

avoid flood insurance, and we are shifting the burden on those who are responsible flood insurance policy-holders.

If we are able to avoid a single 10% unnecessary rate increase, this ripples across to save \$150 to \$200 million for 4 million policy-holders. It is a savings that is compounded over time. So it is \$150 to \$200 million each and every year.

Now, part of the problem of having people who should have flood insurance avoid that responsibility, and we are finding that there are almost a half million properties, vacation homes, second homes, commercial properties, that don't have flood insurance. What that does is that transfers the burden to those that do. It artificially inflates the rate that others pay inequitably.

In addition, it poses a problem because those people that don't have flood insurance that should, well, frankly, it tugs at our heart strings, and we come forward with aid to try and help people after the fact. We are spending billions of dollars that could have been avoided if we had been dealing with an effective flood insurance program, and if we would have implemented some of the initiatives that we brought forward for mitigation to prevent flood damage in the first place.

So, Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be involved with the debate today. I join my colleague, Mr. FRANK, in thanking the Rules Committee for allowing a full and vigorous debate. I hope we see more. This shouldn't be the exception. I hope it becomes a pattern.

This is one of those issues that is not partisan. It is not geographical. It is not philosophical. It is one of the things that simply good government, hard legislating, will benefit from a full and vigorous debate on the floor of the House, and I look forward to being a part of it.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I will proceed to close.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this bill represents an incredible amount of collaboration between Chairman BAKER and Ranking Member FRANK.

This is a very important bill. It makes reasonable changes to the flood insurance program. It will lay the foundation for a stronger, improved flood insurance program. I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that we can enact this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, as you have heard today on the floor, this rule is fair; it is balanced. It is not an exception; it is a rule. And I appreciate the kind comments that have been made by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle about underlying legislation

which will help improve the national flood insurance program.

I want to thank Chairman RICHARD BAKER from Louisiana and Chairman MIKE OXLEY from Ohio for their strong leadership on behalf of this great bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will effect a technical correction in the engrossment of the resolution by inserting "the report of" after "printed in" on page 2, line 9.

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5672, SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 890 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 890

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5672) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except: beginning with the colon on page 15, line 18, through page 16, line 4; page 24, lines 17 and 18; and section 607. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against language in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such other part and not against the entire paragraph. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment of the House and Senate during the month of July.

SEC. 3. House Resolution 878 is laid upon the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 890 is an open rule, and it provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. This resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill and provides that under the rules of the House, the bill shall be read for amendment by paragraph. This resolution waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill, except as specified in the resolution.

It authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. This resolution provides that it shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment of the House and Senate during the month of July and provides also that H. Res. 878 is laid on the table.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 890 and the underlying appropriations bill.

H.R. 5672 will fund many of the priorities of this Nation, combating terrorism and crime, strengthening our economy, fostering diplomatic relations and, finally, advancing scientific growth and innovation throughout this country. Each of these priorities is essential to ensure a stronger and a more secure America, and this bill increases funding over last year for almost each and every one of these priorities.

I should also add, to the credit of the committee, under the leadership of Chairman WOLF, that this bill also contains almost \$200 million in savings for our taxpayers. I want to thank Chairman WOLF for his stewardship of this bill.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 5672 provides \$22.1 billion for the Department of Justice. That is almost \$724 million above last year, and it is \$1 billion above the President's request.

This \$22 billion includes \$6 billion for the FBI, as they develop and execute better ways to combat terrorism and fight various forms of crime, from child exploitation to gang violence. This increased funding means improved information technology, better counterintelligence capabilities, and a greater number of highly trained human assets on the ground.

Additionally, because State and local law enforcement play a fundamental and a critical role in fighting crime, this bill includes \$2.6 billion for their efforts. And that is an increase of \$1.1 billion over the President's request.

H.R. 5672 also includes \$558 million for the Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grants program. That is \$147 million over last year, fiscal year 2006.

□ 1100

And to fight this scourge of methamphetamines which sadly pervades so many of our communities, including those of my own, Georgia's 11th, this bill provides \$1.75 billion for the Drug Enforcement Administration, the DEA.

Unquestionably, this bill demonstrates the commitment of this Congress, working with the President, to continually reassess and strengthen our security and our law enforcement priorities, ensuring that threats at home and abroad are identified and neutralized.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 5672 also provides \$22.7 billion to fund our Nation's scientific priorities, with \$16.7 billion for NASA as well as \$6 billion for the National Science Foundation. Having practiced as an OB-GYN for almost 30 years, I cannot emphasize enough the importance of encouraging scientific advancement in saving lives and improving our quality of life. Scientific innovation also captivates the minds of our children and other generations to come as they dream to develop technologies that will change the world of tomorrow.

