



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JANUARY 19, 2007

No. 11

## Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, January 22, 2007, at 1 p.m.

## House of Representatives

FRIDAY, JANUARY 19, 2007

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROSS).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, January 19, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE ROSS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: America has put her trust in the love God has for us and has shown us throughout our history.

Those who live in such love live in God, and God lives in them.

So let us love one another. For then the love that comes from God living in us will reach out to a waiting world and all will be drawn in to love both now and forever. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WALSH of New York led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 10 one-minute requests on each side.

### LET'S COME TOGETHER FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, assuming we get there, how strange the politics of today will seem to future generations. Here we are debating whether to send more troops into a nation we are already illegally occupying for oil. Here we are contemplating the U.S. invading another nation, Iran. I wonder if we would be having that discussion if Iran did not have a tremendous amount of oil.

All around us we are in conflict because we are addicted to oil. Our energy consumption choices are causing global warming which is causing

weather patterns to change. Think about what we have seen in the last few weeks alone: snow in Los Angeles, billions of dollars in damage to California citrus crops because of a freeze.

The burning of fossil fuels has contributed to erratic weather. Last year, we had the warmest weather in the United States continent in 112 years.

Now, instead of separating the world with our politics, it is imperative that we bring the world together to meet the challenge of global climate change. I am hopeful that in his State of the Union Address next week, the President is going to take a direction to do that.

### OUTRAGE ON THE BORDER

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, on the desolate Arizona-Mexico board last week, a border agent was apprehending seven illegals when a fight broke out at the scene. The border agent shot one of the illegals. The Mexican Government, in its self-righteous arrogance and without knowing any of the facts, has already condemned the border agent.

President Calderon, like Generalissimo Fox before him, is partly responsible for this incident. Why? Because his government encourages illegals to sneak into America. The blood of the dead is on the hands of the Mexican Government.

Meanwhile, back in Texas, a criminal illegal from Mexico, having been deported several times, is charged with

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g.,  1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H761

the murder of a Houston police officer by shooting him in the back. Don't hear much outrage and protest from President Calderon on this case. Why not? President Calderon needs to quit blaming the U.S. for problems he is responsible for in Mexico because his people are fleeing Mexico's third-world environment. He needs to quit encouraging illegals to go to America. He needs to quit making his problem our problem; otherwise, more Americans and Mexicans will continue to die on the border.

And that's just the way it is.

#### SINN FEIN'S ARD COMHAIRLE VOTE ON POLICING

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday in Dublin, the national executive of Sinn Fein voted in favor of holding a special Ard Fheis on January 28 to vote on a motion supporting police and the rule of law.

For those who remain committed to lasting peace and reconciliation on the island of Ireland, bringing this peace process to a successful conclusion, it was a development that would have been unimaginable just 10 years ago.

On both sides of the Irish Sea, the decision by Sinn Fein was welcomed as historic and important. The Taoiseach of Ireland, Bertie Ahern, called it a landmark and timely decision. The British Secretary of State for the North, Peter Hain, called it a hugely significant move of seismic proportions.

Mr. Speaker, as someone who has been involved in this process for three decades, I would describe the action by Sinn Fein as remarkable. It is a reflection of the leadership of Sinn Fein's Gerry Adams and Martin McGuinness. At a critical moment, they honored their commitments and once again kept their word. A vote taken by the executive last week is just the latest example.

No one should minimize the difficulties this decision is causing Sinn Fein leadership on the ground, but for nationalists and republicans the issue of policing has been a long and troubled history. I am confident that the special Ard Fheis will see it as a defining moment in Irish history and vote to support policing and the rule of law.

#### END OF 100-HOUR AGENDA—THANK GOODNESS

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, thank goodness that the 100-hour agenda is over. Maybe now we can get down to doing some real work on behalf of the American people.

The celebration by our friends on the other side of the aisle is for a victory of

form over substance. In just 2 weeks, they have passed a watered-down 9/11 Commission recommendations package, killed working-class jobs by imposing an unfunded mandate upon small businesses, limited choice in health care by forcing the government to fix prices and decrease the availability of medicines for seniors, pulled a bait-and-switch by misrepresenting their promise to cut student loan interest rates while offering no real relief to students; and finally, amazingly, fostered greater reliance on foreign oil by raising taxes on domestic oil production and exploration.

The American people know the difference between campaign rhetoric and good policy, and they demand that the majority honor an open, honest and fair legislative process, one that produces positive, principled and bipartisan solutions. The American people expect no less and deserve more than has been delivered so far.

#### 100-HOUR AGENDA IS A GREAT SUCCESS

(Mr. ALTMIRE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, during the Democrats' 100-hour agenda, the House overwhelmingly passed six bills that are going to make a real impact on the lives of everyday Americans. We have done what we said we are going to do and what the American people wanted to us do, and most important, we did it in a strong bipartisan fashion.

Sixty-eight Republicans joined us in implementing the 9/11 Commission recommendations; 82 Republicans joined us in raising the minimum wage for the first time in 10 years; and 124 Republicans joined us in cutting in half the interest rates on student loans. These bills received strong bipartisan support because they are important to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that as we move forward we can continue to move legislation that can garner the support of both Republicans and Democrats in this House so that we can continue to make the lives of the American people better.

#### KLAMATH COUNTY, OREGON

(Mr. WALDEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, this Congress and the last has failed to keep the Federal Government's commitment to the people who live near our national forests. This breach of faith means Greg Thede, the Klamath County school district superintendent, is faced with the choice of letting teachers go, not purchasing English and reading books for all K-12 programs for nearly a decade, or robbing from the school maintenance budget to cover budget shortfalls.

The Klamath County Sheriff's force of 35 officers, which currently patrols a

6,000 square mile area, that is nearly 100 times larger than the District of Columbia, my colleagues, will now be protected with no backup and by as few as 20 officers.

Klamath County, Oregon, is no stranger to hardship nor to hard work; however, they had to endure much of both in the past few years because the Federal Government keeps breaking its commitment to this rural community. As Al Switzer, Klamath County commissioner says: "These are America's forests; they just happen to be in Klamath County."

It is time for Congress to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act, keep faith with rural schools and counties, and keep the word of the Federal Government to timbered communities.

#### DEMOCRATS WORK ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, NOT THE SPECIAL INTERESTS

(Mr. SIRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, for too long the American people have been paying for the cost of corruption here in Washington, whether it be skyrocketing prices at the pump last summer, or spiraling prescription drug costs. Democrats vowed to wrestle power of this institution away from special interest lobbyists who have been running it for the last 6 years.

Democrats began to restore faith in Congress when we reformed our rules to prevent the kind of lobbying scandals that have become commonplace during much of the past 6 years.

We then began to fix some of the laws that were written and passed in the dark of night. During the first 100 hours in power, we gave the Federal Government the ability to negotiate lower prescription drug prices for American seniors, something that should have been done when the law was first passed.

Yesterday, we repealed \$14 billion in subsidies to big oil companies that simply don't need it right now. We have taken the savings and invested them in renewable fuels so that we can begin to end our dependence on foreign oil.

Mr. Speaker, our first 100 hours are over, but we are only beginning to work on behalf of the American people.

#### AMSTERDAM PROSTITUTION

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the coarsening of culture doesn't happen overnight. It is a slow, steady process that chips away at our moral compass; but every now and then something comes along that puts things in perspective and shows us how far the slide has gone.

I read recently that city officials in Amsterdam have approved putting up a

statue of a prostitute as a tribute to prostitutes worldwide. Sadly, this strikes me as one of those times when we are able to step back and see just how far we have regressed. The last thing the world's prostitutes need is a statue commemorating the sex industry. The sex industry in places like Amsterdam and countless other cities worldwide is not something to be celebrated. It is a tragedy marked by forced sexual servitude, demeaning human exploitation, and unspeakable brokenness.

Each year, countless numbers of girls are kidnapped and forced into sexual slavery. They lose not only their basic human dignity; many will lose their lives.

Mr. Speaker, these people don't need a statue. We need to help them get out of this exploitative lifestyle.

#### COMPLETION OF 100 HOURS

(Mr. HARE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, during the last election, Democrats had a conversation with the American people. We listened to their concerns; the skyrocketing prices of college tuition and prescription drugs, the dangerously low minimum wage, the persisting security threats to our Nation, gas price gouging by Big Oil, and the disgraceful way the House has been conducting the People's business, and we promised to act quickly to make important changes and take America in a new direction.

I am pleased that we can report to those millions of Americans who voted to elect a Democratic majority in Congress, we have heard your concerns and we have taken action. Already less than 100 hours into this new Democratic Congress, we have passed legislation to clean up House ethics rules, implement the 9/11 Commission recommendations, raised the minimum wage, end Federal subsidies to Big Oil, and lower the price of prescription drugs and a college education.

Mr. Speaker, great progress has been made already this session, but these first 100 hours are just the beginning. Democrats are committed to continuing to improve the lives of all Americans. That is what we were elected to do.

□ 1015

#### NORTHERN IRELAND PEACE PROCESS

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

Mr. WALSH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor this morning with my good friend and colleague, RICHARD NEAL of Massachusetts, to draw attention to the Northern Ireland peace process.

Many remember Northern Ireland's troubles with the endless bombings,

bullets, bloodshed and continuous cycle of violence. The fight was for civil rights and national aspiration. The combatants made a conscious decision to end the killing and reach a compromise.

Thanks to the efforts of the British, Irish and American governments and the political leaders of Northern Ireland, we have had peace for about 10 years. But they are still struggling to implement the Good Friday Agreement that provides for power sharing, proportional representation and self-governance.

