

had the opportunity to meet this outstanding young man. I can so relate to him, and I'm sure the rest of us can, in that he had his fair challenges in life.

Here are some of the words that have been used to describe this young man, just briefly, from his mom, Colleen.

"He's my son, my little boy, and my friend. He always made me proud and never disappointed me. His wit he shared with everyone. He always looked out for the underdog and did what he had to do. When he was with his kids and his sister's kids, the room was full of love. I'll miss his head in my lap when talking and watching TV. He was not afraid to show his love. But he's home in my heart and soul today."

From his father, Greg: "His grandpa was in the Marines. His uncle was a Marine. His father was in the Army, and my older brother was in the Army," Greg said. "So there's a family service thing here. He wanted to make a mark."

In a last but fitting honor, Private First Class Lemke was posthumously promoted to the rank of corporal. So today, Madam Speaker, as Corporal Lemke's family, friends, and his fellow soldiers come together at Fort Lewis to remember him in a memorial ceremony, I rise to honor this valiant soldier, loving son, and father, and to express my gratitude, condolences and that of the House to those who knew him and loved him best.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

□ 1530

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

(Mr. FRANKS of Arizona 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 Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR 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 Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO 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 New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York 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. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER 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 Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WELDON of Florida 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 Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP: THE ECONOMY

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 as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to come before the House once again. As you know, the 30-something Working Group comes to the floor to share issues that are before the Congress not only with many of our colleagues but also with the American people.

But at this time, Madam Speaker, I am going to yield to Congresswoman MOORE.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Thank you so much, Representative.

I rise, Madam Speaker, to memorialize another of my constituents, Private First Class Keith Lloyd, who died of wounds suffered when the vehicle he was in struck a roadside bomb in Iraq at the tender age of 26 on January 12.

He was born in Milwaukee. He went to elementary school in Milwaukee prior to his family moving to Oak Creek and then to South Milwaukee. Lloyd graduated from South Milwaukee High School in my district in 2000 and worked in a number of retail stores. He also took courses at Milwaukee Area Technical College in Oak Creek and ITT Technical Institute in Milwaukee.

According to media reports, as a teen, Private First Class Lloyd was not crazy about high school, but he never shirked the responsibility that came with it. After graduation he wasn't quite sure what career path to take, like many high school graduates, including myself.

Finally, as a young man, he decided to follow the path of his younger brother, who had just completed a tour of duty in Iraq with the United States Army. According to his sister Christine, he was looking for direction. He

wanted to make something of himself and thought the Army was a good place to do that. He enlisted in March 2007, and, indeed, he made much of his life and paid the ultimate price for us, his fellow Americans.

This was a young man who did not want to sit on the bench and let life pass him by.

His sister also noted that he had a big heart and would do anything for anybody.

Private First Class Lloyd deployed to Iraq in November as a member of the 1st Squadron, 3rd Armored Cavalry Regiment based in Fort Hood, Texas.

Yesterday Private First Class Lloyd was laid to rest at Good Hope Cemetery in Milwaukee.

Madam Speaker, I wish to express my deepest sympathy and condolences to the family of Private First Class Lloyd today: his sister, Christine; brother Thomas; his mom, Cynthia Allam; his dad and stepmother, Gary and Joanne Lloyd; sister Cora Lloyd; and brothers Kraig, Gary, and Joshua Lloyd.

These men certainly made the lives of those around them better day by day and exemplified the character and qualities that enrich our communities and our Nation. This is indeed a sad day for the Nation. While as the Bible says, "each heart knows its own grief" and I cannot possibly understand the grief their families are going through today, I offer this timely tribute today to express the gratitude of a Nation and my condolences on their loss.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you so very much, Ms. MOORE. And I can tell you anytime we get a chance to come to the floor and honor our patriots is always a day that the Congress should yield and pay respect to not only that individual but also the family.

Madam Speaker, I think it's important we start to look at what the Congress is facing right now and the American people are facing right now as it relates to the economy. The news has been for the last 5 to 10 days the economy, stimulating the economy, and it is very important that we do so. And as you know, many news accounts have shown the President, also the Speaker of the House, and the Democratic leader in the Senate meeting. You have also seen meetings with the Republican leadership and Democratic leadership here in the Congress. The American people are counting on us working in a bipartisan way, and I just want to make sure that all Members know that this is nothing new for the Democratic House of Representatives, especially the majority of Democrats that are here, because we came in saying we wanted to work in a bipartisan way. As a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, I went back and pulled out a chart because so many times here in the 30-something Working Group it's important that we share with the Members what we have already done and what we can do. And I will use this chart all the way up to today.

Many of these acts took place in the first session of the 110th Congress, and it was the first time, with your help,

Madam Speaker, we were able to take the majority of the House:

Implementation of the 9/11 Commission recommendations, H.R. 1, passed with 299 Democratic votes with 68 Republican votes. Raising the minimum wage, H.R. 2, passed 315 with 82 Republican votes. The funding for enhanced stem cell research passed 253 with 37 Republican votes. Making prescription drugs more affordable, H.R. 4, passed 255 with 24 Republican votes. And cutting student loan interest rates in half, H.R. 5, passed this House of course with Democratic votes, all the Democratic votes, 356 with 124 Republicans voting with Democrats on that bill in a bipartisan way. And also creating long-term energy initiatives, H.R. 6, which passed 264 votes with 36 of those votes being Republican votes.