Madam Speaker, this bill also includes funding to further improve the world of today by providing \$9.7 billion for the State Department. Of that, \$1.7 billion goes to secure and replace our vulnerable embassies throughout the world.

H.R. 5672 includes \$5.95 billion for the Department of Commerce, \$900 million for the Securities and Exchange Commission, \$294 million for the Federal Communications Commission, and \$213 million for the Federal Trade Commission.

Madam Speaker, these dollars are essential to not only building a stronger economy but also ensuring a fair and a level playing field for everyone who participates in this economy.

Madam Speaker, last but not least, this bill also includes \$643 million for the SBA, the Small Business Administration, which will support business loans to help entrepreneurs across our great Nation access critical start-up capital for new businesses. Without question, our economy is driven by small businesses and the entrepreneurs who are willing to take a chance and turn a dream into a reality.

In conclusion, this bill also makes provisions for three very important programs in the 11th Congressional District of Georgia. I want to mention these because they are so important.

The Inner Harbor EXCEL Program in Rockmart, Georgia, in Polk County,

provides quality services for at-risk youth and offers a viable alternative to incarceration. It funds the Douglas County Zero to Three Program which helps the county's juvenile courts to better address the needs of neglected and maltreated infants and toddlers.

And, lastly, the National Association of Court Management, which aims to improve our courts and develop related educational programs.

I want to again thank Chairman WOLF for his support of these programs which are so very important to the people of northwest Georgia.

Madam Speaker, as we move forward with this debate, I want to encourage my colleagues to please support this rule and support the underlying bill as we stand together in support of funding our Nation's priorities.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, this morning, we are certainly on an important appropriations bill, but I would like to spend my time this morning talking about a portion of the bill that we were not able to get into the bill.

Last week, the American people watched as the majority led the charge against the estate tax. Republicans argued they were doing it for the benefit of small businesses and independent farmers. But the majority could not provide even one concrete example that supported their claim. No farm has been found, no small business has been found that had to go under because of the estate tax.

What the Republicans were really interested in was the 3/10ths of 1 percent of Americans who pay the tax, super-rich families, 18 of whom have spent a combined \$490 million over the last 10 years in their quest to make the estate tax disappear. Today, I would ask my friends in the majority to compare that sum, \$490 million just in lobbying costs, to the amount of money a full-time minimum wage earner makes in an entire year, which is \$10,712.

The minimum wage has not been increased in 9 years. Because of inflation, it is effectively at its lowest level of purchasing power since 1955. And this majority wants to keep it that way.

In fact, last night, in the Rules Committee, the majority refused to allow an amendment to this bill that would have increased the minimum wage, so we won't have the chance to debate it here today.

Contrary to the claims of Republicans, minimum wage earners aren't just teenagers. Indeed, 46 percent of them are over the age of 25, and 35 percent are the sole wage earners for their families, many of them working two and three minimum wage jobs to put some food on table.

Despite what Republicans will say today, there is no empirical evidence to suggest that an increase in the minimum wage would either increase poverty or cost small-business jobs. In fact, the studies that are available show the opposite to be the case. Twenty States have higher minimum wage standards than are federally required. A Center for American Progress study found that, between 1998 and 2003, small business employment in those States grew at an average of 9.4 percent. In contrast, it grew at an average of only 6.6 percent everywhere else.

There is also no established connection between increases in the minimum wage and an increase in poverty, contrary to the rhetoric. Once again, the opposite is true. Obviously, when you increase salaries in a way that does not decrease employment opportunities, the increase in the minimum wage helps people to rise out of poverty and gives them more spending power.

Finally, consider that 81 percent of all the respondents in America to a January poll said raising the minimum wage was an important priority in their mind. If only 19 percent of Americans aren't thinking about it, that is overwhelming.

And so, Madam Speaker, my Republican friends find themselves in a bind. In their steadfast and determined opposition to even a moderate increase in the minimum wage, they cannot claim to be speaking for the American people. They can't claim to be speaking on behalf of the available evidence, either, because that evidence indicates that an increase in the minimum wage will help American workers and the economy, not hurt them.

Republicans can't really claim to be speaking for anyone, anyone except, that is, the small group of rich business groups who have dedicated a tremendous amount of time, energy and money to fighting a minimum wage increase. It should not come as a surprise, of course. Ultra-rich special interest groups were the reason that they worked so hard to overturn the estate tax last week, and we really shouldn't expect anything today that would be different.

Madam Speaker, what we are seeing is a democracy that has been broken, par for the course from the party that recently tabled the renewal of the Voting Rights Act. Our elected officials are supposed to base their decisions on the will of the people, but this leadership cares only about the will of a few rich businessmen.

