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 gentlewoman 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 support 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

meanings given such terms under section 604 of Public Law 96–399 (15 U.S.C. 3603);

(3) the term ''residential real estate management association'' has the meaning given such term under section 528 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 528); and

(4) the term ''member''—

(A) as used with respect to a condominium association, means an owner of a condominium unit (as defined under section 604 of Public Law 96–399 (15 U.S.C. 3603)) within such association;

(B) as used with respect to a cooperative association, means a cooperative unit owner (as defined under section 604 of Public Law 96–399 (15 U.S.C. 3603)) within such association; and

(C) as used with respect to a residential real estate management association, means an owner of a residential property within a subdivision, development, or similar area subject to any policy or restriction adopted by such association.

SEC. 3. RIGHT TO DISPLAY THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES.

A condominium association, cooperative association, or residential real estate management association may not adopt or enforce any policy, or enter into any agreement, that would restrict or prevent a member of the association from displaying the flag of the United States on residential property within the association with respect to which such member has a separate ownership interest or a right to exclusive possession or use.

SEC. 4. LIMITATIONS.

Nothing in this Act shall be considered to permit any display or use that is inconsistent with—

(1) any provision of chapter 1 of title 4, United States Code, or any rule or custom pertaining to the proper display or use of the flag of the United States (as established pursuant to such chapter or any otherwise applicable provision of law); or

(2) any reasonable restriction pertaining to the time, place, or manner of displaying the flag of the United States necessary to protect a substantial interest of the condominium association, cooperative association, or residential real estate management association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I have a constituent and a friend, Hugh Warner, who runs American Flag Service. He sells a lot of flags, one of the biggest flag salespersons in the country; and Hugh several years ago pointed out to me a problem that some of his buyers had. These were purchasers who were members of a homeowner's association or a condominium association who, when they flew their flag, were admonished by the association that they could not fly a flag on their condo or on their townhouse or home. So, as a result of those problems that Mr. WARNER found several of his people had, as a result of some research that we did, we filed H.R. 42.

This is a very simple bill. We believe that it is a reasonable compromise between the rights of an association, homeowner's association, condominium association, to maintain the value of their properties and the rights of the individual to fly his country's flag.

We are not alone in being advised of this problem, because I have here in my hand newspaper reports from a number of newspapers that are reporting actions, there must be six or eight here, by States that were addressing this same problem; and they each one have passed bills that says that the homeowner's association may place reasonable limits on flying the flag, but they cannot prohibit the flying of the flag.

I will make these a part of the RECORD. We have here some letters from several organizations who are supporting this bill. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, AMVETS, the Military Officers Association of America, and the Gold Star Wives of America are all in support of this bill.

It is a very simple bill. It simply says that a homeowner or condominium owner cannot be prohibited from flying the flag of his country. It also says that the association may place reasonable limits on the time and the manner of displaying the flag.

We think that this is a commonsense accommodation of the rights of the associations to maintain the value of their properties and the rights of Americans to fly the flag.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard for me to understand how a flag outside my condo could depreciate the value of my condo. I would just think that Americans flying flags should increase the value of whatever it flies on.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, June 26, 2006.

Hon. ROSCOE BARTLETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BARTLETT: On behalf of the 2.4 million members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, VFW, and our Auxiliaries, I wish to express our views on the preservation and proper display of our national flag.

The VFW views our national banner as a living symbol. Flags and flag education are a hallmark of our Citizenship Education program. We promote frequent display of the flag, especially on national holidays and days of remembrance. The flag should only be flown during daylight hours, unless illuminated. For a complete guide to the proper display of our national colors, please view our Web site: www.vfw.org.

In addition to proper national flag display guidelines maintained on our Web site, we believe that any display of the flag should keep with local traditions and norms. The bearer of the flag should consider the impact to the community and the flag. The flag should be the correct size for the method of display, thus keeping it from becoming an obstruction. The damage to the flag needs to be considered such as displaying a flag on a highway, which exposes the flag to stains and fabric rips.

Congressman Bartlett, I thank you for your addressing this issue. Your recognition of America's current and future veterans is very much appreciated by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. If any member of my staff or I may be of assistance, do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

DENNIS CULLINAN,
Director, National Legislative Service.

JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2006.