That's bipartisanship. Those are major pieces of legislation, Madam Speaker. This is nothing new to the Democratic majority.

I think it's also important to point to just today here on this floor maybe about 2 hours ago, Democrats and Republicans voted to override the President's veto, and that vote was a bipartisan vote, not enough to stop the President from stopping us from doing what the American people wanted us to do. A bipartisan vote, 265, and that vote was a very important vote. We had 43 Republicans voting with us on that.

I think it's important, Madam Speaker, as we start to move forth on this whole economic stimulus discussion that we continue to work in a bipartisan way, but we're going to need more bipartisanship. Democrats are there at the line ready to do it. And I have a document here that's very easy for any Member to get a copy of that was prepared by the office of the majority leader on June 5 of 2007: "House Democrats' bipartisanship leads to progress." And I also would ask all of my Republican colleagues to grab a copy of it. But I think that it's important that we reflect back on this document to really pay attention to what we have already done and what we can do. But we don't want to end up getting ourselves in a situation where we start deal breaking. When I say "deal breaking," we know that the President and we know that the majority leader has met and we know that the Speaker has met at the White House just recently, just yesterday, and they have been meeting and talking on the telephone. As you know, we try to break this down as much as we can. We also know that in the House, we have had a Democratic economic forum, which was December 7, closing out last year. This whole economic stimulus discussion and effort did not start when it started hitting headlines. We were already out there on these issues. Ongoing discussion between House leaders and Secretary Paulson, who is the Secretary of the Department of Treasury, that has been going on. So many dates, too many to note here on this chart. A

Democratic leadership letter to the President dated the 11th of this month. Also the Speaker has met with the Federal Reserve Chairman on January 14 and also the Democratic leadership meeting with Republican leaders on January 16. And those discussions continue to go on, some that are documented, some that are undocumented. A Democratic leadership meeting with Republican leaders again the following day. We also had a Democratic and Republican leadership meeting with the Treasury Secretary that took place on January 22, just a day ago. Also a Democratic and Republican leadership meeting with the President that I mentioned a little earlier.

We're going to continue to pay attention to this bipartisanship, and when I say "we," I mean those of us in the 30-something Working Group, because I think it should be encouraged. We have always talk about it. I, being a creature of two previous Congresses, always said that bipartisanship can only be achieved when the majority allows it to happen. We have a Democratic majority now that is allowing it to happen. If we start talking and going back and forth on retail politics, the only people that are going to lose are the American people, and I'm not in the business of seeing that happen.

I think it's important also to know that there will be statements made and we have to make sure that we clear those statements up so that we don't have misunderstandings and we start going off into another direction on this whole effort of bipartisanship. I'm saying that and I came to the floor with that theme here today because it's important. If folks want to prove the differences between the two parties, find another way to do it, not necessarily on this economic stimulus package because so many Americans, Democrat, Republican, independent, those that can't even vote yet, those individuals that are dealing with the muddiness of life, that don't have what they need to make ends meet, and our economy is not in the posture for us to play games for several months to come going back and forth. So as much as we can as Members of the House, we need to meet. We need to understand one another. When we misunderstand one another, we need to meet again to make sure that we can work together, something that everyone talks about during the election season that they want to go to Washington, D.C. and work in a bipartisan way. I don't care where you are, if your district is 89 percent Republican or 89 percent Democrat or what have you, independent, Green Party, you name it. You don't want to run on the platform that I'm going to Washington, D.C. to be a partisan. You don't run on that platform. You run on the platform that you're going to bring people together, that you're going to work across the aisle to get the job done for your constituents.

□ 1545

So I think it is very, very important, Madam Speaker, to put those words into action.

And what I am seeing here and what I have seen, Madam Speaker, of the last 4 to 5 days have been what one may see in a piece of campaign literature or what one may see when someone speaks on television about how they are going to do things better if they get an opportunity to do it. You have that opportunity. Don't let that opportunity slip through your fingers when others try to derail the process.

Today, I can say that what took place was an effort, and we tried to override the President on the children's health insurance bill, we may say the State Children's Health Insurance program. I think it is important with the 42 Republicans that voted along with Democrats, 218 Democrats voted in affirmative, it wasn't enough to override the President, but it was a part of trying to take some of the burden off American families, because those families that are hurting right now, we know that health care cost is a huge issue when you start looking at how we are going to move this ball forward and how we are going to help American families.

There are a number of organizations that are in support of the State insurance plan, what we call SCHIP, that are in support of this great piece of legislation. You have the AARP. You have the American Medical Association. You have Catholic Health Association, and Families U.S.A., along with a host of other organizations that I could spend 30 minutes on the floor reading every last one of them off. But that is not going to make a difference right now for this debate or the action that we were going to take, that hopefully we wanted to take place a couple of hours ago, to be able to allow children that are in need of health care insurance. We were denied that opportunity, and I can't say that the Republicans stopped us. I can say that 42 Republicans did what they had to do to be able to stimulate this, not only this economy, putting more dollars into the pockets, very few dollars into the pockets of Americans so that they don't have to spend those dollars in providing health care to kids that happen to be born into financially challenged families, and that would have been a way to assist them. But there were a number of Republicans that voted against the legislation that denied us from having that opportunity.

