

Coventry Wineberry Estates, expanding Shaw's Bridge in East Bradford Township, and enhancing Pottstown Borough Memorial Park with a new dog park, pavilions, restrooms, ball fields, and walking trails.

Mr. Speaker, one thing that was apparent this past weekend was just how integral our public lands and outdoor recreation areas are to our heritage, civic identity, and local community.

I believe the Land and Water Conservation Fund is one of our most important conservation programs and an excellent example of a bipartisan commitment to safeguarding natural resources, promoting our cultural heritage, and expanding recreational opportunities not just for a moment in time, but for future generations as well.

I also believe it is a program that allows our local communities to dream big about how to best go about enhancing their communities for their residents.

As an original cosponsor of H.R. 1814, which would permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund, I am looking forward to working with my colleagues in an effort to help communities across this country create lasting legacies of public access to the cultural and recreational opportunities identified by officials in their local communities as being worthy of funding for future projects.

STUDENT SUCCESS ACT FAILS STUDENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to express my strong opposition to H.R. 5, the so-called Student Success Act. I am deeply disappointed in the majority for bringing such an economically careless and socially egregious bill to the floor today.

If passed, H.R. 5 would take more than \$7 million from the highest need schools in my home State of Alabama. It is really an abomination that this body would do this to our constituents and do this to our students.

H.R. 5 abandons the Federal Government's historic role in elementary and secondary education. Furthermore, this bill neglects our sacred responsibility to ensure that all children, irrespective of race, class, disability, or socioeconomic class, are given the opportunity to attain a high quality education.

Each of us in this body has the opportunity to send our own children to the finest K-12 institutions in this country, but our privilege isn't universal, and we shouldn't legislate as if it is.

In the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, that privilege, the ability to send our children to the private schools or public schools of choice, is nearly nonexistent.

□ 1045

More than 70 percent of the public school students in my district receive

free or reduced lunch, and they live in families that live below the poverty line. And of the 26 school districts that serve my constituents, only two of them have a poverty rate that is less than 56 percent.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act was first written in recognition of the impact that concentrated poverty has on a school system's ability to adequately support the educational programs needed to serve vulnerable communities.

But H.R. 5 would strip the ESEA of the protections for these students by diverting title I funds. This approach is backwards, and our children deserve better. If I were grading this bill, I would definitely give it an F.

As a proud product of Selma High School, this is deeply personal to me. Today more than 90 percent of the Selma High School students in my district, from my old high school, receive free and reduced lunch. Under H.R. 5, this school would lose nearly 20 percent of its Federal funding.

The greatest opportunity that we can give any child is a quality education. This is why I cannot support this bill, which diverts title I funds from 92 percent of the schools in my district. This would further tilt the playing field against poor kids.

These children belong to all of us. Unfortunately, this bill is proof that somewhere along the line we have abandoned the most sacred American principle, that all children—I mean all children—are our children.

We cannot deny that a rising tide lifts all boats. The economic and social costs of refusing to accept these facts are steep.

When President Johnson signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1964, he stated, "As President of the United States, I believe deeply no law I have signed or will ever sign means more to the future of America than this bill." President Johnson was right then, and he is right now.

To promote our educational progress, we must replace No Child Left Behind with a strong bipartisan bill, one that advances what works and improves upon what does not. Unfortunately, this bill does neither.

I urge this body to oppose this reckless bill, H.R. 5. Our children deserve better. Our constituents deserve better. This Nation deserves better.

KELO V. NEW LONDON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to highlight an issue that I believe we must pay closer attention to in this Chamber and in this Congress. You see, on June 23, Mr. Speaker, we marked the tenth anniversary of an important Supreme Court case. That case was *Kelo v. New London*.

Now, the title of the case really means nothing. But I point to Susette

Kelo, who I have here depicted in this picture. She was the plaintiff in that case. And what happened in that case was this, Mr. Speaker, a real tragedy:

She was told by her government that they were going to take her home and give it to another private owner for development. You heard me right, Mr. Speaker. She was told that her home was going to be taken by our government because they were picking the winners and losers because they felt they knew best how to utilize her property and give it to another private owner to develop it the way that private owner wanted to do.

Well, Mr. Speaker, Susette Kelo stood up. She fought this fight. She was told by her friends, she was told by her real estate agents, she was told by her lawyers: Just roll over. The government always wins, and they are going to win this battle.

But she fought it all the way to the Supreme Court. And what happened, however, is that that advice from her friends and from her real estate agent and her lawyers came true. The government won.

But that day we all lost, as American citizens. Because here is what happened after that case. She lost her home. And this is a picture of her property—well, no longer her property—but that property, as it exists today. They demolished her home. They took her property. She lost her piece of the American Dream. And the result of it is a vacant lot that sits in New London.

Mr. Speaker, I highlight this case today because it reminds us of an issue that we must fight for, and that is a fundamental freedom that we all enjoy as American citizens, to own and to use our property.

It is something that is fundamental to our U.S. Constitution. It is something fundamental to us as American citizens. And it is time for us to unite, as Republicans and Democrats, and say enough is enough. We must push back on Big Government. We must stand with individuals.

This land belongs to them, not our government. And that is something that I am afraid that started 10 years ago and continues to this day with actions of Big Government day in and day out, where government regulations, government overreach—local, Federal, State level—act in a way that takes away these fundamental property rights that so many have fought for.

So in Congress I have led the fight. I formed the Private Property Rights Caucus, with Members from Maine to Alabama to California. I have sponsored and authored the Defense of Property Rights Act to say enough is enough. We are going to stand with individuals, and we are going to fight this Big Government overreach.

Mr. Speaker, these hard-fought rights have come at the expense of so many, the blood of those who fought to preserve our freedoms, the blood of our Founding Fathers and the vision they