Congressman ROSCOE D. BARTLETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BARTLETT: On behalf of the Jewish War Veterans of the USA, JWV, I am writing to offer our whole-hearted support for the passage of H.R. 42, ''Freedom to Display the American Flag Act of 2005.''

The members of the JWV, the oldest active veterans' organization in the country, have fought hard to defend the American flag and gladly support the right to display it proudly even in the face of resistance from condominium and other homeowners' associations.

Please count us among the supporters of the bill. We urge its swift passage.

Sincerely,

COL (Ret) HERB ROSENBLEETH,
National Executive Director.

AMVETS,
Lanham, MD, June 21, 2006.

Hon. ROSCOE BARTLETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. BARTLETT: On behalf of AMVETS, American Veterans, I write to endorse your bill, H.R. 42, the Freedom to Display the American Flag Act of 2005. I appreciate your leadership on this issue.

AMVETS strongly supports the right of every person to freely fly the U.S. Flag on their own residential property. I am shocked to learn that some housing associations have been discouraging or preventing homeowners from displaying the Flag. This is certainly not what America is all about. H.R. 42 would affirm an individual's right to fly the Flag on their own property, regardless of any association rules.

The Flag is the symbol of our great Nation. It belongs to all of us and it waves as the ultimate expression of freedom. It represents liberty, equal opportunity, tolerance, and goodwill for those who share our aspirations. Everyone should have the right to display the Flag wherever and whenever they choose, especially on their own property.

Again, thank you for your timely and appropriate bill. I am hopeful the House will act swiftly on H.R. 42 and give homeowners the unabridged right to freely fly the noble symbol of our great Nation.

Sincerely,

EDWARD W. KEMP,
National Commander.

MILITARY OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICA,
Alexandria, VA, June 22, 2006.

Hon. ROSCOE BARTLETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BARTLETT: On behalf of the 360,000 members of the Military Officers Association of America, MOAA, I am writing to support your bill, H.R. 42, that would require condominium associations and similar entities to permit owners to display the U.S. Flag, and for other purposes.

H.R. 42 strengthens freedom of speech under the First Amendment to the Constitution and safeguards that freedom for those who wish to display the U.S. Flag as resident owners of certain types of communities.

Your bill would provide that a condominium association, cooperative association,

or residential real estate management association may not adopt or enforce any policy, or enter into any agreement, that would restrict or prevent an association member from displaying the U.S. flag on residential property within the association with respect to which such member has a separate ownership interest or a right to exclusive possession or use. The bill stipulates that the legislation be consistent with Federal law or rule governing the display of the flag and be consistent with other reasonable management restrictions pertaining to the time, place or manner of such display.

Thank you for your leadership on this common sense measure. MOAA is pleased to endorse H.R. 42, the ''Freedom to Display the American Flag Act of 2005''.

Sincerely,

NORBERT R. RYAN,
President.

GOLD STAR WIVES OF AMERICA, INC.,
Arlington, VA, June 12, 2006.

Hon. ROSCOE G. BARTLETT,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BARTLETT: On behalf of Gold Star Wives of America, 'thank you' for introducing H.R. 42, the ''Freedom to Display the American Flag Act of 2005.'' Gold Star Wives support H.R. 42 because it's the right thing to do to display the American flag on one's own property. It's the patriotic thing to do, especially with Flag Day coming up. We all should be proud to display the American flag.

Over the years, we've read news reports that organizations such as condo or coop associations have rules that prevent their home-owners from flying the American flag on their own property. How unpatriotic of these association managers for their absurd rules. Those management rules are senseless. They should be encouraging flying the American flag, not discouraging it.

Our soldiers continue to serve and die for our country to make it free—free to fly the American flag, especially on our own property!

Sincerely,

ROSE E. LEE,
Chair, Legislative Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I rise today in support of H.R. 42, the Freedom to Display the American Flag Act.

This bill, as the gentleman stated, provides that a condominium association, a cooperative association, or residential real estate management association may not prohibit a resident of the association from displaying an American flag on their property within the association.

American citizens should not be prevented from expressing simple acts of patriotism, especially raising the flag on their own property, even if their property is part of a larger association of properties.

I am proud to be here today to support this bill, which supports basic patriotism and ensures that Americans may display the American flag wherever they live.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of H.R. 42, the Freedom to Display the American Flag Act. This bill would allow homeowners to fly the American flag on their own property in accordance with the U.S. Flag Code.