But I have hope, Madam Speaker, that before this 110th Congress is out we will be able to provide that level of health care. We talked about universal health care. Starting with our children first is very, very imperative for us to be able to head in that direction.

As we start dealing with the issues, when we move to the Senate, we have rule 22, that you have to have 60 Senators to be able to bring anything to the floor in an appropriate way or to be

able to procedurally get it there. I think it is important because I am trying to look down the road because I have been down this road before. We get that warm and fuzzy feeling in our heart and start believing what we are reading and start saying, Wow, this is unbelievable. People are working together and we are actually going to move something through the process. Republicans are happy. Democrats are happy. And then we run into a handful of Senators, and the Senate may very well say, Well, we are not happy. And the reason why we are not happy is that I want to make sure that I can make some of the tax cuts that have been put out there now that are not right put into the moment, because that is what this is about.

This stimulus package is not about stimulating the economy 8 months from now. It is about stimulating the economy right now. And it's important that we get it to the target audience that is going to help us do that. And so I think that any other great ideas that may come out of, independently of the bipartisan discussion that has been going on for almost double-digit days now will be counterproductive to us moving this piece of legislation forward. We know that when we come to final rest on this legislation, we know a lot of things are on the table that are going to create right-now jobs, that are going to create right-now investment, and it is going to be able to get into the hands of Americans that are going to spend those dollars to be able to jump-start our economy, to be able to bring it out of the, quote, unquote, I don't want to use the "R" word, but the recession that folks are talking about and that economic indicators some feel we are in, some feel we are not. We have some individuals saying technically we may be in one.

The bottom line is the economy is not what it needs to be to be able to continue the United States of being in the position that we are in right now, well, in a better position, a position we have been in the past, of being not only the largest economy in the world as it relates to a nation but also being very strong and very vibrant.

We know that we can get in these very high altitude conversations of saying that it is important for us to be able to have trade, it is important for us to see small business start-ups, it is important for American people to be able to buy things at an affordable cost. But it is also important for us to pass this economic stimulus package within days, not weeks, not months. So I want to make sure, speaking to all of my colleagues here in the House, that we move with the spirit of saying that we are going to deal with the target audience that we are trying to reach right now, and that we are going to do it in a way that is bipartisan and that we won't have any last-minute legislative Hail Marys or amendments or procedural maneuvers that will stop us from achieving the goal of carrying out

at least one major act at a time of urgency on behalf of the American people. We have done it before with other major pieces of legislation, but this economic stimulus legislation is very, very, very important.

Now, Madam Speaker, I think that as we start to look at this, because I want to make sure the Members are able to communicate not only with the 30-Something Working Group but also with me independently, or any staff or what have you that wish to do so, can be reached at 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov. The reason why I give that Web site out, Madam Speaker, we have to call it out when we see it. It is almost like we are in the football season right now, and there is a lot of replays, and some of the replays are called within the last 2 minutes from the officials' box in what you may call the sweet area in a football stadium. And I think it is important that if you see this kind of activity that will derail this bipartisan spirit that we have right now, we need to call it out. We need to be able to say that that is going to be counterproductive. We already know that the agenda in trying to continue the tax cuts that were brought about under President Bush, and I believe the President is in the position of saying we don't need that part of tax legislation to be a part of this stimulus package, that is for another date, that is for us to deal with, that is for us to hash through in the Ways and Means Committee, which I am proud to be a member of, that is another day's debate. It is not a debate on this economic stimulus package that we are going to hopefully bring to the floor within days. I want to be able to head that off so that we don't have to waste the American people's time to really get into this issue of another debate as it relates to the tax issue. So I think it is important as we continue to move through this process that Members communicate with Members because a lot of folks say, well, it is just a lack of communication of the reason why we are not able to be successful in pushing some of these issues forward.

I can also shed light on another issue, Madam Speaker, and that issue is the fact that we have a number of different tracks that are taking place here in the House and also in this Congress. The campaign spirit that is out there right now amongst the Presidential candidates, Democrat and Republican, and what we do here, that spirit, the spirit that we have here in the House may very well be broken based on what someone may say, and many of those individuals are Members of Congress, may say as it relates to their plans. Making those political statements here on the floor through legislation or trying to push into an economic stimulus package because someone said it on the campaign trail and for them to be able to say, well, that was just introduced, you know, in the, in this discussion, may be counter-

productive if it is not within the spirit of what we are trying to do here.

I also would like to share a statement that was made a little earlier today as we start talking about that spirit, and the Republican leader said, I hope that Democrats are not looking to give nontaxpayers rebates or what have you or incentives. I want to just clear it up. I am assuming that he is not speaking of those individuals that are paying payroll taxes, because they are. So many individuals, they don't have to pay because they pay so much in payroll tax, and we do have that. And also when we talk about a targeted audience, that targeted audience is the audience that will put the money into the economy versus saying, Well, I have received this rebate check, or, I have received some sort of incentive that will change my economic attitude towards spending, so I am going to go put it over here and invest it to deal with it at another time and another day. That won't be the kind of investment that will help us move this economy forward. I think it is important for us to pay attention to that, and just because someone is what I define as financially challenged, means that they cannot participate in what we are trying to do in stimulating this economy because we need them and we need them to keep this economy moving.