Over the years, in the face of significant criticism, Sinn Fein has delivered on every commitment outlined in the Good Friday Agreement.

We now look to Ian Paisley and the Democratic Unionist Party to step up and deliver on behalf of the Unionist community. It is time for the DUP to validate their word given at St. Andrews by unequivocally committing to a devolved power sharing government with Sinn Fein. They must make good on their word and consummate their remarkable achievement. An historic moment is dawning on the island of Ireland. It is time to act.

#### COMPLETION OF 100 HOURS

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, last November the American people overwhelmingly called for change in Congress and a change in the direction of this country. In the first 100 hours after taking office the new Democratic majority answered that call by passing significant legislation to begin taking this Congress and this country in a new direction.

First, we passed groundbreaking ethics reform and fiscal responsibility rules to clean up the way Congress operates. Then we implemented the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, a long overdue step towards making our Nation safer. We went on to raise the minimum wage for millions of working Americans, gave HHS the ability to negotiate cheaper prescription drug prices for millions of seniors, and made college tuition more affordable for millions of students. And just yesterday, we repealed Republican policies that gave corporate welfare to big oil companies instead of investing those funds in consumer relief alternative fuels and energy efficient technology.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats were elected because Americans wanted to see real change in Congress, and we have not let them down. The legislation we passed will make a real difference in the lives of all Americans, and we can all be proud of the great start that we have made right here in this House.

#### GLOBAL WARMING TASK FORCE

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Speaker has indicated that she intends to appoint a special task force, a select committee, to investigate global warming. The committee I serve on, Energy and Commerce, has jurisdiction on this matter and, in fact, we have had a hearing on this subject on July 27, 2006 in our oversight subcommittee. We investigated the so-called hockey stick effect. The hearing showed that there is a lot of information on global warming and that this is a very serious issue. But I question the need for another committee when the Energy and Commerce has full legislative power to continue to investigate and legislate. The committee the Speaker has designated will duplicate what is already in place with the longstanding expertise on the Energy and Commerce. In fact, as the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee recently said, "We are just empowering a bunch of enthusiastic amateurs to go around and make speeches and make commitments that will be very difficult to honor."

#### GIVING AMERICANS WHAT THEY WANT IN A BIPARTISAN FASHION

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, last year during the political campaign, House Democrats promised to pass six pieces of legislation if the American people trusted us with control of the House. The American people were looking for a new direction and turned to us to get them there.

In the first 3 weeks of the new Congress, we have not disappointed. Democrats have delivered on all six promises. During 100 hours we have increased the minimum wage, implemented the 9/11 Commission recommendations, cut student loan interest rates in half, repealed preposterous welfare handouts to Big Oil, approved Federal funding for promising stem cell research, and provided our government the ability to negotiate lower prescription drug prices for America's seniors.

Six major pieces of legislation passed by this House within the first 100 hours of the 110th Congress. And this legislation begins to move our Nation in a new direction, one where the needs of all Americans are finally addressed here on the House floor. These six pieces of legislation will produce real results for the American people, and that is why they garnered such strong bipartisan support over the last 3 weeks. And this is only the beginning.

#### FREEZING WEATHER IN CALIFORNIA

(Mr. MCCARTHY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk of the severe damage that the recent freezing weather in the Central Valley and Central Coast has had on our crops.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must do what we can to help the hardworking farmers and workers who were hit this past week with freezing weather and are predicted to have lost almost all their crops which feed our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, California's fresh citrus industry is valued at over \$1 billion and provides 95 percent of the country's fresh citrus. Kern County alone, which I represent, produced over \$350 million worth of citrus in 2005. While we do not know the full extent of the damage yet, over 75 percent of our citrus crops may have been lost.

Also in my district is San Luis Obispo, where over \$7 million worth of avocados were grown last year, this freeze could have ruined the next year's crops as well.

My heart goes out to all my constituents who have spent sleepless nights trying to save their crops. I applaud Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, who has already declared a state of emergency in Kern and San Luis Obispo and eight other counties. My California colleagues and I have already sent a letter to the Agriculture Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this Congress to speed all Federal disaster assistance they can to California farmers and workers.

#### 100 HOUR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to hear the Republicans belittling the 100 hours, say, well, we really didn't do much. It is low hanging fruit. Well, if that is so, why in the last 12 years did the Republicans not raise the Federal minimum wage? In fact, they didn't even allow a vote on raising the Federal minimum wage in the last decade, and they would belittle that because they don't care about working people in this country.

They said a year ago, their leaders in face of the Abramoff scandal which enveloped the Republican Party, that they would have ethics reform on the floor and passed before the end of February. Well, February came and went. We got it done in January, a year later, after we took control. They couldn't even clean up their own mess. And they belittle what we are doing.

A year ago, they jammed through legislation to raise the cost of student financial aid to pay for tax cuts for wealthy investors, to extend those tax breaks from 2008 to 2010. Yesterday, we passed legislation to cut the costs of interest and student financial aid in half. We took on big banks, and we will take on the wealthy investors. There is a big difference in this Congress, and the Republicans are whining.

#### THE HOLD ON TO YOUR WALLET CONGRESS

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, this is the "Hold on to Your Wallet Congress" because they have spent 100 hours getting into the taxpayers' wallet, and as we have heard them say, they have just gotten started.

We have had no regular order, no rules. They have made it easier to raise taxes by passing a semblance of PAYGO that makes spending permanent and tax relief temporary.

They don't want recorded votes because they don't want their constituents to know what they are voting on. They have passed a 9/11 bill that our private industry tells us is going to be billions of dollars in cost to the taxpayer. We have a minimum wage bill that is going to cost billions of dollars to small businesses and also brought about the Tunagate scandal.

Yes, you know, we are seeing it on every front, an energy bill that is going to raise taxes, not make gas more affordable, student loan legislation that doesn't do one single thing to help students get into college and stay in college.

Yes, hold on to your wallet, Mr. Speaker. They are coming for it.

#### RECOGNIZING PETTY OFFICER DUSTIN KIRBY

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share one of the many stories of bravery from our Armed Forces stationed in Iraq. I want to tell you about Navy Petty Officer Dustin Kirby, a native of Hiram, Georgia, a skilled Navy corpsman attached to the 2nd Marine Division in Iraq.

Petty Officer Kirby was injured by sniper fire outside of Fallujah on Christmas Day. I had the honor of visiting him and his family at Bethesda Naval Hospital earlier this week, and I was deeply moved by his courage and dedication to the defense of our Nation.

From my visit, it was clear Petty Officer Kirby had touched many lives. In fact, while we visited he got a phone call from his fellow troops overseas.

His wife, Lauren, his parents, Jack and Gail, his brother and sister, all shared with me their praise of his bravery and resolve.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of soldiers like Petty Officer Dustin Kirby that I know we will achieve victory in Iraq. The dedication and determination of our Armed Forces is what protects our Nation every day and what will ultimately help deliver security and freedom in the Middle East.

I ask that my colleagues join me in commending Petty Officer Kirby for his service.

#### CONGRATULATING ELIZABETH ELZA

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend congratulations to Elizabeth Elza of Elkins, West Virginia, who was recently awarded the Most Outstanding Junior Trooper Award in the 11th annual West Virginia State Junior Trooper Academy. Elizabeth's hard work, dedication and outstanding performance contributed to her recognition as the top junior trooper.

At the Junior Trooper Academy, junior troopers are trained in law enforcement activities to expose them to the criminal justice and law enforcement career fields during an intensive 5-day period. Candidates are between 14 and 17 years old and must be recommended by a State legislator, school superintendent or uniformed member of the State police.

Elizabeth is truly a leader in her community and among her peers. We need more women in leadership positions, and I am pleased to say that Elizabeth is well on her way to being a role model for future young women in West Virginia. Elizabeth is not only a leader in her community, but an accomplished athlete as a member of, get this, the Elkins High School wrestling team.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to highlight Elizabeth's accomplishments. Congrats on being the most outstanding junior trooper.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Ross). Pursuant to section 201(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 601), and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker and President pro tempore of the Senate jointly appointed Dr. Peter R. Orszag as Director of the Congressional Budget Office, effective January 18, 2007, for the term expiring January 3, 2011.

#### HOUSE PAGE BOARD REVISION ACT OF 2007

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of January 18, 2007, I call up the bill (H.R. 475) to revise the composition of the House of Representatives Page Board to equalize the number of members representing the majority and minority parties and to include a member representing the parents of pages and a member representing former pages, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 475

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 "House Page Board Revision Act of 2007".

**SEC. 2. REVISION OF COMPOSITION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PAGE BOARD.**

(a) **EXPANSION OF MEMBERSHIP.**—Section 2(a) of House Resolution 611, Ninety-seventh Congress, agreed to November 30, 1982, as enacted into permanent law by section 127 of Public Law 97-377 (2 U.S.C. 88b-3(a)), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "one Member" and inserting "two Members";

(2) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (1);

(3) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraphs:

"(2) one individual who, at any time during the 5-year period which ends on the date of the individual's appointment, is or was a parent of a page participating in the program;

"(3) one individual who is a former page of the House who is not a Member of the House or an individual described in paragraph (2); and"

(b) **SPECIAL RULES FOR MEMBERS REPRESENTING PARENTS AND FORMER PAGES.**—Section 2 of such House Resolution (2 U.S.C. 88b-3) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) In the case of the members of the Page Board who are described in paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a), the following shall apply:

"(1) Each such member shall be appointed jointly by the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives.

"(2) Each such member shall serve for a term of one year and may be reappointed for additional terms if the member continues to meet the requirements for appointment.

"(3) A vacancy in the position held by any such member shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. An individual appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve for the remainder of the original term and may be reappointed in accordance with paragraph (2).