We all know that our democracy was designed to keep this House responsive to the needs of the public, but history shows us that this leadership listens only to well-paid lobbyists and is willing to do almost anything to ensure their agenda is implemented. For years, they have repeatedly assaulted the process, abusing rules and the ethical standards of this Congress to get what they want, no matter the price.

When Democrats opposed a repeal of the estate tax last week, we did so because we believe those who have benefited the most from our society have an obligation to give the most back. This week, I think we saw that, with a great gift of Warren Buffett, one of our richest persons and citizens, to help the people at large, not just in America but throughout the world.

I ask my Republican colleagues, is that the American dream for you? Or is it one where people cannot get a raise in their minimum income to be able to take care of their families? Is working 40 hours a week for poverty wages the American dream for you? Or is it the belief that honest workers will be given an honest chance to build the life for themselves that they deserve?

We have not forgotten that dream on our side. We are going to continue to stand united behind Americans as they pursue it. We also stand for an open and honest democratic government that will demand it. And we will not rest until we have made this House the People's House once more, because the citizens of this great Nation deserve no less.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, at this time, I want to yield as much time as he might consume to the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Georgia for yielding and for his superb management of this very important appropriation bill that is coming forward. I also want to extend my appreciation to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) for the hard work that he has put into this very important measure. It is a bipartisan bill that I know enjoys broad support.

I know that the topic of discussion is the issue of increasing the minimum wage. I would like to say for the record, as I did in the Rules Committee last night, that I am a strong proponent of seeing the minimum wage increase. I want to see every American's opportunity increased, and I believe that the policies that we have put into place, not providing some sort of guarantee, I mean, States have minimum wage rates. My minimum wage rate in the State of California is substantially higher than the Federal minimum wage rate. There are some States that have a lower minimum wage, and I think it plays a role in the standard of living.

But I am one who has traditionally been concerned about the notion of mandating from the Federal level an increase in the minimum wage. I know that that is the issue that is going to be talked about time and time again. An argument is propounded by many that we somehow are more interested

in the rich than we are in those who are trying to get onto the first rung of the economic ladder. Nothing could be further from the case. We believe very strongly in ensuring opportunity for every single American.

We want to make sure that there is opportunity out there, and there have been a wide range of empirical studies done, Madam Speaker, that show that if we look at the impact that it has on small businesses and on a wide range of other entities out there, it can be inflationary and, in fact, it can cost jobs.

Now, I know a lot of people try to dispute that and say that it hasn't happened, but I think that realizing we have a 4.6 percent unemployment rate, as has been said time and time again by the President and others, it is lower than the average for the last four decades, we have a strong, growing economy today and I would not want to take any action whatsoever that could potentially impinge on the economic growth that we are enjoying.

And we want to see everyone's wages increase. We want there to be greater opportunity for people to improve themselves. So, regardless of what arguments you might hear to the contrary, we are passionately committed to that. Some of us just have difficulty with having the Federal Government mandate it.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. WOLF, and JERRY LEWIS, who chairs the full committee, for this work product; and I want to talk about one particular issue that has been very important to me for the last 12 years.

Back in 1994, Madam Speaker, we established something known as SCAAP. That is kind of an intriguing acronym that is out there. It is known as the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program. The idea behind that is the fact that the Federal Government has the responsibility for the security of our Nation's borders. We all know that. We have had a raging debate that has gone on in this body and in the other body.

We are hoping very much that we are going to be able to come up with a measure that focuses first on border security, which is what we did in the House bill, but as we look at the things that were included in that measure, increasing border fencing, criminalizing those who would allow their property to be used for tunneling under the border, a wide range of things, we also have to recognize that there is a real problem that exists in this country today and that is there are many people here illegally who have committed crimes, and in light of the fact that they have committed these crimes, they have been incarcerated throughout the country.

In my county alone of Los Angeles, and I represent both Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties, the great sheriff, Lee Baca, who was just re-elected a few weeks ago, he is in Los Angeles County, and Sheriff Gary Penrod in San Bernardino County, they

have come to me regularly and said that it costs millions and millions and millions of dollars for the incarceration, of criminal justice of people who are in this country illegally who have committed crimes. In fact, Sheriff Baca has told me repeatedly that it costs \$150 million a year in Los Angeles County alone.

Now one of the things that we have done over the past 6 years, we have been able to provide roughly \$1 billion to the State of California for the reimbursement. Again, we don't cover all the costs, but it is, I believe, important for us at the Federal level to step up to the plate and realize that security of our borders is a top priority, and if there are people who are in here illegally committing crimes and a cost is thrown onto the shoulders of State and local governments, we should provide this reimbursement.

□ 1115

Last year, I was privileged to work with our colleague, JIM KOLBE, and we coauthored an amendment that increased by \$50 million the funding level for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program to \$405 million. What we have done this year, and I take my hat off to the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee who have worked so hard on this, we have actually seen the committee itself come up with a level of \$405 million. Again, that is not enough, Madam Speaker, but it is, I believe, a very important step to say to those who are taking on this responsibility at the State and local levels that they should be reimbursed.

