religion, belief in God taken off of all public properties and coins and currency. Recently, there were thousands of coins minted without "In God We Trust" on them, and now they're talking about putting "In God We Trust" in an obscure place on coins so that people can't read it, right on the edge of the coin. I think this is—we're moving in a very, very wrong direction.

This country was formed with a firm reliance on God Almighty, and when we start taking God out of everything, as some people want to do, we run the risk of having him turn his back on us. This Nation was formed and was founded with people praying every day in the Second Continental Congress when we had the Declaration of Independence and in Constitution Hall because they couldn't come to an agreement, and by prayer and supplication they were able to reach agreement; thus, we have the Declaration of Independence, and we had our Constitution that has made this country so wonderfully powerful and respected around the world for the past 250 years.

Those who try to take God off of all things governmental, such as coinage or currency or in this Chamber, are making a terrible mistake, in my opinion. And I'm going to be introducing legislation that will demand or mandate that "In God We Trust" be maintained and retained on our currency

and on our coinage in a prominent place.

Once you start turning your back on the good Lord, I think you are going to reap the whirlwind, and this is something this Nation cannot afford to do right now.

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

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

FAA AIRSPACE REDESIGN

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Aviation Administration has come up with a proposal to redesign the airspace around New York, New Jersey and the Pennsylvania area. Despite all the opposition and all the concerns of the people affected, lo and behold, the FAA made no significant changes in their final proposal. Full steam ahead, business as usual, the public be damned.

So I stand today in strong opposition to the FAA proposal to redesign the airspace around New York, New Jersey and Philadelphia. Specifically, I am disturbed by their actions surrounding the proposal to route up to 600 airplanes a day over Rockland and West Chester Counties in New York, which I represent.

The FAA created that proposal with zero input from the people whose lives would be most harmed by this proposal. In fact, even when I brought this up to the FAA in a meeting in my office, it took over a week of urging before they would even agree to attend a public forum that I held in Rockland.

They also conducted this entire process over the course of several years without any kind of adequate notification. My constituents expected better and they deserved better.

Throughout this process, we have seen, time and time again, that the FAA would ignore the opinions and suggestions of myself and anyone else who would be affected by their proposal. Valid suggestions that would improve this proposal were written off without serious consideration.

The FAA is trying to push through a proposal that doesn't make sense, and they are refusing to accept any changes.

But the plan itself is not my only problem. The misleading tactics and the stonewalling by the FAA only add to this issue. Every effort I and my constituents and some of my colleagues have made has been met with bureaucratic resistance while, at the same time, the FAA has laid down strict deadlines for comments and changes.

Just as an example, I tried multiple times to get an answer for how loud it would be when an airplane flies over us. This is critical information since overflights will be happening up to 600 times a day. All the FAA would tell me were 24-hour noise averages, which tell me nothing. Noise averages mean nothing to us. A room could be silent for 23 hours and have a 140-decibel rock concert for an hour, and the noise average would be something around a whisper. This is just one example of the FAA providing incomplete or misleading information.

In addition, every document the FAA has sent to my office, from the original proposal to the record of decision, has been extremely complicated and vague. I've been living in New York my entire life, and I was unable to interpret the maps of where the planes would be flying over my district. If my staff and I, who are knowledgeable about the region, are unable to decipher the maps, how is the general public supposed to know where the airplanes will be flying over their homes? The answer is that they will not, and that's just what the FAA wants.

It would be easy for the FAA to publish good maps of the area. They could use maps that are labeled with names of cities, streets and bodies of water. They could draw lines of these maps signaling precisely where the planes would be flying and at what altitude, but they chose not to do so. They chose instead to provide strangely colored maps with very few labels, so it was nearly impossible to figure out where

the planes would be routed. It is this type of complex and misleading information that makes me and my constituents distrust the FAA.

And finally, let me say the agency has deliberately manipulated information that it is giving out to be public. For example, my office sent in over 25 pages of comments from over 60 constituents. We also sent in a petition signed by nearly 100 local residents, and finally, we sent 237 pages of a transcript from a public town hall meeting I held in Rockland, which was attended by well over 1,000 people. Dozens of people spoke, not one of whom supported the plan. But the spokesperson for the FAA was quoted in the newspaper claiming they had only received five comments from affected people. Five. This is dishonest. This is unacceptable from an agency that is supposed to represent all of the people in the country.

