

Christian children's books written in English because they contained illustrations of Bible prophets Moses and Abraham, an alleged violation of Islamic Shariah law.

The Malaysian Government's publications and "Religious Enforcement Police" found that the images of Bible characters in the Christian books offended the sensitivities of Muslims and must be banished.

Malaysian Prime Minister Badawi indicated other religions must understand that Islam is the true religion for Malaysia.

The government's "midnight raid" on these books infringes on the basic human right of religious freedom, a right which ironically is protected in the Malaysian constitution, but nonexistent under Islamic Shariah law. This is yet another example of the problems with a State religion.

Ghandi once said, "If we are to respect others' religions as we would have them respect ours, a study of the world's religions is a sacred duty." The Malaysian government expects all religions to be tolerant of the Islamic religion, but hypocritically is intolerant of the Christian faith.

And that's just the way it is.

VERRIDE SCHIP VETO

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

Ms. WATSON. Today, I join my colleagues, Madam Speaker, to override the President's veto of H.R. 3963, which the President vetoed on December 12. Since then, we received more discouraging news regarding the growing domestic and global economic crisis. It is imperative that we look at the impact of the downturn on our Nation's children. A slowing economy will definitely lead to an increased demand nationwide for SCHIP services.

Overriding the President's veto of SCHIP is more critical than ever during this period of economic downturn. I urge my colleagues to join me to override the President's veto and to guarantee that sufficient funding levels to address the need of our Nation's uninsured children become a reality.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

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

Mr. STEARNS. As Congress contemplates an economic stimulus package to aid our slowing economy, we also must commit ourselves to reduce Federal spending.

As American families tighten their budgets to weather this impending economic storm, Congress should match their sacrifice. While reducing taxes is important, another aspect is to control the Federal deficits, the Federal spending. A decrease in wasteful spending

would directly increase the value of the dollar and ultimately lower deficits.

The American people and businesses are better at deciding what to do with their money than the Federal Government. With more money in their hands, an increase in investment in our economy and in increase in personal savings would take hold and ultimately lead to a stronger and growing economy.

As we in Congress consider this one-time stimulus package over the next few weeks, I contend that a long-term solution to this problem is to lower spending, which will in turn lead to lower taxes and a permanent economic bounce and revitalization.

FIGHTING POVERTY

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

Mr. JEFFERSON. Madam Speaker, I rise to thank Representative BARBARA LEE for passing her resolution yesterday committing our Nation to fight poverty.

Nowhere is this commitment and action needed more than in the City of New Orleans. Ironically, on the day that the levees broke in New Orleans, 2½ years ago, the Census Bureau was releasing its report on poverty, showing that Orleans Parish had a poverty rate of 23.2 percent, seventh highest in the 290 large counties in America. Thirty-five percent of the city's African American population is classified as poor. Seventy-seven percent of the students in New Orleans participate in free or reduced-cost lunch programs. Pre-Katrina African Americans made up 67 percent of New Orleans, but 84 percent of its population is below the poverty line. And it is mostly in its 47 neighborhoods of extreme poverty where our citizens are still out of town, unable to return and share in the rebuilding of New Orleans.

So the commitment of our Nation must not be just to recover the City of New Orleans, but also to focus on the peculiar needs of its impoverished citizens, needs existing before Katrina made much more desperate since.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS

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

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, today's economic debate should focus on big picture tax policies that emphasize sustained prosperity for American workers and their families.

A one-time, consumption-driven stimulus may be popular, but what we really need is tax relief that will energize economic growth. We need certainty for our industry which is currently making tomorrow's business plans today based on the assumption that taxes are going to increase dramatically.

We should also reduce tax rates on our companies from the highest tax rates in the world to instead placing American employers on an even tax footing globally.

Madam Speaker, today's economy didn't happen overnight, and tomorrow's growth and prosperity will depend on our commitment to bold, forward-looking tax policies now.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

(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. Madam Speaker, I have risen several times on the floor of the House to encourage my colleagues to consider the mortgage crisis when we talk about an economic stimulus package.

It is well known that an economic stimulus package should stimulate and it should be driven by existing law. But there is no reason why we cannot find a connector for a 90-day moratorium, a moratorium on those who are about to go over the brink and provide a freeze on those adjustable rates. An economic stimulus package is to stimulate. What more stimulation than for people to keep their homes and pay their mortgages.

Might I also say that as the mortgage collapse goes, then families are subject to not having their children covered by the SCHIP program. The debate today will be enormously important because it will cost less than \$3.50 a day to provide for these children. And as well, it will help States all over the Nation, including the 1 million children in Texas that no longer have health insurance because of this horrific veto.

We need a stimulus package that provides people with housing and a stimulus package that takes care of our children.