I am glad to see that the spirit of the majority, of Chairman RANGEL, who put out a statement today, the economic stimulus package, must help lower and middle-income families, I don't think there is anything wrong with that statement, and I think that it is within the spirit of what we are talking about here. Mr. RANGEL goes on to say that the intent of the economic stimulus package has not yet been written, but everything remains on the table; however, I would like to respond to suggestions that various Republican leaders have made to prevent the stimulus package from reaching hardworking families. I think that it is also important that as we look at that, as we look at that statement there, again, we are looking at responding, and we are looking at working within the spirit of this legislation that we are communicating.

Many times things are said, like I mentioned here earlier, like the Republican leader mentioned that he was concerned about that it is important to put it in black and white so that everyone can understand. I know, I know my Republican colleagues want to make sure these tax cuts meet lower and middle-class families. I hope that I am not proven wrong as it relates to any vote that may happen in committee or any vote that may happen here on this floor. But it is important that we put these statements out there and for it to be able to reach these hardworking families who work from paycheck to paycheck and make contributions to Social Security and Medicare, as Mr. RANGEL goes on to say, or who may have recently lost their jobs, any argument on this issue that will be equally

met with vigorous discussion as it relates to tax incentives to businesses.

Now, here is another piece as we start to look at this very issue, dealing with businesses and dealing with individuals. The backbone of our economy are small businesses, and I guarantee you that small businesses will be a part of this economic stimulus package. But at the same time, let's not leave back in the dust those Americans that we know that will pump dollars into the economy and we know that have been paying payroll taxes and we know that have been paying into Social Security. So when we look at that, let's make sure that we work in a bipartisan way and that we understand each other.

Madam Speaker, I encourage rapid response. I encourage Members to say, Well, if this is the way I feel, I am going to say the way I feel, but at the same time, be able to receive that answer or, at the same time, continue to meet.

This chart I pulled out earlier, Madam Speaker, twice on this chart, and we will have it every time we come to the floor in the 30-Something Working Group, Democratic leadership meeting with Republican leaders, 1/16 of this month, Democratic leaders meeting with Republican leaders, 1/17. If they met in the a.m. and p.m., I would like to even put that down because I think it is important that we have that. Goodness gracious, if we were able to pull together this package in a way that American people will see that folks are actually talking daily in a meaningful talk, not just shooting shots over the bow of the ship, meaningful talk, hopefully we will be able to resolve issues like the impasse that we have had on the issue of health care, the impasse that we have had on the issue of Iraq and other various important issues that have come before this Congress.

□ 1600

This should be encouraged. I'm a Democrat. I enjoy being in the majority. And I hope that we are in the majority for as long as the sun rises in the East and sets in the West. I hope that happens.

But as long as we are in the majority, it doesn't mean that we can't also have that same spirit towards bipartisanship, and that's important. Because I have been in the minority before, and I know how it feels. I know how it feels when you can't get a bill agendaed in a certainty; you can't get a bill agendaed in the committee or you can't get your amendment heard on the floor. I know how that feels.

But I think it's very, very important that as we look at these very important issues that are facing our Nation, that we use that bipartisanship in a way that we haven't used it in the past. And we have passed bills in a bipartisan way, as I said a little earlier in the hour, but do it in a way that it will be a jaw drop for the American people. They'll say, wow, this is interesting

how they came together and made this happen without trying to make a political stand.

I think that from what I'm reading and what I'm seeing, it seems like the President is on board. It seems like the Speaker is on board, seems like the majority leader is on board. It even seems like the minority leaders in both chambers are on board.

So as we look at rule XXII over in the Senate and we look at the 60 vote, the procedural piece that has to happen before you get to bring in any bill before the Senate, that that spirit lives within those Republican Members that will help us get to that 60.

When I say "us," it's only 51 Democrats in the Senate, but let's continue to pay very close attention to it.

Mr. RYAN, I'm so glad to see you all the way from Niles, Ohio. We know the Republicans will be going to a retreat this week. So we have an opportunity to work off line and do some work and get back to the district and do some great things. But this whole issue about economic stimulus, I tell my friends, when I come to the floor, even when you're not here, I make reference to what I have seen in your district, what is happening in your district and how important this bill is for Ohio just as important as it is for Florida.

I yield.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I think what is happening now highlights a lot of what has already been going on in a lot of areas around the country. I think when you start to look and see people are talking about the downturn in the economy and jobs and what is happening now: Unemployment rate going up, people not having the disposable income. When you look at a lot of areas, and it is not just Niles, Ohio. It is not just Youngstown, Ohio. It is not just Akron, Ohio. It is in Des Moines, Iowa. It is in Waterloo, Iowa. It is in Detroit, Michigan. It is in all of the industrial Midwest where, quite frankly, globalization has had a negative impact on a lot of the communities there.