We have to secure our borders. We have to do everything that we possibly can to bring an end to the problem of illegal immigration. As we continue to work on that, it is absolutely imperative that we do all that we can to make sure that the Federal Government takes its responsibility.

So this is an open rule that we have, and I believe it is very appropriate. It has funding for important measures.

Another issue that is very important to me is the fact that when it comes to space research, we have been able to improve the quality of life for people all over this country and around the world. One of the greatest centers of that operation happens to be the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, which is part of the California Institute of Technology. The Jet Propulsion Laboratory is in Pasadena.

I am proud to say the Jet Propulsion Laboratory is in La Canada-Flintridge. I jointly represent that area with our colleague ADAM SCHIFF. When I look at this bill, I am very pleased that recognition of the importance of that facility and the programs there is included in it.

So this is a good bill. I am strongly supportive of it and believe the rule will allow for a wide-ranging debate.

Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the

gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I am urging every Member to vote “no” on the rule as a protest against the Rules Committee action in refusing to allow a minimum-wage increase amendment to be attached to this bill.

I know that there are some people that say it shouldn't be on this bill; but the fact is, Mr. HOYER and I and several others tried to have it attached to the Labor-Health-Education appropriations bill, and after we won, with the help of seven Republicans and 1 Democrat, the House Republican leadership decided to prevent that bill from coming to the floor of the House. So now we are trying to attach it to this bill.

I make no apology for that. The majority leader of the Senate attached 40 pages of unrelated language to the defense bill last year, language which insulated the pharmaceutical industry from lawsuits.

This issue is not about committee jurisdiction. This issue is about whose side are you on. For more than 9 years, we have seen no increase in the minimum wage. I take that problem personally, because after my parents were divorced, my mother worked for the minimum wage, and I can tell you how it feels to see a woman work 40 hours and come home with less than \$40 in the check. It doesn't feel very good.

I can tell you how it feels to see you run out of money before you run out of days of the month, so at the end of every month, you have to take a household item, a table or a lamp or a radio, down to Eitzkins' Pawn Shop to get a little money to get through the month. And the outrageous fact is that today, the minimum wage buys less than it did when my mother was earning it a number of years ago.

This Congress has an obligation to do something about that, but it hasn't. In the meantime, food prices have gone up by 20 percent, housing costs have gone up by 25 percent, medical expenses have gone up by 40 percent, and gas prices have doubled.

Last week, this institution voted to take no action to block a cost-of-living increase for Members of Congress. It takes a woman working at the minimum wage 4 months to earn the equivalent of that congressional COLA. Four months. What is the matter with people in this institution if they can justify a COLA increase for Members of Congress at the same time that they have been blocking a minimum-wage increase for 9 years? I find it outrageous.

I don't want to hear this baloney about, “Oh, President Clinton warned that he would veto the minimum wage a few years ago.” President Clinton was a strong proponent of the minimum-wage increase. He was forced to warn the Congress that he would find a bill fiscally irresponsible if the Congress took the minimum wage and attached it to over \$200 billion in tax

giveaways and tax cuts that were paid for totally with borrowed money.

So let's not have any nonsense on this floor about how President Clinton, after all, resisted the minimum wage. What President Clinton did was to resist the taking of the minimum wage hostage to the tax writing, borrow-to-pay-for-tax-cut schemes of the majority party.

So, Madam Speaker, this, to me, is a matter of elemental decency. It is a matter of equity. A Congress that does nothing to stand in the way of a cost-of-living increase for itself is a Congress that certainly ought to have the decency to pass a minimum-wage increase for the people we are talking about.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, in regard to some of the minimum-wage arguments the gentleman from Wisconsin is making, I want to point out, and these are not my statistics, but these are accurate statistics, that one-third of minimum-wage workers are children of the head of a household. Over half, 52 percent, actually of minimum-wage workers are under 25 years old. Less than 1 percent of minimum-wage workers are in households with a total income of \$20,000 or less.

The big concern, of course, Madam Speaker, in regard to minimum wage, and I am certainly not suggesting that that issue might not be considered by this Congress in a more appropriate setting than this appropriations bill, indeed it might, and indeed we may need to raise that minimum wage somewhat, but we have to be very, very careful that in the process we don't destroy some of these jobs.

The gentleman talked about a situation with his own mom, and there are plenty of people in those situations. But if we raise the minimum wage to too high a level, then they won't have any job at all to come home from.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), a hardworking member of the Appropriations Committee.

(Mr. SWEENEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWEENEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. Let me point out that I think Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN have done a spectacular job in very tight circumstances with this bill. Having been on the committee in the past, I am very proud of this work product.