"(4) Each such member may be paid travel or transportation expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, for attending meetings of the Page Board while away from the member's home or place of business. There are authorized to be appropriated from the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives such sums as may be necessary for payments under this paragraph."

**SEC. 3. REQUIRING REGULAR MEETINGS.**

Section 1 of House Resolution 611, Ninety-seventh Congress, agreed to November 30, 1982, as enacted into permanent law by section 127 of Public Law 97-377 (2 U.S.C. 88b-2), is amended—

(1) by striking "Until otherwise" and inserting "(a) Until otherwise"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(b) The Page Board shall meet regularly, in accordance with a schedule established jointly by the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives."

**SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to the portion of the One Hundred Tenth Congress which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act and each succeeding Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, January 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as chairwoman of the Committee on House Administration, I am delighted to call up this important bill to reform the governance of the House Page Program.

I trust that all Members recall the circumstances that led to this bill coming up during the first days of this new Congress, so that there is little need to deal with them here. Suffice it to say that the events of last September have been abundantly clear that the House Page Board can no longer be constituted as it was during the last Congress with two Members of the majority but only one from the minority. Such a ratio potentially raises the specter of partisanship and political considerations where they have no place.

Mr. Speaker, the House Page Board has the statutory responsibility to govern and oversee the Page Program. The Board must not only be free of partisanship, it must function so all of its members have access to the information necessary to discharge their responsibilities and do what is right for the pages. These delightful pages, whose parents send them here, trusting that they will be safe, become the responsibility of this House.

□ 1030

If structural changes are needed to ensure that members of the page board can properly oversee the programs, free of extraneous concerns, then we must make such changes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan has written an excellent bill that changes the page board's form and function. First, it enlarges the page board to include a second Member of the House appointed by the minority leader, thus equalizing the number of Members between the two parties. I must say the Speaker of this House is using her nonpartisan efforts to try to bring equity to this board. This alone could strengthen the board dramatically by making the minority full partners on the board.

But the bill goes further. It adds two outside members of the board, one to represent parents of current or recent pages, and another one who represents a former page to represent the pages themselves. These two outside board members must be appointed jointly by the Speaker and the minority leader for a 1-year term, but can be eligible for reappointment if they continue to meet the requisite qualifications. These additional representatives for pages and parents will infuse the board's deliberations with perspectives that only they can bring.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that the page board gives the program the attention it deserves, the bill requires regular board meetings on a schedule established jointly by the Speaker and the minority leader. This bill, which would be permanent and effective immediately, authorizes reimbursement of the outside board members for the expenses of attending meetings. I am confident that Members agree that the benefits of a parent and a former page representation will be worth the modest cost.

I commend the gentleman from Michigan and the gentlewoman from West Virginia for introducing this excellent bill, and I commend the Speaker for scheduling this the first days of this landmark 110th Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 475. I will not go into any detailed explanation of it because the Chair of the committee has already given that.

But before I begin my remarks on the legislation before us, I want to express my gratitude to all the dedicated young people who come to serve the House as pages. We are blessed to have such a talented group of young people who are willing to leave home and come here to work for us and for the people of this Nation.

I still recall the first page that I appointed during my first term in the Congress. She was a wonderful young woman, and she served here well. She then went on to college, then to medical school, and is now in residency and has established an outstanding record. Both here in the Congress as a wonderful page and academically, she has done very well. I am certain she will be a wonderful doctor as well. This is typical of the types of people that we have in this Congress as pages.

This legislation is certainly no reflection on any problems that they have created, but rather a reflection on problems that Members have created. We believe that pages who serve here should feel nothing but pride for the important role they play in the daily operations of this House and in the legislation that we present. The legislation before us is meant to improve the way that we as adults conduct our oversight of the page program.

Sadly, the sordid revelations of last fall were not the first time the House had demonstrated a failure to protect the young people who come here to serve in the program.

In July 1982, following allegations of sexual misconduct involving Members of both parties and their involvement with pages, the Democratic Speaker and the Republican leader of the House appointed a Speaker's commission on pages to study the page program, its usefulness, and to determine what changes needed to be made to better protect America's youth during their

service to the House of Representatives.

Many of the commission's recommendations were adopted by the House, including the creation of a leadership-appointed page board responsible for overseeing the page program. That was certainly a step forward, and today's legislation restructures the board that was created then. It has not been the fault of the pages that we had the incident this past year. It is not even the fault of the page board; but, in fact, rather, it was the fault of not engaging the full page board to deal with the problem that made the problem even worse.

This legislation before us will improve the board, make it more effective, and enable it to better carry out its important responsibilities. The pages who work here provide tremendous service to Members, staff, and the operations of the House of Representatives. They gain an invaluable experience, a superb education and improved insight into the workings of their own government.

We owe it to them to ensure that we are doing everything possible and to ensure that they are able to have a positive, healthy, and beneficial experience. We must ensure that we are taking good care of and protecting the young people who have been entrusted to us.

The legislation that is before us will help us meet our important obligations. I believe that adding an additional member and making it truly bipartisan with no party dominating will be a truly positive change.

I believe that adding a former page to the board will be a positive change. In the past at times we have had Members serving on the board who were serving as pages. They performed that function. But by specifically naming a former page to the board, we can ensure that their input is heard.

Furthermore, having a parent of a former page or, perhaps, even a current page serve on the board will be an asset to us as we consider the operation of the page program, their education and all the regulations pertaining to them.

I hope this legislation will help us meet our important obligation in this regard, and I ask all the Members of Congress to support this excellent piece of legislation.

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

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to one of the authors of this important bill, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 475, the House Page Board Revision Act of 2007. Since 1985, I have had the honor of serving on the House page board, either as the chairman or as the Democratic representative.

Whenever we met as a board, our efforts were to arrive at decisions by

consensus. H.R. 475 strengthens that spirit of cooperation by providing two basic reforms of the House page board.

First, we expand the membership of the page board. The current membership includes two Members of the majority party and one Member of the minority party, as well as the Clerk of the House and the House Sergeant at Arms. This bill would expand the page board members by adding three new members to the board.

We add a second Member of the minority party to make it an even two Democratic Members and two Republican Members. In a major change, we also add two outside members to the board, one a parent of a current or recent page and the other, a former House page. The Speaker and the minority leader will jointly appoint the page parent and the former page. These additions to the House page board provide for partisan balance and for diversity of views from people who have direct interest in the success of the page program.

The second reform in H.R. 475 is the requirement that the House page board meet on a regular basis. The Speaker and minority leader will jointly establish the frequency of such meetings.

Mr. Speaker, we look forward to operating the page program in an effective manner. We will work together to review and constantly improve the operations of the House page program. It is our goal to assure that the pages will gain every possible benefit from this program while ensuring the well-being of the young people who serve this House as pages.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 475.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to recognize a current member of the page board, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by commending my colleague on the page board, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), for his service to the program, long service to the program, and for the bipartisan manner in which he has handled the legislation before him today.

I would also like to thank the Chair and ranking member of the House Administration Committee, and I would like to join my fellow, the ranking member and all of us, really, to say thank you to all the pages who are in the room today, all the pages who are currently serving, and all those pages who have done wonderful service in the past.

I am proud to be the original cosponsor of the House Page Board Revision Act and rise to urge my colleagues to support it. I believe my colleagues will support it.

The House page program has existed for well over a century and provides teenagers with an incredible opportunity to learn about the legislative process, gain leadership and teamwork skills that can be applied to whatever profession they decide to enter. House

pages provide a valuable service to the House of Representatives as well. The page program is truly an asset, both to this body and to the Nation.

I guarantee, if you ask any page in this room, present or former, about their experience, there is one word that they always use to describe it when I ask, and that is "fantastic." That is why Members of this House were shocked to learn that a former Congressman's inappropriate interaction with House pages came to light last fall.

As a mother, it was very upsetting to find out that children sent to Washington could possibly be preyed upon. As a Member of this House and a member of the page board, I was disappointed that the information regarding those e-mails was not shared with the full page board.

But since it is impossible to go back and fix, it is important that the House move forward to make the changes to prevent such an incident or other incidents that could endanger the safety of young people. Certainly, we all know that one of the most important rules of this House is for Members, of course, to conduct themselves in a manner that reflects credibility of the House.

But it is imperative that we learn lessons from last year's situation and take the steps necessary to better protect House pages and to ensure that any potential problem is investigated fully.

Mr. Speaker, many of the items in this bill are suggestions that I made to the page board in October, and I will include this letter into the RECORD listing my reasons for supporting this.

This legislation balances the partisan make-up of the page board by incorporating two pages from each party. I believe this provision is important, not just symbolically but it is also important because it demonstrates that nothing within the page board is ever construed as partisan.

It is important that everyone involved, House Members, staff, employees, pages, dorm supervisors alike feel comfortable approaching the page board with any information about possible threats to the safety of the children in this program. Demonstrating that the board is truly bipartisan should make this easier.

Expanding membership to include a former page and the parent of a current or recent page will improve discussions on policies for the page program and provide that additional perspective, that additional set of eyes and ears for any problems that may arise.

Certainly, regular meetings, I heartily agree, of the page board, will help shed light on any trouble facing our pages, and I am pleased that this provision has been included in the bill.

My hope is that other recommendations that have been put forward, such as a peer counseling program, better communications, will strengthen this program as we move forward into the future.

I commend the leaders of both parties for agreeing to take action to better protect the pages who serve this House; and, again, I thank Mr. KILDEE for offering this bill. This is a good bipartisan piece of legislation, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

October 5, 2006.