Mr. Speaker, when the Transportation-HUD appropriations bill came to the House for a vote, I strongly supported an amendment to eliminate funding for this airspace redesign proposal. I did this, not only to express my dislike for the proposal, but also to send a message to the FAA that they cannot treat Americans this way. And I will continue fighting this.

And finally, let me say to my colleagues, this may only right now concern the northeast corridor, but if the FAA can get away with running roughshod over Members of Congress, over constituents, over Americans, they can do it in any region of the country. We need to fight this. This is wrong. If it

can happen in the northeast, it will happen all over America. We must fight this plan, and I will continue to fight it.

REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 306 (b) of S. Con. Res. 21, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the budget allocations and aggregates for the House Committee on Education and Labor for fiscal years 2007, 2008, and the period of 2008 through 2012. These revisions represent adjustments to the Committee on Education and Labor's allocations and aggregates for the purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, and in response to the conference report to accompany H.R. 2669, the College Cost Reduction and Access Act. Corresponding tables are attached.

Under section 211 of S. Con. Res. 21, these adjustments to the budget allocations and aggregates apply while the conference report accompanying H.R. 2669 is under consideration and will take effect upon enactment of the measure. For purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, revised allocations made under section 211 of S. Con. Res. 21 are to be considered as allocations included in the budget resolution.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES
(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

House Committee	2007		2008		2008–2012 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Current allocation:						
Education and Labor	13	4	-150	-145	-750	-742
Change in College Cost Reduction and Access Act (H.R. 2669):						
Education and Labor	-4,890	-4,890	-176	-842	5,754	4,888
Revised allocation:						
Education and Labor	-4,877	-4,886	-326	-987	5,004	4,146

BUDGET AGGREGATES

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal Year 2007	Fiscal Year 2008 ¹	Fiscal Years 2008–2012
Current Aggregates: ²			
Budget Authority	2,255,570	2,350,357	n.a.
Outlays	2,268,649	2,353,992	n.a.
Revenues	1,900,340	2,015,841	11,137,671
Change in College Cost Reduction and Access Act (H.R. 2669):			
Budget Authority	-4,890	-176	n.a.
Outlays	-4,890	-842	n.a.
Revenues	0	0	0
Revised Aggregates:			
Budget Authority	2,250,680	2,350,181	n.a.
Outlays	2,263,759	2,353,150	n.a.
Revenues	1,900,340	2,015,841	11,137,671

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2009 through 2012 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.
¹ Pending action by the House Appropriations Committee on spending covered by section 207(d)(1)(E) (overseas deployments and related activities), resolution assumptions are not included in the current aggregates.
² Excludes emergency amounts exempt from enforcement in the budget resolution.

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

□ 1615

THE TEXAS/MEXICO BORDER

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, last week I got to go down to the west Texas town of El Paso, that town that Marty Robbins sang that famous ballad about. It was one of my several trips to the Texas/Mexico border since I've been in Congress, now almost a dozen times down along the Rio Grande River.

The Texas border with Mexico, the river border, is 1,248 miles long. That doesn't mean much, but it's the same

distance from New York City to Kansas City. And I spent last week in two of those counties, the furthest west county, El Paso County, and the second county to the east, Hudspeth County.

I met with the Sheriff's Department in El Paso County, and Sheriff Leo Samaniego and his chief deputy, Jimmy Apodaca and Public Information Officer Rick Clancy, all El Paso natives, took me around the area of El Paso city and the County of El Paso. I'd like to describe the scene that I saw there.

In El Paso, El Paso is a community of about 500,000 people. Across the Rio Grande River is Juarez, Mexico, a community of over 2 million individuals. Juarez, unlike some border towns, is a thriving area. The economy is booming. And across the city of El Paso, on the Rio Grande River, there is an 18-mile fence. And let me describe that fence between Mexico and the United States. The Rio Grande River is to the south. The next thing you see is green

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