□ 1045

THE BEST ECONOMIC STIMULUS IS A JOB

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I think we all know that the best economic stimulus is a job. It is a job that you can sink your teeth into, that you can go to work every day and you can use this job to provide for your family. So, as the debate ensues, let's keep our focus on how policies affect the environment in which job growth takes place. Of course we all want to see lower marginal rates on our income tax rate. We want to lower cap gains. We want to lower the corporate tax rate. We want to see full and immediate section 179 expensing for our small businesses. And for those of us that live in States that do not have a State income

tax, we want to see deductibility of State sales tax extended. All of these are good things and, Madam Speaker, we are working for all of these. I hope that we also will keep in mind that actions speak louder than words. So this body should use this conversation about economic stimulus as an opportunity to prioritize and reduce what the Federal Government spends. Reduce the budget. Let's spend less. And remember, the best economic stimulus is a job.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2007—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the bill (H.R. 3963) to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

(For veto message, see proceedings of the House of December 12, 2007, at page H15382)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Madam Speaker, I yield, also, 15 minutes of my time to the distinguished gentleman from New York, my good friend, Mr. RANGEL, and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the matter under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, stock markets around the world are plummeting. Home foreclosures are ballooning. States, without exception, are facing budget crises. Employers are cutting jobs. Gas and heating oil prices are draining household budgets. The vote of my colleagues today can stop tomorrow's headline from saying American

children are losing health care. This vote to override the President's veto of the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2007 will not only bring health care to 10 million children, it will protect children and families who may lose their jobs and no longer have health insurance. This is not lip service. This is health coverage.

The bill includes mental health services on a par with medical services. It requires dental services be afforded our children. It protects school-based health services and rehabilitation and case management services for those with disabilities. It provides outreach and enrollment grants and new funding for obesity program.

We know from a recent 2005 study that investing \$1 million in State funds in Medicaid will generate 33 new jobs and \$1.23 million in new wages in a year. This bill strengthens that safety net by allocating the funds that States need to protect and cover more low-income children.

It should be noted that every complaint that the administration has set forth about this legislation has been met. The bill passed with the support of 265 Members, including 43 of our good Republican colleagues. It passed the Senate with 64 Members, including 17 of our Republican colleagues.

I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto. Vote to secure health care for our children. It is right, it is decent, and it is necessary.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) have 15 minutes of the time I control to control as he sees fit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I recognize myself for such time as I may consume.

Well, here we go again. Depending on how you count it, this is somewhere between the ninth and the 13th time that we have been on the floor of the House in this session of Congress debating the SCHIP program. That seems a little ironic since it's a program that both sides of the aisle support, and I would support enthusiastically.

I listened intently to what my good friend from Michigan, the dean of the House, Mr. DINGELL just said about the program, and I feel compelled to point out a few things that he failed to mention. Number 1, every American in this country, if they're below 100 percent of poverty, receives health care if they wish it through a program called Medicaid. If you are above 100 percent of poverty and are a child, right now a child is defined as an individual between the ages of birth and 19 years old, between 100 and 200 percent of poverty, you can receive health care through the SCHIP program, which is a State-Federal partnership.

The numbers are somewhat in dispute, but we believe that under the current program, in the neighborhood, I believe, of 6 million children and 600 to 700,000 adults are receiving health care through SCHIP. If you're above 200 percent of poverty, hopefully you have insurance through your own health insurance program or through a program provided by your employer.

There are some States that cover children up to 250 percent of poverty, and there are some States that cover them up to 300 percent of poverty. And there are a few States that have petitioned to cover them up to 350 percent of poverty.

So on the Republican side of the aisle, here are the principles that we adhere to in this debate. If you're a child between the ages, up to the age of 19 and your family income is over 100 percent of poverty or less than 200 percent of poverty, we believe you should have health care through SCHIP and we want to fund it, and we want to work with the States to get as many children in that category covered.

If you're an adult, we don't believe you should be covered under SCHIP, so we think that the 6 to 700,000 adults should be transitioned off of SCHIP and put back on Medicaid.

If you're above 200 percent of poverty, we want to work with the States. We want to work with the private sector to come up with innovative plans to cover those children that perhaps aren't covered and their family income is above 200 percent of poverty.

If you're not a citizen of the United States, we don't believe you should receive health care coverage under SCHIP.

So that's what the debate is about. The Democrats want to expand the coverage. There are some of them that want to use it as a surrogate for universal health care for every American in this country. I don't say that all of my friends on the Democratic side do, but some do.

So the Republicans' position is, continue the existing program, perhaps increase coverage somewhat above 200 percent of poverty; cover every child in America between 100 and 200 percent; don't cover illegal aliens; and transition adults off of SCHIP.

The law of the land, the Barton-Deal bill that we passed in December, extends the basic program that I just outlined, I believe, through March of 2009.

So, once again, we're going to have a vote on the President's veto. I predict we're going to sustain that veto. And then I'm still hopeful that Mr. DINGELL and Mr. RANGEL and Mr. STARK and Mr. PALLONE, who are the leaders on this issue in the House, will convene their various committees, and we'll do legislative hearings and then put together a bipartisan bill and mark it up in committee and then bring it to the floor, and we can have a permanent authorization of SCHIP sometime in this Congress.