Hon. JOHN SHIMKUS,  
Hon. DALE KILDEE,  
*Mr. Bill Livingood, Sergeant-at-Arms.*

DEAR PAGE BOARD MEMBER: This week has been difficult for all Members of Congress, as well as for the institution in which we serve. Make no mistake, the revelation of Mark Foley's despicable actions have been difficult on the young people in our Page Program as well. I am confident that I speak for the entire Page Board in expressing outrage and hoping that anyone involved in this tragic sequence of events be severely punished.

Today, Speaker Hastert called for the Page Program to be reviewed and strengthened. As the Speaker correctly stated, times have changed since this great program was created, and I believe it is incumbent upon us to ensure we address these changes as they pertain to the Page Program.

As a fellow member of the Page Board, I write to you today for two reasons: (1) To offer my full support for the continuation of the Page Program, and (2) Offer my suggestions on how we can begin to update and strengthen this program to ensure it continues to offer a safe learning experience for our nation's young people.

As we move forward, I ask that we consider using the following items as a starting point for reform to the Page Program:

(1) Increase the number of Members of Congress on the Page Board and, like the Committee on Standards & Official Conduct, establish equal representation from both parties on the Page Board. I know we all agree that the issue of safety for the young people in the Page Program is not a partisan one.

(2) Developing a peer counseling program within the Page Program. Modeled after peer programs that have been successful in our educational system, this would provide pages with an additional outlet to express any problems or concerns that may be easier than reporting to an adult.

(3) The implementation of monthly meetings with the Page Board, pages, as well as a representative from the U.S. Capitol Police. We should create a system in which all members of the Page Board have more information on any potential problem facing the pages, including receiving reports from the Capitol Police on any possible problems with crime activity on Capitol Hill or in the page dorm neighborhood.

(4) Establish training and guidelines on educating Members of Congress and pages on the job description and responsibilities of those in the Page Program as well as proper relationships with pages, Members of Congress, or any employee of the House of the Representatives.

I look forward to working with you to achieve our shared goal of improving this great program, and more importantly, ensuring we have put in place the best procedures to protect the safety and welfare of the young people in the Page Program.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, now I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), a former page.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Chair for her time and for presenting this legislation. I also commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS),

the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), and the others who have been involved in this.

Mr. Speaker, it is important because of the tradition and because of the future. I know some people have said why does Congress even maintain the page program. We could privatize it. We could have messengers. Why does Congress even maintain a dormitory?

□ 1045

Because we contribute to the growth and the education of future leaders.

I speak as a former page, many decades past now, but I must count that as one of the formative experiences of my life. The pages learn the discipline of employment, they learn teamwork, but they also take to heart the democratic process, the representative government. They literally walk in the footsteps of some of the great figures of history. But we have a responsibility as Members of Congress not just for their education and growth, but also for their safety.

This legislation is important. I am pleased that the legislation mandates that the Page Board be composed of equal numbers of Republicans and Democrats, that it include a former page and a page parent, and mandates regular meetings of the board, so that the board is constantly aware and makes us in this body constantly aware of our responsibility for the welfare and the growth and the safety and the education of the pages.

The country is better off because of these pages, many of whom have gone on to important leadership positions and contributed in so many ways, in their hometowns, in their home States, and, in many cases, in the Federal Government.

As a former page and as a parent, I was offended and shocked at the breach of trust that occurred in the past year. But I am pleased that we are acting today to address systemic shortcomings and to prevent any such occurrence in the future, and, more to the point, working to make this a truly positive experience for all pages, all these young men and women, future leaders, and important employees and public servants even now.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just make a few closing comments.

Mr. Speaker, I am just delighted with this piece of legislation. I congratulate Mr. KILDEE, my esteemed colleague from the State of Michigan, and also Mrs. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, who spoke earlier. It is a good piece of legislation. It is, unfortunately, needed. But it should have been in place before. It might have helped to prevent some of the events we had this past year.

So I strongly support this legislation. I urge all of our colleagues to vote for it. May we all have a better Page Board and a better Page Program and continue one of the most outstanding programs that a young person in this Nation can participate in.

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

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the ranking member on the Committee on House Administration for his stewardship and his leadership in the Page Program. I would like to thank all of those who were responsible for this great legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this House must pass this bill. The Page Program is a treasured institution that offers youngsters from across this country the opportunity to serve and to learn firsthand about the Congress, while helping us to conduct the Nation's business.

As I said this morning to the pages when I was coming in, this is your bill. Of all the bills you have heard throughout the years you have been here, this one is yours, and we are happy to introduce this bill today.

Recent unfortunate events have shown that the governance of the Page Program needs reform. The House minority must be brought into the process as full partners with equal representation, eliminating any hint of partisanship. This is why I applaud the Speaker of this House. She wants to make sure, as much as we can, to have nonpartisanship in conducting the business of the People's House.

This board will benefit from new representation of parents and former pages themselves, and that is an added incentive, Mr. Speaker, because when you have parents and when you have former pages, they can have input that will benefit these pages who are here with us.

These and other reforms proposed by the gentleman from Michigan and the gentlewoman from West Virginia, who have served diligently on the Page Board, will greatly improve the program. I think also the increase in meetings will be an additive as well, Mr. Speaker.

So I am proud for all of those who have been part and parcel of this legislation, as well as I am proud of our new Speaker, who has made these reforms part of the agenda for the first days of the new Congress.

I urge all Members now to support this legislation and to protect these young folks who come from all areas of this country, coming here to do a part and to serve us as we do the people's business.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 475, the House Page Board Revision Act of 2007. I thank my colleagues, Mr. KILDEE, the gentleman from Michigan, and Mrs. CAPITO, the gentlewoman from West Virginia, for their good work in crafting this bipartisan legislation, which will do much to ensure the safety of the pages that serve the United States Congress.

In view of recent events, parents everywhere are right to be concerned for the safety of their children—after all, if children are not safe in the Capitol, the seat of the National Government, can they be safe anywhere? It is

important that we pass this legislation today to reassure the public that the Capitol is safe for children, including pages.

The scandal that erupted on September 29, 2007, involving former Representative Mark Foley's predatory conduct toward House pages, and coverup by the senior House Republican leadership, has led some to call for the termination of the Page Program. In my view, that would have been a terrible mistake and a terrible commentary upon the ability of the House of Representatives to ensure the safety of the children entrusted to its care.

Mr. Speaker, the Page Program needs to be mended not ended. The teenagers who serve as congressional pages are outstanding young men and women, invariably chosen because of their high achievement and outstanding service to their community. Service as a page is often a stepping stone to greater public service and nearly always a window into history. The program's alumni include Representative TOM DAVIS, Representative DAN BOREN, Senator CHRISTOPHER DODD, and Microsoft founder Bill Gates.

Instead of eliminating the page program, we need to get rid of sexual predators in office. An important part of the new Democratic majority's agenda is end the culture of corruption that pervaded the previous Congress and to make the 110th Congress the most ethical Congress in history.

The page program is a good thing; the kids that are in it are good kids. Right now, security for pages in Washington includes curfews, a buddy system when they leave their dormitory, 24-hour security at the residence hall, sign-outs when the pages leave, parental notification for many extracurricular activities, and a pre-program orientation laying out acceptable and unacceptable behavior for pages.

Mr. Speaker, as the Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I am proud to support this legislation today. I support H.R. 475 because it will ensure more oversight of the Page Program in Congress, thus reducing substantially the risk of exposing pages to harmful persons or conduct. We must show America that we are striving to keep America's children safe, starting here on Capitol Hill.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSS). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, January 18, 2007, the bill is considered read and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie	DeFazio	Jones (NC)
Ackerman	DeGette	Jones (OH)
Aderholt	Delahunt	Jordan
Akin	DeLauro	Kagen
Alexander	Dent	Kanjorski
Allen	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kaptur
Altmire	Diaz-Balart, M.	Keller
Andrews	Dicks	Kennedy
Arcuri	Dingell	Kildee
Baca	Doggett	Kilpatrick
Bachmann	Donnelly	Kind
Bachus	Doolittle	King (IA)
Baird	Doyle	King (NY)
Baker	Drake	Kingston
Baldwin	Dreier	Kirk
Barrett (SC)	Duncan	Klein (FL)
Barrow	Edwards	Kline (MN)
Bartlett (MD)	Ehlers	Knollenberg
Barton (TX)	Ellison	Kucinich
Bean	Ellsworth	Kuhl (NY)
Becerra	Emanuel	LaHood
Berkley	Emerson	Lamborn
Berman	Engel	Lampson
Berry	English (PA)	Langevin
Biggert	Eshoo	Lantos
Bilbray	Etheridge	Larsen (WA)
Bilirakis	Everett	Larson (CT)
Bishop (GA)	Fallin	Latham
Bishop (NY)	Farr	LaTourette
Bishop (UT)	Feeney	Lee
Blackburn	Ferguson	Levin
Blumenauer	Filner	Lewis (GA)
Blunt	Flake	Lewis (KY)
Boehner	Forbes	Linder
Bonner	Fortenberry	Lipinski
Bono	Fossella	LoBiondo
Boozman	Foxx	Loeback
Boren	Frank (MA)	Lofgren, Zoe
Boswell	Franks (AZ)	Lowey
Boucher	Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel
Boustany	Garrett (NJ)	E.
Boyd (FL)	Gerlach	Lynch
Boyd (KS)	Giffords	Mack
Brady (PA)	Gilchrest	Mahoney (FL)
Brady (TX)	Gillibrand	Maloney (NY)
Braley (IA)	Gillmor	Manzullo
Brown (SC)	Gingrey	Markey
Brown, Corrine	Gohmert	Marshall
Brown-Waite,	Gonzalez	Matheson
Ginny	Goode	Matsui
Buchanan	Goodlatte	McCarthy (CA)
Burgess	Gordon	McCarthy (NY)
Butterfield	Granger	McCaul (TX)
Campbell (CA)	Graves	McCotter
Cannon	Green, Al	McCrery
Cantor	Green, Gene	McDermott
Capito	Grijalva	McGovern
Capps	Gutierrez	McHenry
Capuano	Hall (NY)	McHugh
Cardoza	Hall (TX)	McIntyre
Carnahan	Hare	McKeon
Carney	Harman	McMorris
Carson	Hastert	Rodgers
Carter	Hastings (FL)	McNerney
Castle	Hastings (WA)	McNulty
Castor	Hayes	Meehan
Chabot	Heller	Meek (FL)
Chandler	Hensarling	Meeks (NY)
Clarke	Herger	Melancon
Clay	Hereth	Mica
Cleaver	Higgins	Michaud
Clyburn	Hill	Millender-
Coble	Hinchev	McDonald
Cohen	Hinojosa	Miller (FL)
Cole (OK)	Hirono	Miller (MI)
Conaway	Hodes	Miller (NC)
Conyers	Hoekstra	Miller, Gary
Costa	Holden	Miller, George
Costello	Holt	Mitchell
Courtney	Honda	Mollohan
Cramer	Hooley	Moore (KS)
Crenshaw	Hoyer	Moore (WI)
Crowley	Hulshof	Moran (KS)
Cubin	Hunter	Moran (VA)
Cuellar	Inglis (SC)	Murphy (CT)
Culberson	Inslee	Murphy, Patrick
Cummings	Israel	Murphy, Tim
Davis (AL)	Issa	Murtha
Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Musgrave
Davis (IL)	Jackson-Lee	Myrick
Davis (KY)	(TX)	Nadler
Davis, David	Jefferson	Neal (MA)
Davis, Jo Ann	Jindal	Neugebauer
Davis, Lincoln	Johnson (GA)	Nunes
Davis, Tom	Johnson (IL)	Oberstar
Deal (GA)	Johnson, E. B.	Obey