As my friend from Georgia pointed out, this bill has a multiple of purposes, and one of them is to help fund the efforts of the State Department to establish diplomatic relations throughout the world.

Twenty years ago in West Berlin the La Belle Discotheque was bombed by

the Libyan Government. Eighteen years ago, over Lockerbie, Scotland, Pan Am Flight 103 was shot down by the Libyan Government.

Madam Speaker, that was at the beginning of, the early part of, the war on terror and terrorism. Lockerbie had an incredible toll, 270 murdered victims, with 189 Americans part of that. La Belle had two GIs murdered in that bombing and 50 permanently injured American citizens.

In 2002, Libya agreed to pay compensation to the families of Lockerbie in order to avoid a criminal trial, avoid a criminal trial. In 2004, they agreed to pay \$35 million to the victims of the La Belle Discotheque.

During the full Appropriations Committee markup, I passed an amendment, Madam Speaker, that prohibits the State Department from fully establishing diplomatic ties with Libya and accepting a Libyan ambassador until the Libyan Government makes full compensation payments to the victims of these two horrendous terrorist acts. You may ask why I did that and why that was appropriated in this bill. Well, it is about timing.

On May 15, the State Department proposed the removal of Libya from the list of state-sponsored terrorist nations. Congress has 45 days under the law to review that removal. That 45 days will be up this Thursday. I fear very much so, and that is why we incorporated it into this bill, that this is the last opportunity that this government has to do the right thing for the people, for American citizens who have been victimized by terrorist attacks.

Without the language that was put into the full appropriations markup and protected by the Rules Committee, this Congress, this government, might not be there to stand and do the right thing, which, unfortunately, over the last 20 years it has shown it has not been all that willing to do for the victims of these vicious attacks.

So I want to thank Chairman DREIER and the Rules Committee and I want to thank Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS of the International Relations Committee for agreeing that it is important that we go forward and ensure that the full compensation, the reparations, if you will, to these families, is maintained.

Madam Speaker, in 2002, Libya agreed to pay compensation to the families, in order to avoid a criminal trial. While 80 percent of that agreement has been met, the remaining 20 percent was held back by Libya as long as they remained on the U.S. list of state sponsors of terrorism.

Libya has now been removed from that list, and must now follow through on its agreements. The State Department removed Libya from the list on May 15th. Congress has 45 days to review the removal of Libya. That 45-day window is up on Thursday. We need to send a strong signal to Libya that they must live up to their deal.

Some of my constituents experienced this act of terror very personally. Glendon and Margaret Rafferty, of Ticonderoga in my Congressional District, lost four family members—

their daughter Bonnie Leigh Williams, son-in-law Eric, and granddaughters Stephanie and Brittany. Joan and Tom Dater, of Pittstown in my Congressional District, lost their daughter, Gretchen.

Despite Libya's pending removal from the state sponsors of terror list, Libya publicly stated yesterday they are no longer obliged to pay the final installment of these reparations to the families. This is unacceptable.

I will point out to my colleagues, if they don't think it is serious, the Libyan Government indicated yesterday that they don't intend to meet the full obligations under this agreement, just as they have for 20 years stonewalled efforts by those families to reach some reward; and I don't know if we can call it a just reward, because it really isn't. Money is not going to replace their loved ones or their children murdered here, but at least some branch of this government is going to step up and say that it is wrong that that happened, that we not going to let it happen, and you don't just get a free pass back in once you have committed those kinds of horrendous, awful terrorist acts.

I want to thank Members on both sides of the aisle for joining with me on this. I want to let the families of these attacks know that we are with them.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 seconds simply to say that the workers who need it most, 57 percent of the benefits of the wage increase will go to families with working adults in the bottom 40 percent of the income scale. It is true that people are trying to raise families on the minimum wage.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I regret that this rule does not make in order two amendments that were offered during full committee.

First, I offered an amendment that would provide \$600 million additional money to this bill to protect our communities, invest in economic development, especially in rural areas, provide critical legal assistance to low-income families and respond to concerns by Members about the Federal investment in science and education funding. All of this, Madam Speaker, would have been accomplished by just nicking by about \$1,657 the tax cut received by the wealthiest people in this country, those who make over \$1 million a year.

Under this amendment, those who make over \$1 million a year, instead of an average tax break of \$114,172, under this amendment, which would have allowed us to put \$600 million more into this bill for those worthy causes, they would have received an average of \$112,515. All of that could have been paid for, and certainly they would not have been hurt at all.

Well, we had a good debate in full committee, an hour and a half long, touching on the budget policy of the past few administrations, the budget

resolution that resulted in this bill's tight allocation and the tax cuts that I believe are evidence that the Bush administration is not serious about balancing this budget.