So this stimulus package, I think, as you have been talking about over the past 30, 35 minutes or so, it needs to be targeted to those families that are going to spend the money to stimulate the economy, those small businesses, I think, that are going to reinvest back whether it's in a machine shop in Streetsborough, Ohio, or wherever the case may be. But make that money available.

But I think it's also important for us to talk about what we've been doing since we've been in the majority to affect the long-term growth of the economy. And I think, you know, one of the past Federal chairman's said that they're just too many bubbles, you know. That was the problem that we have had here.

We had the tech bubble in the 1990s and the low interest rates and the housing bubble, and now we are looking at that bubble bursting.

Just to give you an example on how this ripples throughout the economy, we have an aluminum extrusion manufacturer in Gerard, Ohio, 300 pretty high-paying jobs that's going to close down because they supply the aluminum for the housing market, not commercial but the housing side.

So this downturn, this bubble busting has this ripple effect throughout the economy, and that's why I think you see us in the position that we are in today.

But if you look at what we are doing long term, for long-term stimulus, what we've tried to do with stem cell research here in the Congress, that opens up whole new vistas of opportunity in the health care field. That opens up opportunity for research and development in a growing field.

If you look at what we are trying to do with alternative energy, you will see that these investments that we are making into the research and development of a lot of these alternative energy technologies, those are investments that are going to yield great benefits for us, because long term, you know, someone has got to make the windmill. Someone's got to make the hydraulics for the windmill. Someone's got to make the blades. These things need to be trucked around. These components need to be assembled.

That is a direct investment once this technology is purchased or at least improved and able to produce some sufficient amount of energy, that's going to be American manufacturing. If you look at solar panels, that could be a potential opportunity for American manufacturing.

So before I kick it back to you, it's important that we recognize some of these long-term investments that we are making here. And one of the ones that we saw, if you were looking at some of the economic indicators from the summertime when the wage was passed and implemented, there was actually an increase in consumer spending. It shouldn't be much of a surprise because if you put more money in the pockets of these folks, that's what happens.

Finally, before I give it back to you, it's important to recognize for the American people that this stimulus package, what we are seeing here is going to stimulate the economy, is what we have been arguing about here since President Bush came in with his lopsided tax cuts for the top 1 percent.

Now, if you give somebody who makes millions and millions of dollars a year—and God bless you if you do. We want you to make money. We are not against you. We understand the importance of people investing in business in our country. But that person is not going to take a couple hundred thousand dollars that they get in a tax cut and go out and spend it. What are they going to spend it on? When you have that money, you have everything that you need. You are not going to go out and say, "Well, I got a couple hundred

thousand dollar tax cut. I'm going to go out and buy a new pair of shoes now."

You have everything that you need. So that cut does not have the economic stimulus, and if it is getting invested, let's be honest. That is getting invested in Asia. If you are looking to make money and put it in the market or you are looking to buy a particular stock, you are going into a certain area, and it would behoove you to put that money somewhere in Asia.

So, having said that, the tax philosophy that we have here that you should give middle class tax cuts to folks, if it stimulates the economy now, if it is good for the economy now, it should be a good fiscal policy.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. It's still good seeing an appropriator speak in tax language, talking about tax issues. So it's good to see it. I just wanted to let you know how much I appreciate it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I appreciate you, just in general.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I thank you, even though I talk about appropriations all the time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I know you talk about appropriations all the time, especially when you are trying to get money from appropriations for very important projects and investments in your district. In Hollywood and Miami, there are a lot of needs there.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And my constituents surely appreciate the help and assistance because they pay enough taxes, and we're up here making sure that if they pay their fair share, they get their fair share back.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. They should get some back. You are exactly right.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That's correct.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And I know you have water projects there and education projects there. You have energy projects there.

If we are going to have the kind of development that we have, the economic development that lifts up all congressional districts, we have to make all of those investments.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You're right. You're right.

I was talking earlier before you walked in on cloture. I believe it's called cloture in the Senate, and it's an old French word for closure. You hear it all the time, but you don't necessarily know the meaning of it. It sounds like it was something as it relates to clothes, but that's what it means in English pretty much.

And I think that when we look at this issue and the fact that we always get to the point where even when we get our act together here in the House, it's either one or two Chambers. It's either the House or the Senate.

Let's look at the SCHIP override. The Senate has a veto-proof vote in the Senate: 68 Senators voting in the affirmative for SCHIP.

In the House, we fall short. I think here in the House that we may very well have the kind of bipartisanship we

need to get this economic stimulus package passed. But in the Senate, I'm concerned. I'm very concerned because you have 51 Democrats and you are going to need 9 Republican Senators, and I'm hoping, just hoping, that we are able to get the nine for it to be true bipartisanship. So that means the Republican leader is just as important as the Democratic leader, and we are trying to move this process through.

And I think that we need to pay very close attention, and also pay attention to what is being said in the Senate, what's being said here in the House because this piece of legislation is too important. I don't think that Democrats can hang their hat and say, "We passed the legislation to stimulate the economy." I don't think the Republicans can say it without saying Democrats, vice versa. So I think that is important that we pay attention. And I keep saying that because I know that in this building, and we are talking about the 500-plus Members of Congress and all of our great ideas that we may have, coming to the table with an amendment or making a procedural move through any one of the said committees could very well derail this spirit that we have.