Olver	Rush	Tauscher
Ortiz	Ryan (OH)	Taylor
Pallone	Ryan (WI)	Terry
Pascarell	Salazar	Thompson (CA)
Pastor	Saxton	Thompson (MS)
Paul	Sánchez, Linda	Thornberry
Payne	T.	Tiahrt
Pearce	Sanchez, Loretta	Tiberi
Pence	Sarbanes	Tierney
Perlmutter	Saxton	Towns
Peterson (MN)	Schakowsky	Turner
Peterson (PA)	Schiff	Udall (CO)
Petri	Schmidt	Udall (NM)
Pickering	Schwartz	Upton
Pitts	Scott (GA)	Van Hollen
Platts	Scott (VA)	Velázquez
Poe	Sensenbrenner	Walberg
Pomeroy	Serrano	Walden (OR)
Porter	Sestak	Walsh (NY)
Price (GA)	Shadegg	Walz (MN)
Price (NC)	Shays	Wamp
Pryce (OH)	Shea-Porter	Wasserman
Putnam	Sherman	Schultz
Radanovich	Shimkus	Waters
Rahall	Shuler	Watson
Ramstad	Shuster	Watt
Rangel	Sires	Waxman
Regula	Skelton	Weiner
Rehberg	Slaughter	Welch (VT)
Reichert	Smith (NE)	Weldon (FL)
Renzi	Smith (NJ)	Weller
Reyes	Smith (TX)	Westmoreland
Reynolds	Rodriguez	Wexler
Rodriguez	Rogers (AL)	Whitfield
Rogers (KY)	Rogers (MI)	Wicker
Rogers (MI)	Rohrabacher	Souder
Roskam	Ros-Lehtinen	Space
Ross	Roskam	Spratt
Rothman	Ross	Stark
Roybal-Allard	Rothman	Stearns
Royce	Roybal-Allard	Stupak
Ruppersberger	Royce	Sullivan
	Ruppersberger	Sutton
		Tancredo
		Tanner

NOT VOTING—18

Burton (IN)	Gallegly	McCollum (MN)
Buyer	Hobson	Napolitano
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Norwood
Camp (MI)	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Cooper	Lucas	Smith (WA)
Fattah	Marchant	Visclosky

□ 1117

Mrs. BIGGERT changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to consider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 42, on passage of H.R. 475, House Page Board Revision Act, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, if I had been present earlier today, Friday, January 19, 2007, I would have voted as follows on today's recorded vote: rollcall No. 42, "yea"—H.R. 475—House Page Board Revision Act of 2007.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 19, 2007, I was absent due to a family obligation. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 42, agreeing to H.R. 475—to revise the composition of the House of Representatives Page Board to equalize the number of members representing the majority and minority parties and to include a member representing the parents of pages and a member representing former pages.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 42, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on Thursday afternoon and Friday morning. Had I been present for rollcall 40, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 6, a bill I proudly cosponsored that will improve America's energy independence and financial situation.

Had I been present for rollcall 42, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 475.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the measure just considered.

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

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. HOYER, for the purpose of inquiring about next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We are going to meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour on Monday and at 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules, including, and every Member ought to pay attention closely to this announcement, to the important bill, I think frankly it is going to pass with every Member's vote; we will consider several bills under suspension, but including legislation regarding Members' pension accountability.

I think everybody in this House believes that we ought to have legislation, we have had it; when the minority was the majority they pushed for this legislation, we agreed with them, we are pushing it as well. We think there will be agreement on making sure that if you commit a crime while a Member of Congress that is contrary to your duties that you are going to lose your pension. We think the American public believes that is fair.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 for morning hour and noon for legislative business. We will consider additional bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of those suspension bills, as is the practice, will be available by the end of today.

On Tuesday, obviously we will receive the President for the delivery of the State of the Union message. So we will vacate the Chamber about 5 o'clock to give the opportunity for the security forces to make sure the Chamber is secure.

On Wednesday, we will meet at 10. We will consider a resolution to restore to the Delegates and Resident Commis-

sioner their ability to cast votes in the Committee of the Whole. This rule was in place prior to January 1995, and we believe it is a good rule and will try to adopt that amendment to the rules. We will finish business in time—I have discussed with Mr. BOEHNER and Mr. BLUNT—we are trying to accommodate our schedule so that the minority is able to leave in a timely fashion to go to their meeting in Cambridge.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank my friend. I have several questions. On the last issue that you just raised, that is the first notice that I have had, maybe our staff has had notice, right before coming to the floor on changing the rules for the Committee of the Whole to where Delegates could vote. I would ask my friend, is that only in the Committee of the Whole? Is that what that rule change would be?

Mr. HOYER. This is exactly the same rule that was put in place by the Democrats when we were in the majority to give to our five Delegates the opportunity to come to the floor to express their opinion in the Committee of the Whole. That rule, however, provides that in the event that the votes of the Delegates make a difference in the outcome, that immediately the Committee would rise, go into the House, and it would be revoted in the full House without the ability of the Delegates to vote.

The reason I articulate that, Mr. Whip, is to point out that, as you know, that was taken to court to see whether or not that was appropriate under the Constitution. The Court ruled that it was appropriate under the Constitution, with that caveat that I have just referenced. I have discussed this with all five Delegates. They are all supportive of this rule.

We believed, as you know, when you adopted your rules in January of 1995 and dropped the Delegates, we believed that that was unfortunate, because we have five people here sent by their constituents to the House but do not have an opportunity to express their view in a public way, their position in a public way on behalf of their constituents. This will do that, although under the Constitution we are constrained to write it as we did, which has been confirmed by the court. And I thank the gentleman for that question.

Mr. BLUNT. Now, I believe there are seven Delegates, and we might get our numbers straight on that. Also, I think I am right in that this has only happened in one Congress.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. Yes, I would.

Mr. HOYER. There are five, believe me. There are obviously the representative of the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. BLUNT. Okay.

This only happened in one Congress, which was the Congress in 1993 and 1994. I wasn't in Congress at the time, but I recall it was very controversial, I

believe the gentleman suggested so controversial that there was a court case that determined that these votes, if they had impact on the outcome, immediately would have to be decided by the full House. And I am wondering, is that to give a deceptively large margin in the Committee of the Whole? The majority is in the majority. Four of these five Delegates are on the majority side. Every time it doesn't matter in terms of passage, I guess that means it appears that there are four more votes or maybe five more votes than there would otherwise be.

What is the purpose of this? If it made a difference, it would immediately have to go to a vote that they could not participate in.

I yield for an answer.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The purpose is to honor democracy. We are fighting in Iraq to honor democracy and allowing people to vote. I thought it was unfortunate, personally, that we did not continue the rule in place that we adopted in 1993 in the rules package. And this rule will of course extend to the Republican delegate, Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, as well as the gentleman from the District of Columbia. I personally believe very strongly she ought to have a full vote in this House. She represents 680,000, thereabouts, Americans who, if they moved across the river to Virginia or across the line to Maryland, would have a full vote. I think it is inappropriate, wrong, and frankly inconsistent with our commitment to democracy that she does not have a full vote on the floor of the House.

But I say to the gentleman the purpose is to give to these elected representatives of constituent parts of this country, not States, but constituent parts of this country the ability to express their views on this floor. Under the Constitution, obviously, if they make a difference, there would be a constitutional question; make a difference in the sense that the margin is so close that they would make the difference between winning and losing a proposition. So we provided then and are providing now what the Court has sanctioned as the way to give to the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, a Republican, as well as the four Democrats who represent those four areas of our country that I indicated, the District of Columbia, clearly a part of our country, and the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam, the ability to come to this floor and express their opinion. We believe that is consistent with the democratic principles of this country, and that is why we are doing it.