I signed on to this bill because I have a constituent who was told by his homeowners association that his flagpole and his display of the American flag were in violation of their association rules.

Homeowners should have the freedom to display the American flag on their property. Our flag represents our country as a symbol of our patriotism, unity, and most of all bravery.

Right now our service men and women are courageously fighting the war on terrorism and putting their lives on the line every day to protect our great Nation and the freedoms that we hold so dearly.

This bill guarantees the homeowner the ability display the flag and show their support for this great Nation.

We must always remember the sacrifices others have made so that we enjoy the freedoms we have. The flag should never be considered an eyesore on property.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 42.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEASONED CUSTOMER CTR EXEMPTION ACT OF 2006

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5341) to amend section 5313 of title 31, United States Code, to reform certain requirements for reporting cash transactions, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5341

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

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Seasoned Customer CTR Exemption Act of 2006''.

SEC. 2. EXCEPTION FROM CURRENCY TRANSACTION REPORTS FOR SEASONED CUSTOMERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds as follows:

(1) The completion of and filing of currency transaction reports under section 5313 of title 31, United States Code, poses a compliance burden on the financial industry.

(2) Due to the nature of the transactions or the persons and entities conducting such transactions, some reports as currently filed may not be relevant to the detection, deterrence, or investigation of financial crimes, including money laundering and the financing of terrorism.

(3) However, the data contained in such reports can provide valuable context for the analysis of other data derived pursuant to subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code, as well as investigative data, which provide invaluable and indispensable information supporting efforts to combat money laundering and other financial crimes.

(4) An appropriate exemption process from the reporting requirements for certain currency transactions that are of little or no value to ongoing efforts of law enforcement agencies, financial regulatory agencies, and the financial services industry to investigate, detect, or deter financial crimes would continue to fulfill the compelling need to produce and provide meaningful information to policy-makers, financial regulators, law enforcement, and intelligence agencies, while potentially lowering the compliance burden placed on financial institutions by the need to file such reports.

(5) The Secretary of the Treasury has by regulation, and in accordance with section 5313 of title 31, United States Code, implemented a process by which institutions may seek exemptions from filing certain currency transaction reports based on appropriate circumstances; however, the financial industry has not taken full advantage of these provisions and has contended that they are unduly burdensome.

(6) The act of providing notice to the Secretary of the Treasury of designations of exemption—

(A) provides meaningful information to law enforcement officials on exempt customers and enables law enforcement to obtain account information through appropriate legal process; and

(B) complements other sections of title 31, United States Code, whereby law enforcement can locate financial institutions with relevant records relating to a person of investigative interest, such as information requests made pursuant to regulations implementing section 314(a) of the USA PATRIOT Act of 2001.

(7) A designation of exemption has no effect on requirements for depository institutions to apply the full range of anti-money laundering controls required under subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code, and related provisions of law, including the requirement to apply the customer identification program pursuant to section 5326 of such title, and the requirement to identify, monitor, and, if appropriate, report suspicious activity in accordance with section 5318(g) of such title.

(8) The Federal banking agencies and the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network have recently provided guidance through the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Bank Secrecy Act/Anti-Money Laundering Examination Manual on applying appropriate levels of due diligence and identifying suspicious activity by the types of cash-intensive businesses that generally will be subject to exemption.

(b) SEASONED CUSTOMER EXEMPTION.—Section 5313(e) of title 31, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(e) QUALIFIED CUSTOMER EXEMPTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Before the end of the 270-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Seasoned Customer CTR Exemption Act of 2006, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations that exempt any depository institution from filing a report pursuant to this section in a transaction for the payment, receipt, or transfer of United States coins or currency (or other monetary instruments the Secretary of the Treasury prescribes) with a qualified customer of the depository institution.

''(2) QUALIFIED CUSTOMER DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified customer', with respect to a depository institution, has such meaning as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, which shall include any person that—

''(A) is incorporated or organized under the laws of the United States or any State, including a sole proprietorship (as defined in 31 C.F.R. 103.22(d)(6)(vii), as in effect on May 10, 2006), or is registered as and eligible to do business within the United States or a State;

''(B) has maintained a deposit account with the depository institution for at least 12 months; and

''(C) has engaged, using such account, in multiple currency transactions that are subject to the reporting requirements of subsection (a).