This discussion was important because it was a reminder of our different priorities. My amendment is a reflection of the Democratic priorities that, with more funding, could be reflected in this bill, and I regret that that amendment was not made in order today.

I also was concerned that the rule does not make in order an amendment that I was proud to cosponsor with Representatives HOYER and OBEY that would have raised the minimum wage, which has not been increased since 1997, from \$5.15 to \$7.25 by January 1, 2009.

□ 1130

The increase would occur in three increments, 70 cents each on January 1, 2007, 2008 and 2009. Such a small amount of money would have huge meaning to working families.

There are 7 million low-wage workers that would receive an increase in their hourly wage rate and increase their standard of living if the minimum wage were increased.

While I am pleased that the rule does provide protection for an ill-advised tax on commercial explosives which was proposed by President Bush, this rule does not protect this ill-advised tax the President's fiscal year 2007 budget contained for the second year in a row, a tax on the users of explosives. My State, due to its extraction industry, would bear the largest share of the burden associated with this tax. At an appropriate point in this bill, I intend to make a point of order against the tax.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentleman is talking about how he would pay for his amendment that would cost \$600 million. Madam Speaker, I think it is important that we point out that they always say how much of a tax break people making more than a million dollars, and they talk about a \$114,000 tax break, and we are going to cut that down to \$112,000, but they never say, the gentleman from West Virginia certainly did not say, how much these people with an adjusted gross income of over \$1 million are actually paying in taxes every year. It is a huge number, and they do not want to share that with the fellow Members.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule because it precludes the consideration of an increase in the minimum wage which has not been increased in 8 years.

In regard to the underlying bill, I do appreciate the work of the chairman

and the ranking member in funding valuable programs within this year's utterly inadequate allocation. I am pleased that this bill contains funding for SBA's Microloan program.

For the past 3 years, the President has recommended eliminating this program, but this Congress has funded SBA Microloans every year since the program was established in 1992 by the first President Bush.

Last week, on a bipartisan basis, the Appropriations Committee restored funding for SBA's Microloan program for fiscal year 2007. These Microloans go to people with viable businesses who have limited credit history, limited collateral, and limited or no business experience. They go to low-income individuals, women and minority owners that have faced obstacles in securing capital, and they are a significant source of new jobs in rural areas.

Through the Microloan program, intermediaries have provided 23,500 loans totaling more than \$282 million, averaging only \$12,500 per loan, a small amount of funding each year. This program has created over 64,000 jobs during its existence. In my district, the Western Massachusetts Enterprise Fund has issued 92 loans, for a total of \$1.5 million and created 180 jobs.

Businesses that use the Microloan program receive more than just financial backing. Lender intermediaries offer technical assistance and support to these small business owners as their companies develop. The assistance component of the program lasts throughout the life of the loan and ensures a high success rate.

Intermediaries like the Western Mass Enterprise Fund respond to the needs of owners at each step in the business growth.

As we all know, small businesses are the lifeblood of the American economy. The greatest job growth in the economy comes from the growth of successful small businesses.

With that, I again, Madam Speaker, urge, in spite of good features in the underlying bill, I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, at this time I have no additional requests for time, so I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, for the last 5 years Republicans have stood by as the compensation of chief executive officers of major corporations has soared. At the same time, the salaries of middle-class Americans have stood absolutely still.

The minimum wage has not been raised since 1997, almost a decade. In that time, Congress has voted to increase its own pay nine times. If this Congress can get a raise, the American people ought to be able to get a raise. Had it been merely adjusted just for inflation from its level in 1968, those earning minimum wage would be making \$9.05 instead of \$5.15. Instead, its

purchasing power remains at its lowest level in half a century.

Madam Speaker, millions of full-time minimum wage workers and their families live in poverty. Sixty percent of minimum wage workers are women. They are adults over 20 years old. On average, minimum wage workers contribute over half of their total family's income. Who can live, much less raise a family, on \$10,700 a year?

It is not just the cost of milk and bread that has increased by 25 percent since it was last raised, Madam Speaker. Four-year public college tuition has increased 77 percent, health insurance 97 percent, gasoline 136 percent. Today, it takes a full day's pay for a minimum wage worker to pay for a single tank of gas.

Is there any clearer indication that the quality of life for those earning minimum wage in this country has decreased? Is there any more obvious sign that these families are headed in a downward spiral? The cost of everything is going up, while their wages are spiraling down.

For Democrats, this is a moral issue. We believe we should be raising the minimum wage, one of the best tools we have to keep families from falling off an economic cliff in this country. Even more than that, we believe something very elemental, that people who work full time in America should not be poor. We believe that their families should not be poor.