Mr. BLUNT. Reclaiming my time, it seems to me that the courts must not think it is consistent, or they wouldn't have ruled and determined that if these votes made a difference you have to vote again with a body that doesn't include the votes from those five individuals.

I would also suggest that while the gentleman makes the point that the Delegate from the District of Columbia represents essentially the same number of people that everybody else on this floor does, that the Delegate from Guam, for instance, represents about a fourth of that number, about 160,000, 165,000 people. So their vote will be tallied in the Committee in a way that appears that the Committee vote has a substantially different margin than the same issue taken to the floor would have, and I am sure this will be a matter of some concern. It was controversial when it was done. It only lasted for one Congress. And as the gentleman would make the point, appropriately, that when my side became the majority side in 1995, that 2-year period where this existed, that rule was changed back.

A little more notice on that would have been helpful, but we have been given notice. We now know that this issue will come up on Wednesday. And in my own mind, I am still unclear why it is so significant for the work of the Committee to be disproportionate in its appearance to the work of the full House. They have maybe four or five extra votes that if they made a difference in essence don't count. But if they don't make a difference, it looks like the margin that the majority has created is bigger than in reality it would be if that was the margin that made the difference in whether an issue passed or not.

I would be glad to hear a response to that.

□ 1130

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time. Of course, we are not very worried about that, we have been getting so many Republicans to vote with our propositions, 124 on one of our bills, 82 on another one of our bills, our margins are so big that is not a big concern to us at this point in time, I tell my friend.

Frankly, Guam is in no different position than some of our States. Some of our States have one Member, and they are guaranteed a Member no matter what their size is. So Wyoming, Montana and other States who have either more or less, Montana now represents more than most of us, Wyoming less than most of us. I am not sure what the population of Alaska is. But to that extent, Guam, American Samoa are not in any different position than a State that is guaranteed a vote.

Now under the Constitution, and I will say again to my friend that it wasn't the courts that imposed this, in our efforts in 1992 and 1993 when we adopted the rule to extend to our colleagues who vote in every committee in this House, they vote in the Ways and Means Committee if they are there, I don't know that there is a Delegate member, but they vote in the Natural Resources Committee, the Science Committee, other committees on which they are members they vote.

They are in line to chair or not chair subcommittees, depending upon their seniority. It is only in the Committee of the Whole that they cannot vote. So they cannot express their views for their constituents on an issue.

The Constitution is such, which is why we drafted the rule, you are correct, to have them make a difference would be, we believed, inconsistent with the Constitution. We need a constitutional amendment to do that. We are not offering a constitutional amendment. We don't think that is necessary.

But I want to tell my friend honestly, I have been the chief proponent of this and feel strongly about it, I believe passionately that Ms. NORTON ought to have a full vote, number one.

Number two, I believe the four Delegates, whether they be from Puerto Rico, whether from Guam, American Samoa or the Virgin Islands, ought to have the opportunity to come to this floor and express their views. So we are offering that rule. We thought it was a good rule.

You are right, in the final analysis it is not going to skew the difference between the minority and the majority parties because ultimately if they make a difference, it is not that their vote will not count, their vote will count. Their constituents will see their vote up and other Americans will see their vote up, and they are going to say the gentledady from Guam or the gentleman from American Samoa or the gentledady from the Virgin Islands or the gentleman from Puerto Rico believed X, Y or Z on a vote. We think that is consistent with our view that we ought to be extending opportunities for democracy, not limiting them.

Mr. BLUNT. Reclaiming my time on that, in the committees my understanding is if the Delegates in the committees, if their vote is the vote that makes the difference in committee work, that vote does not have to be taken again. There is a fundamental difference clearly, the Constitution and the courts believe, in what happens on the House floor and what both majorities have decided happens in committee.

I also think there is no analogous situation in terms of the number of people represented.

Generally, the single district States now are close to or bigger than. The individual from Montana represents more people than anybody else on the House floor. There is no 160,000-vote in any State.

My good friend from American Samoa, we have been friends for over two decades now. We have found many times to work together, and this certainly in no way reflects on my true fondness or long friendship with him. I would be glad for you to make a comment, and if you want to make a comment about the fact that American Samoa was excluded from the minimum wage increase, another issue that we are concerned about, we would

like to be consistent in at least that regard in how we treat these Delegate representatives and the people they represent.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from American Samoa.

Mr. FALCOMAVEGA. I thank my good friend and colleague for yielding to me for a few seconds to respond to some of the concerns that he has expressed on the floor concerning whether or not we ought to be giving the privilege of the congressional Delegates to vote in the Committee of the Whole.

The gentleman makes a good point. The fact of the matter was that this matter was taken to court by the other side of the aisle, and on appeal the Court said it is constitutional if this procedure takes place where if, as a result of the vote a congressional Delegate's vote makes a difference, any Member of the House can also then appeal to the Chair for a revote. That is what makes it constitutional.

But to the point where the gentleman says because Guam is only 160,000 residents, I think once we get into the population consideration we are getting into another area. My good friend, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, who is a Republican, represents 4 million Americans. I can also make the argument to my good friend that we also bleed and die in the wars that we were currently fighting.

If there is any sense of equity and fairness in the process, at least give us a chance to participate in that regard.

I can say the same thing for our good friends from the State of Wyoming or other States. But when you consider the fact that we have a \$20 billion presence of our military, the strategic importance of Guam, we should appreciate the fact that people representing the territory of Guam should be given an opportunity. Guam, despite its small population, does and is a very important territory as far as our military strategic interests are concerned.

To the question of the minimum wage issue, I would say to my good friend from Missouri that I would prefer that we take this issue up at another point in time because I have my own ideas. I would simply say the fact of the matter is that the Federal Labor Standards Act does apply to my little district since 1938. The Congress amended the Federal Labor Standards Act in 1956 to allow the Territories, because in those days our economic situations were just not able to bear the Federal minimum wage standards. For that reason, we have established these industrial committees through the supervision and administration of the U.S. Department of Labor to help us, being under the Federal umbrella. So we do this so that eventually the economies of these territories will come up to par with the national standards.

The problem is that my good friends on the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands are not under the minimum wage provisions of the Federal

Labor Standards Act. This is the issue we are trying to correct.

I must say that I think the good Speaker from San Francisco has been unfairly characterized to suggest that she is doing this as a double standard, being hypocritical. I think it was unfair for our good friends on the other side of the aisle to depict the Speaker in doing something like this. It is not right.

I thank my good friend from Missouri for yielding, and I just wanted to explain those things.

Mr. BLUNT. I have great affection for my friend, and have had for a long time. This is not meant to reflect on him or the people he represents in any way. By the way, there are about 60,000 people on American Samoa that my friend represents, as opposed to 600,000 that others represent. I will let you respond to the number if you want to.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I will be happy to check on that with my good friend. I represent probably the smallest constituency in the House. But is it any different from our friends from Wyoming, if we are talking about population as a factor, to give representation? The fact is it is not because of the population but because of our status as a U.S. territory.

Now I can't say, because many of the Members don't realize we have had a 106-year unique political relationship with this great Nation. I bet to say that not many of the Members know about that relationship. If you want to talk about the contributions we have made, my little territory has the highest per capita casualty rate in the whole United States. If you want to count the numbers, I have had to go eight times to my district to take the remains of our soldiers who were killed in that terrible war in Iraq. If you want to make comparisons to the 70,000 people, yes; but we also say in a very proud way, we are very, very proud to make that contribution to our great Nation. So if you want to talk numbers, I think we can get into other situations as well.

Mr. BLUNT. I am sure we will, and I thank my good friend for that point.

I would just point out for the purpose of this discussion, Alaska, which the majority leader wondered about the population there, has 626,000 people. Wyoming has about 420,000—some people.

In terms of the decision to have the relationship with the Territories, that was not made anticipating that the Territories would be represented as States are represented. That is the plain and simple truth of it.

If it had been, there probably would have been a different thought about how you treat both Puerto Rico and American Samoa. This is a debate that I am sure a dozen years ago was widely discussed as a debate that should be had as a constitutional debate.

If your vote in the Committee of the Whole is going to matter, it shouldn't be reversible by a vote by the body

that doesn't include those five representatives. We have Wednesday to discuss this, and I am sure that we will.

I am glad to get the notification, although I think on an issue like this that clearly was a huge issue a dozen years ago, that notification on the floor is a little later than I would have hoped for.

The other issue on the schedule, I appreciate the leader trying his best to accommodate the retreat that our Members will have next week. And of course there will be a reciprocal accommodation for the retreat you have the next week.

Having scheduled the floor for some period of time, as the majority leader for a while and as the majority whip working with the leader, I sympathize with the leader's challenge of the floor.

I would say that on this entire issue of the voting 5 days a week, whether in truth there is anything to vote for or not, I think has been widely taken advantage of, not by the leader but particularly by people who don't prefer to understand how hard our Members work.

The late night comedians love the idea that Congress was suddenly going to work 5 days a week. I think that was an unfair view of what our Members do. In fact, I would advance the theory that our problem is not that our Members don't work 5 days a week, our problem is that too many of our Members work 7 days a week. Too many of our Members get so focused on this that they don't focus on the things that the people they work for hope they would, and this makes it even more difficult to get your work done.

Here we are today, it was about 11 when we started this discussion. We had a 30-minute debate that when we finished at 6 p.m. last night, I would advance, could have happened then and then Members would have had a day in their district to meet with people who want to meet with Members on occasion during their regular workweek, not on Saturday or Sunday, and under this current schedule the only option is to come to Washington.