We have a war that's going on in Iraq. As of today, we have 3,929 individuals that have lost their lives in Iraq, and we have had a number of them wounded in action, 15,996. And we have those families that are living in this economy.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And the latest report is 650,000 Iraqis who have been killed as well.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That is correct. So we have a number of loss of life.

The point I'm trying to make here is that we even have numbers for Afghanistan and what is happening there, and we just had an Armed Services meeting a little earlier today, and there is discussion. One of the witnesses, a lieutenant general, said, "Well, the Afghans are saying what, Americans, will you leave us?" Well, this is a big question when we talk about spending, we talk about the economy.

Let me draw this picture here. You go to dinner with your friends and there's six of you, and the bill comes out to like, I don't know, 4- or \$500. You have been there for a couple of hours, of course ordering several appetizers and ice tea and an entree, and it comes up to \$600. Do you spend the time of divvying up the bill and collecting the money, or do you always have to get up and say, "I have it. I'll take care of it?" You know what I'm talking about?

That's what America has been saying to every conflict we have ever had. Afghanistan, for what needs to happen there, do we always have to be the people there who say, "I got it?"

The euro is doing a lot better than the dollar right now, and there's a separation between NATO and EU, and they have their own account and they're making investments.

Afghanistan is the gateway to narcotics, illegal drugs into Europe. And so the fact that I know that they're playing a role already, but I'm saying that even a greater role, we are in it because of terrorism. We are in it. Madam Speaker knows exactly what I'm talking about. We are in it not only in the terrorist end, terrorism, trying to prevent terrorism not only in the world, but also domestically.

□ 1615

But I think it is important that the EU plays a greater role. There is going to be three reports released, from what we were told in committee today, and the next 10 days dealing with that variation.

I shared those two scenarios just to say that as we start looking at the bipartisanship spirit that we have, the bipartisanship spirit that we have and continue to build on, we have to do it in all economic issues, because we can talk about the war, and the two wars that are going on, it has a lot to do with economics that we are facing or the problems that we are having here in this country as it relates to our own economy because of the debt that we are spending, or that we are paying down on, and it is continuing to build.

It is continuing to build, even though we have spent several hours here on this floor talking about if you are going to spend it, you have got to pay for it. Then we find ourselves in a situation where we are pushed up in a corner of the wall where the American people have to pay for the fact that we are unable to work in a bipartisan way to get the job done in the time we should get it done before it becomes a crisis situation.

So this bipartisanship is just a lot bigger than just a word. You can just say I am bipartisan. It is bigger than that. It has a lot to do with how much we pay for something. It is almost like a plane ticket. I am breaking it down because I want to make sure, because here in Washington we have big, lofty terms and using acronyms. It is like a plane ticket. If you have to buy a plane ticket, and you buy it on the day of travel, you are going to pay more than you would have paid 30 days in advance or 2 weeks in advance or a 7-days-in-advance ticket.

Without bipartisanship, we find ourselves buying the ticket hours before the flight when it is imperative that we get on the flight, when we could have gotten on it cheaper and even probably better seating with a 30-day-in-advance or a 60-day-in-advance.

As we look at this, we have to not only clip, but we have to pay attention. I am asking all the Members to pay attention to it, because we pay more when we fight on these issues that must happen here in this country on behalf of the American people.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The point, too, is the decisions that you make, I think, and so articulately explained here, the decisions that you make have long-

term ramifications. If you make bad decisions, as we have seen, now, regardless of where you were on the war, what your position was before it started, or when it started or how your vote was, we now have to calculate and figure out \$1.3 trillion was spent on this war that we elected to go into that now has been proven time and time again that Saddam Hussein had nothing to do with 9/11. Hussein did not have weapons of mass destruction.

As policymakers, we need to look back and evaluate whether or not this was a good decision; \$1.3 trillion at the end of next year, or at the end of this year will have been spent on this war. We look all across our country, and has it helped reduce gas prices? No. Has it helped create stability around the world? No. Did it decrease the number of terrorists around the world? No. It actually increased the number, and every intelligence report from all over the world will tell us that.

We need to understand that as we make these decisions, whether it is on the stimulus package, whether it is on our Tax Code, whether it is on the investments that we are going to make in this country, these are big decisions, because the ramifications are pretty big when you look 5 or 6 years down the line and could be as costly when you get into an elective war as \$1.3 trillion.

These are the kinds of decisions that we are making here, and I think it is very important for us to recognize, as we make them, that these have long-term ramifications. The tax cuts, you combine the war and the tax cuts. When our friends were in charge of this body for 6 years, since President Bush was in, and President Bush was President, a Republican-controlled House and Senate, \$3 trillion was borrowed from the Chinese, the Japanese, to increase our debt. So our debt went up by \$3 trillion. They raised the debt limit five times. So when you combine the Bush tax cuts with the war, some very immature policy decisions were made.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. The bottom line is, you have your back up against the wall, you have to make a decision, you have to do it now.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Now.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You can't wait. You can't throw it off to the side. You can't, say, sling-shot in the end for a win. You can't do any of that kind of stuff. You have to do it in a very responsible way.