The fact is that despite the fact the economy grew 4.2 percent last year, its best statistical performance since 1999, very little of this growth is reaching many families. Indeed, over the past 5 years, productivity as measured by real GDP per hour worked has risen by about 14 percent, as the real wages of non-managerial workers have risen less than 2 percent. Who is getting the 12 percent?

So when people look at the statistics like that and wonder where is the rest of the money going, all they need to do is to look at their Congress emptying the Treasury by passing massive estate tax cuts for the likes of millionaires and billionaires.

Madam Speaker, by raising the minimum wage to \$7.25, this Congress can say that hardworking families have a right to share in some of this economic growth, that this country is not about the survival of the fittest but about opportunity and opportunity for all.

Lastly, Madam Speaker, there is a direct corollary between small business growth and the minimum wage. I think the findings would surprise many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Between 1997 and 2003, small business employment grew more in States with a higher minimum wage, 9.4 percent, than in the Federal minimum wage States where it only grew 6.6 percent. That tells us that raising the minimum wage is not only a matter of economic security for families but for businesses and for our economy as well.

So, Madam Speaker, I will oppose this rule, because I believe the American people need to know where their Representatives in this Congress stand when it comes to the minimum wage. They need to know, are you for economic security for families or are you against it? Do you stand with America's families or do you stand against them? That is the choice before this Congress today. I oppose the rule.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, in response to some of the comments the gentlewoman from Connecticut was making, and the gentleman from Wisconsin earlier said in his remarks that they wanted an opportunity, and was taking an opportunity on this bill, to discuss the minimum wage issue even though it was not the appropriate format, and I agree with that, I think that the discussion of this issue certainly would be more appropriate for the next appropriations bill that we will be considering, Labor-HHS. Or maybe it will come up even as a stand-alone measure. I do not know.

But it just seems to me that on this appropriation bill, Science, State, Justice and Commerce Appropriations Act, that this is not the right format to bring up the issue.

I do not question the gentleman's right or any of the Members on the other side of the aisle who have spoken during this rule time about the minimum wage issue. But this is not something that this is the last opportunity to get this done.

I want to say, Madam Speaker, too, in regard to this issue, listen to this, minimum wage hikes pit low-skilled adults against teenagers from higher income families. This was an article in a newspaper May 13, 2004.

Employers react to minimum wage hikes by replacing low-skilled adults with teenagers from high-income families who are drawn into the job market by better pay. Decades of research confirmed what President Roosevelt's Department of Labor found just 1 year after the minimum wage made its debut in 1938.

In a number of instances there have been reports that workers who have been receiving less than the minimum wage have been laid off and replaced by more efficient workers. Minimum wage hikes can destroy jobs and destroy them permanently. When jobs are destroyed by minimum wage hikes, those jobs often never come back.

Again, this is a newspaper article from May 13, 2004. Following minimum wage increases, employers often replace less skilled employees with machines or simply reduce the level of service to customers. Businesses automate their telephone reception. Fast food diners bus their own tables. Gas stations go self-service. Shoppers scan and bag their own groceries.

The point I am making, Madam Speaker, is that you have to be, and I know the gentleman from Wisconsin

certainly understands these issues as well as anybody, but the concern is that you do not want to destroy jobs by raising the minimum wage to a level, that this in fact happens, as I quoted from some of these articles in past statistics.

I do not think that this side of the aisle is opposed to looking at this issue, and, again, whether it is on the Labor-HHS bill or whether it is on a stand-alone situation, but I do not think this is the appropriate time to have this debate.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 10½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, the gentleman says that this is an inappropriate bill to which to attach the minimum wage. The majority party has routinely attached gigantic pieces of legislation to appropriation bills.

The Senate majority leader did that, as I just recited a few minutes ago, on an outrageous special interest provision insulating the drug companies from legal suit just a few months ago.

Let me tell you what is inappropriate. What is inappropriate is to have a bunch of guys wearing suits in this Chamber sit on their duffs for 9 years and not find a way to increase the minimum wage for the lowest paid workers in this country. That is what is inappropriate.

□ 1145

This is what is outrageous, and that is why the ranking of this Congress is less than 23 percent in the public opinion polls. I would like to find somebody in that 23 percent. I cannot believe there are 23 percent of the people who think this Congress has lived up to its obligations to middle-income workers and the middle class.

The fact is, you can either help raise the minimum wage or you can stand as an obstacle to it. So far, the Rules Committee has stood as an obstacle to it. The Republican leadership of this House has stood as an obstacle to it. When we did attach it to the most appropriate appropriations bill, your leadership blocked that bill from coming forward.