I know my good friend appreciates how hard the Members work. I know his suggestion that we would start working 5 days a week in Washington was not intended to be an indication that Members somehow don't work as hard as other Americans do because he and I both know that is not the case.

I wish our Members would have been able to go home last night or this morning and spend some of this workday at home instead of on an airplane. All of our Members as far as I know have a desk in their district office. If they are not going to be there Monday through Friday, they are not going to need that desk very often, and the only way to see them is right here. I think it is unfortunate that we had to come back today for 30 minutes of debate on a measure that was already agreed to on a vote that not a single person voted the other way. I say that more in

sympathy than I do in criticism. I understand the pledge you made.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I yield on that issue.

Mr. HOYER. First of all, let me say he and I agree. I was at dinner last night and Secretary Paulson was there. Secretary Paulson, as everybody knows, was the managing partner of Goldman Sachs. Obviously he worked very hard and is a very successful individual. He has been in his job now for a few months.

He said to me he was surprised how hard Members of Congress worked, how complex were the challenges confronting them, and how much of an education, frankly, over the last months he has had in dealing with Members of Congress, working on both sides of the aisle, how hard they had to work to come to grips with solving our Nation's problems.

I want to make it very clear that Members of Congress do in fact work 6, 7 days a week, and that is the rule, not the exception. And when they are at home in their districts, they are doing what the Founding Fathers expected them to do, particularly in this House, the people's House. They are going home and listening to their public and having town meetings, they are visiting business enterprises that are creating jobs and visiting schools. They are talking to their constituents. They are meeting people with problems with the Federal Government in their district offices where, as the minority whip has pointed out, they have offices, district offices, to serve their public. That is our job.

I tell my public that this job really is a two-fold job. Fifty percent of it is coming to the House and voting yea or nay on policy. Fifty percent of it is making sure that our districts are represented well in their interface with the Federal Government.

□ 1145

The Federal Government has an impact on our States, on our municipalities, on our jurisdictions and on our people, on our veterans and on our seniors in particular, but many, almost everybody. It is our job to be in close communication with them. As a matter of fact, the reason we are elected every 2 years, by the Founding Fathers' device, was to specifically keep us in close touch.

So I agree 100 percent with the minority whip when he indicates that our Members are working, whether they are here on this floor or they are at home. Period. Having said that, we are going to be considering a CR pretty soon because nine of the 11 appropriation bills that we were supposed to pass into law are still not passed. They weren't passed by the end of the fiscal year, September 30 of 2006. They have not been passed as of January 19, and we are going to try to get at least a CR passed so that we can fund last year's responsibility.

And I want Members to know that the committees have had essentially 2 days to work in this place, Tuesdays and Wednesdays; and the committees have been complaining that they aren't able to get their work done. I want everybody to know, Mr. BLUNT and I are close friends. We are not close Democratic friends and Republican friends; we are close friends. We see one another a lot, we talk to one another a lot, but what I have said, and the whip knows I have said this, we are going to come in Monday nights. Now, why are we going to come in on Monday nights? Because if we do not come in Monday nights and we come in Tuesday night at 6:30, the committees cannot meet because they can't get quorums.

Woodrow Wilson said that the work of Congress is done in its committees. If committees can't work, the Congress can't work. America sent us here to work, to get its work done, to make a difference, to take us in a new direction, and that is on our side.

I am prepared, as the leader, to take some of the flack when sometimes, as we wanted to do today, as the whip knows, we wanted to do the pension bill today. Mr. DREIER objected, it wasn't in the regular order, we understand that, we are going to accommodate that, so we are going to do it Monday. We think it is going to be an overwhelming vote on that. That could have been done today. We could have done that and moved it on, but we will be here on Monday. And committees will have Tuesday and Wednesday. Next week is a short week, the week after is a short week, so we won't be meeting on Fridays. So we are not on an onerous schedule.

But I would say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, this leader wants to accommodate the interest of Members. Why? Because I know you work hard, because I have been here for 26 years and I work very hard, and my colleagues work hard. I want you to also know that I think it is our responsibility and duty to the American people to be here in sufficient time to allow us to do the people's business.

And I want the people to know that when we are not on the floor on a Friday and only doing a half an hour or an hour's work, as the gentleman indicated, that our committees have 4 hours, from 9 to 1, to try to do their work.

Now, we are early in the session, so they may not have needed today. And, yes, I could, as practice has been, when we get to Thursday conclude, well, we can get this out of the way and go home. I know Members like to do that.

I want Members to be informed on a regular basis it is my intention, as the leader, as the person responsible for scheduling, to talk to our committee chairmen and committee ranking members that they will have the opportunity to get their work done, and I am hopeful that they will report that work to the floor.

My friend and I have discussed getting work for the floor is sometimes

difficult; but I say to my friend, I think it is more difficult if the committees don't have the opportunity to work. We are trying to provide that, while at the same time, I say to my friend, provide for Members' schedules, not only at home to work, but Members to be at home to see their children and their families and their wives and their husbands. We think that is important as well.

So scheduling, as my friend, Mr. BLUNT, has observed, is tough; but we are going to try to provide a schedule which provides the opportunity to do our business here and at home and to make sure that we stay in close touch with our families.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BLUNT. I am reminded of a friend of mine, when I was the Secretary of State in Missouri, who was the leader, the Democratic leader in the State Senate, was fond of saying: If you can't change your mind, you can't change anything. I am absolutely confident that no committees met today. And I understand the work the committees do in the Congress. When the committees aren't working when we could have added 30 minutes onto the schedule last night and been done, not in the middle of the night, by 7 o'clock, I think that would have been a good decision to make. I would hope my friend will remain flexible about that in the future.

This has gone on some time today. I appreciate the chance to talk about the work next week. I am also hopeful, and I would ask, will the change in the rules on allowing delegates to vote in the Committee of the Whole, will that go to the Rules Committees, and will there be a chance for Republicans to at least offer amendments?

Mr. HOYER. The answer to your question is it will go to the Rules Committee; the Rules Committee will consider it. I have not talked to the Rules Committee, nor have I talked to you or to Mr. BOEHNER about what you might want to do on that, but we will do that.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, the gentleman is right, we certainly haven't had any discussion on this until the floor today.

I would also make the point that last week we did take two bills to the Rules Committee; but before any opportunity was given to even offer an amendment, it was announced that no amendments would be allowed. I think that is unprecedented in the last 12 years, where at least the Rules Committee always heard the amendments and tried to offer amendments and always offered a substitute in every instance that I am aware of.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I yield briefly, as the gentleman can usually out-talk me.

Mr. HOYER. I would like to yield to Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I am a member of the full Transportation Committee; and Water Resources, a subcommittee of Transportation, did meet today. Per-

haps there were other committees meeting.

Mr. BLUNT. I would ask my friend how long you met and what was the topic.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I don't serve on that subcommittee any longer. I met some people on the way to the committee who told me they were meeting.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate the information.

Mr. HOYER. I just knew that you would be delighted to have that information.

Mr. BLUNT. I would be glad to find out the substance of that meeting this morning. I doubt it was very substantive or could not have been done yesterday. I think all the Members understand this discussion.

I think the general coverage of Congress meeting for 5 days a week was a disservice to the institution. It is like assuming that a surgeon only does the surgeon's work when they are in the operating room.

Another point that I believe I am helping my friend, the majority leader, make is, when we are in committee and not on the floor, that doesn't mean we are not working. When we are at home holding town hall meetings or meeting with constituents, or in my case, seeing how we are doing restoring power to 200,000 people that didn't have power in my district this week in weather that was between 6 and 26 degrees all week, it was impossible for me to be there today because I had to be here to cast a vote that could have been cast last night.

I hope we all work hard. Certainly the majority has had the better of this argument so far because it is a lot of fun to talk about Members of Congress that don't work, or suddenly Members are working. Another thing I am going to tell my friend we are going to do, frankly, is keep track of how many hours we worked in essentially a 3- and 4-day week versus a 4- and 5-day week. So far, we are winning in hours of working on the floor.

We worked hard; you worked hard. On the appropriations process, I would have liked to have finished that last year. It is clear to me that the unwillingness of the other body to move forward, a thing neither you nor I have a lot of control over, was the real reason we didn't get more of that work done. We had 11 of our 12 bills done by the 4th of July, without tremendous effort to keep Members here on Friday. The year before we had all of our bills done by the 4th of July. I think that is a reasonable target for us, and I hope that we help achieve that target this year.

We do want to get our work done. This is a bicameral legislative system. We don't control what happens on the other side.

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

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I asked to speak because the whip yielded back his time.

I understand the gentleman's contention. Very frankly, we did our business in a timely fashion and got a lot done these last 2 weeks, in our opinion. We may differ on that. We got, we think, a lot done in a bipartisan fashion, really, in terms of the votes.

I will tell you, the Foreign Affairs Committee had a hearing today; it is going on now. Lee Hamilton is testifying on Iraq. We believe that is timely and important. So that committee is meeting. I just got the notice of what committees are meeting.

I only state that because I believe my friend is correct, that early on we don't have as many committee meetings. We believe that having the time available for our committees to get work done is going to facilitate having meaningful work on the floor, and we hope that we can do our meaningful work on the floor in hours where it will provide for Members not having to work until 11 o'clock and 12 o'clock at night, even though it may save them 2 or 3 hours on a Friday. But we are going to work with you. We have worked together; we are going to continue to work together. We will have differences.