Again, if we keep saying it, if I look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow and see bipartisanship, bipartisanship, and even more bipartisanship, that is fine with me, because it is almost like McDonald's. I mean, I feel like going and getting a number 3 after a football game because I have seen it eight times. I really think I actually like certain things at McDonald's, which I do. You can just look at me and tell.

But I think it's important that we continue to talk about what's hap-

pening right now and what the President has to say when he comes and walks down this aisle next week, I believe, when he comes in here to come talk to us about what's going to happen in this economic stimulus package, what's going to happen as it relates to the two wars going on, what's going to happen as it relates to health care. This opportunity that we have now, 10 days of discussion, bipartisanship, he stepped off the plane from the Middle East and had bipartisanship stamped on his lapel saying we have got to get this going. We have to make it happen even though there was a letter that the Speaker and the majority leader wrote him on 1/11 of this month saying, What's the plan? This is what we want to do. We have to stimulate the economy. Let's do it.

We had our economic summit on 12/7 of last year, having deep discussions as Democrats on this very issue. I think it is important, the President comes down. He has to almost give the speech of his life, but guess what? Action has to follow it. This reminds me, Mr. RYAN, I think we were both State senators at this time, when the planes hit the Twin Towers, the plane hit the Pentagon and one went down in Pennsylvania, that spirit that we had then when people were willing and looking for leadership on the issue of how we are going to come back together as Americans and how we are going to pick this country back up. We have this opportunity.

The President has this opportunity to lead. This is his last year in office. We have Republicans and Democrats that have an opportunity to change the opinion of the American people on how we can work together.

So in this last half of this 110th Congress where we are talking about bipartisanship, and I am just saying talking about it, let's show them some real action. We came together on economic stimulus. We came together on this issue of Iraq. This discussion that I am hearing the President, I want to go and have this kind of bilateral discussion and sign a piece of paper and lock our hands on Iraq for years to come, is not bipartisanship. There has to be some discussion in Congress on that.

It is important that as we start looking at Afghanistan and what we are going to do there, I think it is very important that the President can use that in a bipartisan way. So if we are going to make a deal, let's make a deal on bipartisan agreements as we move from this point on. This is the talk of the year that a lot of folks have made New Year's resolutions. I don't know. Maybe the President said, I am willing to be bipartisan, and he talked about it during his original campaign. I am not a divider. I bring people together. I make sure that folks worked together, I mean, united. I mean, that was the word that he used.

I think that if we want to do that, then we are going to have to do it in a way that does an even better job than

we did in the first half of the session. We can't paint a clearer picture on how important this is.

In closing, Mr. RYAN, I want to ask you if you would, we still have time, a few minutes, if you would, and our colleagues, you see these ideas, that is how they come, being drafted or being mentioned, or something outside of the bipartisan discussions that have been going on that is here on this chart, and you are not bubbling your great idea to your leadership, and your leadership is not putting it on the table, and I see your leadership, Democrat or Republican, then it is going to derail what the American people want. That is an opportunity to stimulate the economy and stimulate the family economy and to make sure that we can remain strong and prosperous.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You mentioned bipartisanship. I think, as we are closing out here and as we had the vote today on the SCHIP bill, that it's important for us to recognize how far away the President is from bipartisanship on some of these issues. Here we have the SCHIP, State Children's Health Insurance bill. This was a program that was started by Newt Gingrich and President Clinton to invest money into the health of poor and middle-class kids. The program was \$35 billion over 5 years. It passed this House in a bipartisan way with many, many, many Republican votes, mostly Democratic, but many Republican.

The President vetoed this bill twice. So a bipartisan bill drafted by Newt Gingrich, signed into law by President Clinton is vetoed a couple of times by President Bush. His reason is it costs too much money. It's \$35 billion over 5 years.

This is the same President that raised the debt limit five times and ran up \$3 trillion in debt and turns around days later and asks for another \$200 billion in Iraq, but he doesn't have and doesn't see the sense in the investment of \$35 billion over 5 years for kids' health care. So when you hear "bipartisan," you have got to be skeptical.

Now I want to kick it to who we very affectionately refer to as our "mother" here in Congress, STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES, who, I know I saw her on TV at the Presidential debate the other night, Madam Speaker, and I think Mr. MEEK, and you were there too, that it seems like Mrs. JONES may have gotten more TV time than Hillary Clinton got during the Presidential debate.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. I don't know whether I did or not. I wanted to come to the floor and say how proud I am of my "sons," Kendrick and Tim. Actually, they are not my sons, but I call them that anyway.

But I come here and look, and I have Anna and Mary who are visiting the House floor today, and these two young women are examples of how important SCHIP could be to the children of America. I am so glad they had a chance to join me with one of my good friends, Robin. We serve on a couple of

committees together, and this is what we talk about, bipartisan action on the floor of the House.

Ladies, thank you so much for coming to visit with me. I will take this pink sweater and this red ribbon and I will look gorgeous.

But I am glad to join my colleagues here on the floor of the House as we talk about the economic stimulus, because the people of Ohio need a stimulus. They need jobs, they need health care, and they need jobs that make real money. They need to be saved from these mortgage brokers who have hurt them deeply.