So give me a break. It is not that you do not think this is the appropriate vehicle. It says your party, by a 2-1 ratio, in this House is really against the minimum wage increase; and that is outrageous after you have just voted to give yourself a COLA.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to make sure that the gentleman from Wisconsin knows that this Member voted against giving himself a COLA and has consistently done

that in the two terms that I have served.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGREY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I wish more Members would join him and me.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have no further requests for time, and I will close with an urge to my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule as a protest against not being able to raise the minimum wage. The idea that if we were to raise that 50 cents would cause such inflationary spirals in this country is so laughable that I am surprised anybody would even try to contemplate such a thing, or that in order to have to pay somebody an extra dollar an hour you would go out and buy a many thousand dollar machine. I cannot imagine any businessperson in the country to be that incredibly dumb.

The fact of the matter is that we simply have got our foot on the necks of those people, and we cannot worry about them because the concerns of this Congress are for the rich and not for those who are struggling to make it.

Even if there are young people trying to pay their way through college, for heaven's sake, give them a better break. The college tuition costs have gone up higher than almost any other thing in the country. That is one of the reasons it always breaks my heart on the death rate and wounding rate in Iraq, because so many of the young and men and women who went into the Guard and Reserve did so in order to be able to get an education.

I think it is deplorable that this country cannot provide better education opportunities for its students without having them to put their lives on the line, but that is the circumstances we find ourselves in.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I would simply like to point out small business employment between 1997 and 2003 grew at a faster rate in States with a higher minimum wage than it did in Federal minimum wage States, 9.4 percent versus 6.6 percent.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. The gentleman is correct, and I believe 43 States have had the wisdom to try to raise the minimum wage because we simply cannot get it done here.

It should not be the luck of the draw where you are living whether the minimum wage is going to be raised or not. It is a responsibility we have and a responsibility, frankly, most people are tired of watching us shirk.

With that, I urge a "no" vote on this rule because of the minimum wage.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, in regard to minimum wage increases and the hope, the fact is that as minimum wage increases, hope for job seekers decrease. A Duke University economist found recently that for every 10 percent increase in mandated wages, the probability of job seekers finding a job decreased by nearly 3 percent, according to the Employment Policies Institute.

Other top researchers found similar results. This one, a Boston University study, noted that low-skilled adults in States that raise their minimum wage are often crowded out of the job market by teens and students.

Research from Michigan State University echoed this conclusion, finding that high-skilled teens are those who are perceived as desirable employees often displace low-skilled employees in a minimum wage job after a mandated wage hike.

Madam Speaker, I rise again in support of this rule and in recognition of the importance of this underlying bill.

H.R. 5672 funds the critical operations of our government from the diplomatic affairs of the State Department to the law enforcement activities of the Justice Department.

Additionally, it provides funds for the various watchdog agencies that ensure a free and fair economic playing field for businesses and consumers alike.

This bill has substantial funding for sciences, to make sure that America stays on the forefront of medical and technological innovation as we continue to reach for the stars, both literally and figuratively.

While some critics may call for more funding of this program or that program, they not only fail to realize the limited funds available in this Federal budget but also fail to fully appreciate the hard work of the subcommittee in balancing our funding needs with the need to respect the taxpayer dollar.

Madam Speaker, while this bill may not be perfect, no bill is, it is a good bill that sets priorities and it sets a solid vision for the future on multiple fronts.

So, in conclusion, I again want to thank subcommittee Chairman WOLF, Ranking Member MOLLOHAN, full committee Chairman LEWIS and for all of the hard work and the time that went into this bill before us today.

I want to encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this rule and the underlying bill.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I oppose the Rule, because it prevents an amendment offered by Representatives OBEY, HOYER and MOLLOHAN to phase in over two years an increase in the minimum wage from \$5.15 to \$7.25 an hour.

Madam Speaker, millions of hard working Americans are barely earning enough to sup-

port their families on the wages they are being paid. Some of these people are single mothers, and some are working several jobs just to make ends meet.

Madam Speaker, the proposal to raise the minimum wage is a modest one and it is phased in over time.

Department of Labor figures show that the minimum wage was at its most valuable in 1968, and since then its value has fluctuated, but it has never been lower than it is now.

In January 2006, it would have needed to be increased to \$9.05 to equal the purchasing power of the statutory minimum wage in 1968.

There has been no raise in the minimum wage in almost ten years, and minimum wage increases over the years have not kept up with increased prices.

I have always, and will continue always to support a reasonable increase in the minimum wage, and since the Rule sought to prohibit an amendment to do this, I oppose this Rule.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

FREEDOM TO DISPLAY THE AMERICAN FLAG ACT OF 2005

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 42) to ensure that the right of an individual to display the flag of the United States on residential property not be abridged.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 42

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Freedom to Display the American Flag Act of 2005".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "flag of the United States" has the meaning given the term "flag, standard, colors, or ensign" under section 3 of title 4, United States Code;

(2) the terms "condominium association" and "cooperative association" have the