I recognize my "sons," of whom I am so very proud.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you so very much, Mrs. JONES. Being a member of the Ways and Means Committee, we talk about the economy. I know that we will have a lot to do and say about that, and we talked about a bipartisan spirit. But we have, I think, like 2 more minutes left. But if you want to share anything as it relates to the economy that you would like to share with us, you can.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. I will recognize each of you. Thank you very much.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you, Mrs. JONES.

We want to encourage the Members and also anyone who is watching us here on the floor, the 30-Something Democrats at 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov and www.speaker.gov/30something. You said something that I think is very, very important in this debate.

We are not here drinking the tea. I mean, we are not here saying, Oh, let's just all link up together and flowers falling from the ceiling and all and that we are working in a bipartisan way. What we are doing is saying that we are working like the American people would like for us to work on this very important issue. We are hoping that the President continues to do what he is doing as it relates to talking to Democratic leaders and real-time, Democratic leaders speaking with the President, Republican and Democratic leaders in the Congress continuing to work together in real-time, meeting day after day, morning and evening, so that we can put together a work product so that we can all work for it and get it out to the American people.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think you have done a great job today, Mr. MEEK, and I just want to say how proud I am to come down here with you and make these points and listen to you break down the issues of the day where you are putting the cookie on the bottom shelf.

□ 1630

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, days like this you just have to plow through it.

With that, Madam Speaker, it has been an honor to address the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SHEA-PORTER). All Members are reminded that it is not order to refer to persons on the floor of the House as guests of the House.

VACATING 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the ordering of a 5-minute Special Order in favor of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is vacated.

There was no objection.

BORDER WARS

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. Madam Speaker, I come to you today to discuss what is going on internationally with our country. You know, this country is at war in Iraq. We have been for a number of years. This country is at war in Afghanistan, and we have been for a number of years.

While the news from the front is encouraging, both of those wars are not over with yet. And it is interesting to me that even though we are sending our troops, our young men and women, the finest America has to offer, halfway around the globe to protect the dignity of other countries, it concerns me that we fail to protect the security of our own Nation on the southern border of the United States.

Because, Madam Speaker, there is a border war going on in the United States on our southern border. Unfortunately, too many people, especially here in Washington, DC are blissfully ignorant of what is taking place on the southern border. You see we have two international borders. We have one with Mexico and we have one with Canada. The number one duty of government is to protect the people, to protect America from all incursions, all invasions.

So we send our troops halfway around the world to protect the interest of the United States in Iraq, protect the interest of the United States in Afghanistan, and I agree with what we are doing in Afghanistan and Iraq. But we also need to be concerned about what is taking place closer to our homeland, and that is the border wars that are taking place.

Why I say that is I have been down, while I have been in Congress these 3½ years, I have been down to the Texas-Mexico border now 13 times. I have also been to the border between California and Mexico.

Madam Speaker, each time I go to the border I see more evidence that we are not winning the border war, that it is more difficult, it is harder on our

troops down there, the sheriffs, the border agents. It is harder on the people who live on the border between the United States and Mexico. Many ranchers and people who live along the Rio Grande River on the American side have bars on their windows because they are afraid of people who come across from the southern part of the United States committing crimes.

Madam Speaker, I want to make it clear I am not talking about everyone that comes to the United States is here to commit a crime. I am not saying that. I am saying when we fail to enforce the rule of law, that being you don't come to America without permission, that we get everybody. We get the good, we get the bad, and we get the ugly. Right now, Madam Speaker, we are getting a lot of bad and we are getting a lot of ugly.

Let me give one example of those people who come in and flaunt the law of the United States that you don't come here without permission. I have here a night shot taken, and I am not sure that it can be seen, but I will hold it up anyway. This top photograph is a night scene of the bottom photograph. This is a photograph on the bottom of the Rio Grande River near Laredo, Texas. Across the river is Mexico. This is the nighttime version of that.

What we see here is a raft with several individuals coming to America without permission. They are all dressed in black uniforms. You notice the guy in the front has an AK-47. That is an automatic weapon made in China. You also see, Madam Speaker, that behind each of these individuals coming in the raft are duffle bags. In those duffle bags are presumably drugs, narcotics, cocaine or heroin or both.

These individuals are foreign nationals. What happened was these individuals were Guatemalan soldiers trained in the United States. Once they went back home, they started working for the drug cartels that paid them a whole lot more money than being Guatemalan soldiers. They switched sides, and now they smuggle drugs into the United States on behalf of the drug cartels. The individuals, you know, are the bad, and they are the ugly. The reason is the border is not secure. If the border was secure, these outlaws wouldn't be coming over here without permission.

That is just one example of what is taking place on the southern border of the United States.

Madam Speaker, there are three, some argue four major drug cartels in Mexico that bring that cancer into the United States and sell it. Right now those drug cartels work with the coyotes. We call those people "coyotes" because they, for money, smuggle people into the United States. And the drug cartels and the coyotes now work together smuggling drugs and people sometimes in the same load.

In other words, when our Border Patrol stops a vehicle sneaking into the United States, they will find not only