I am going to work with Mr. BOEHNER, the leader, to accommodate our Members. You are my friend. The fact that we are in session or not in session is not an indication of whether Members are working. That representation was never made, nor was it ever intended to be made. It is a misrepresentation, certainly in my view, that that is any contention of mine or implication that ought to be drawn. I think the gentleman agrees with that. Members work hard whether we are in session or not in session.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 2007

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 38) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 38

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, January 23, 2007, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.*

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PENSION BILL REGARDING CONVICTED FORMER MEMBERS FALLS SHORT

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, today Congressman Ney was sentenced to 30 months in jail after pleading guilty to two Federal felonies. Amazingly, under our law he will still collect a congressional pension funded by the U.S. taxpayer. In fact, other Members of Congress who pled guilty or were convicted of crimes collect. Congressman Rostenkowski collects. Congressman Traficant collects. Congressman Cunningham collects. All taxpayer-funded pensions.

On Monday, we will take up a very limited bill to kill pensions for Members of Congress who commit only one of four felonies. The legislation we will consider misses 17 other public integrity felonies that the House already adopted with the support of Speaker PELOSI and Speaker HASTERT in previous years. The legislation we consider on Monday has never been through a committee and the leadership will not allow any amendments to the legislation. There will be no vote permitted to add the other 17 public integrity felonies that should have been part of this needed reform. The legislation that we will consider on Monday will fall short of the potential that we had to reform this House.

□ 1200

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHANDLER). The Chair will now recognize Members for special orders not beyond 2 p.m.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

#### NO NEW TAXES

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about an issue that is not so much on our agenda in these first 100 hours, but I believe it will encompass much of our focus during the course of the 110th Congress. It has to do with the how and why that we will achieve fundamental entitlement reform.

President Bush and many leaders in the new majority in the House and Senate have spoken of the priority of reforming Social Security and dealing with the extraordinary unfunded obligations of our mandates in future years. The President, to his credit, 2 years ago raised the prospect of fundamental Social Security reform. But the American people rejected the President's call.

And I rise today to speak about what I believe the parameters of that debate should be from the perspective of a conservative in the minority who believes in the principles of limited government.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the American people did not reject the Social Security reform or the personal retirement accounts that the President advanced. I think they rejected the entire debate and how it unfolded. I think they rejected the notion that the predominant goal of Social Security reform was to make the numbers add up or, in the language of the wonks, to achieve solvency in Social Security. Such a yardstick expresses no opinion on how to fix an increasingly bankrupt system, and I believe that as a result it invariably blesses benefit cuts or tax increases as a result.

And while President Bush has spoken to his opposition to tax increases, Treasury Secretary Hank Paulson has repeatedly said, in conversations with Members of the House and Senate, that "everything is on the table," raising the specter of the possibility of raising taxes to achieve Social Security reform. And even the President's own Press Secretary, when asked directly whether the White House was ruling out a tax increase to achieve Social Security reform with this newly minted

Democrat majority in Congress, the Press Secretary said, "No, I'm not."

I believe, Mr. Speaker, this is all code for a willingness within the Bush administration to consider raising taxes in exchange for achieving Social Security reform. Such a tax increase would likely come from lifting or eliminating the cap on the amount of salary and wages subject to the payroll tax. The current income that is subject to the payroll tax is \$94,200.

But raising payroll taxes, I would offer, would prove devastating to working Americans, small businesses and the economy as a whole and, worse, if we eliminated the cap on income subject to payroll taxes for Social Security, would only add a brief 7 years to Social Security's financial solvency.

According to the Heritage Foundation, eliminating the cap will increase taxes by \$484 billion over the first 5 years. This 12.4 percentage point marginal tax rate increase would hit middle income families struggling to make ends meet, pay for college and save for retirement, and much of the increase would be borne by the 3 million small business owners who pay both the employer and employee portion of the tax hike. These entrepreneurs are the driving force of our economy, Mr. Speaker. And as a result, a tax increase of this nature would result in a 2 to 3 percent reduction in economic growth, causing massive layoffs across the country. And, again, eliminating the cap on income subjected to Social Security payroll tax would only extend the life of Social Security for 7 years.

Now, there are many, even on my side of the aisle, that are flirting with the notion of raising taxes. But, Mr. Speaker, we have been down this road before. It was 1990, when I was a candidate for Congress, when another President Bush teamed up with a Democrat majority in Congress and headed to Andrews Air Force Base all in the name of entitlement reform and deficit reduction, brought the American people the promise of reform in the future, and the largest tax increase in American history.

We must not go down the road of compromise again. I think the administration needs to be clear that any Social Security compromise must reject tax increases of any kind. That means no increase in the payroll tax rate and no change in the cap apart from the current indexing that happens under the law.

I would say, respectfully, to my colleagues and to the President of the United States, we should say to our good friends in the new majority, "Read our lips. No new taxes."

It is imperative that we bring reforms like personal savings accounts to this new deal program. I think it is imperative that we make the new deal a better deal for younger Americans, but raising taxes on small business owners and family farmers in the manner of lifting the cap or raising the rate is an idea whose time should never come.

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

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

#### LAPSE OF SAFE AND SECURE COUNTY RURAL SCHOOLS ACT

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, as I speak here on the floor of the House today, layoff notices are being prepared for teachers, for county sheriff deputies, and other workers in counties in the Pacific Northwest and indeed, across America. This is a result of the lapse of something called the Safe and Secure County Rural Schools Act, legislation that was enacted in a bipartisan way when Bill Clinton was President of the United States and the Republicans controlled the House and the Senate. And this legislation was adopted in recognition that many counties across America are substantially owned by the Federal Government. And the Federal Government is obviously exempt from taxes. And because of major changes in Federal environmental laws, timber harvest in those counties has dropped dramatically, in some cases to near zero. Therefore, the shared revenues, under a compact with the Federal Government, of these counties and schools have shared in the revenues with the Federal Government. And now, for many counties, these revenues would be near zero without the guarantees that were enacted in the last year of the Clinton presidency. I argued at the time that they should be made permanent. Unfortunately, lobbying by the timber industry and some county commissioners who hadn't thought this through, who thought they could drive a crisis and maybe get a change in forest policy, they were made temporary. They have expired as of the 1st of October and that is why the layoff notices are being prepared now.

Congress must act to renew this legislation. Congress needs to hold up its end of the bargain with these counties and these schools across America. The formula is based on historic timber harvest, and historic timber harvest has dropped dramatically, as I said earlier. Some criticize Oregon saying, well, you get a lot of the money. Well, we have the highest Federal ownership of forest lands and the highest timber harvest on Federal lands, and we also have something that is very unique called the ONC lands, which are a vestige of a failed railroad and reversion of Federal lands and the agreement between the counties and the Federal Government. Quite complicated.

But the bottom line is, we are just asking the Federal Government to make good on its commitment, its

partnership. Otherwise, we are going to see, essentially, counties in southwest Oregon who have very little other opportunity to raise revenues, and none regarding the Federal lands. They don't get PILT payments or anything else. We are going to see them laying off vital service providers. There are large parts of southwest Oregon that could become virtually lawless with our State cutbacks in State police and the question of whether or not we will be able to have county sheriff patrols in large areas. In my home county, the size of the State of Connecticut, you know, once when this happened previously, because of a depression in the timber industry, we had no deputies in an area the size of the State of Connecticut, outside of the cities. With the meth epidemic in rural areas in the West and other things, this would be very bad, not only for Oregon and those counties, but for the entire western United States. It is in the public interest.

We are hopeful, we have asked the President to put it in his budget. Last year he sort of haphazardly put it in his budget after ignoring the issue for a number of years. Unfortunately, the financing mechanism that the President chose was immediately criticized by Republican Senators, and declared to be a nonstarter. There are indications it may be in the President's budget this year. We are hoping that the President has found a more suitable offset, something that we can bring to the Congress and begin to move this legislation through.

We need to look at the emergency supplemental for the possibility of a 1-year extension, and then I am committed to moving a permanent extension through a committee on which I serve, the Resources Committee. Greg Walden and I did that 2 years ago very quickly. But the bill stalled out in Agriculture. Hopefully, this time after we get it out of the Resources Committee, that it will move more expeditiously through the Agriculture Committee for the deliberation of the entire Congress. It is not just the Pacific Northwest at risk. It is hundreds of counties and school districts, from Florida to Maine, all across America, who are at risk. And this Congress and this President need to act to fulfill this commitment and this promise.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR.  
MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Martin Luther King Day that we celebrated earlier this week. Americans celebrated the life and legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King who would have turned 78 this month. While there is much left to be done, Dr. King's dream of a colorblind society is closer to reality this year than last.

Dr. King championed nonviolent resistance as a means to bring about fundamental change. He sought such change to bring about equality between peoples of all races, an end to segregation and racial injustice and improved working conditions for all.

Dr. King was a master of rhetoric, and he used his power to bring together Americans from a variety of backgrounds to march in pursuit of equality and justice. And Dr. King achieved great success at attaining these lofty goals, despite his murder at the age of 39.

At only 26 years of age, Dr. King became a national figure by leading the Montgomery bus boycott. At that time, Dr. King was the new pastor of the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church and was spurred to action by the arrest of Rosa Parks for refusing to give her seat on a public bus to a white man. Dr. King inspired action through his words, "There comes a time when people get tired of being trampled over by the iron feet of oppression." With that, he called for a citywide boycott of public transit and demanded first come, first served seating, courteous treatment by bus operators, and the employment of African American bus drivers. The boycott lasted 382 days and in that time, Dr. King's house was bombed and he was arrested. Ultimately, the United States Supreme Court outlawed racial segregation on public transportation.

With the success of the Montgomery bus boycott, Dr. King noted, "We have gained a new sense of dignity and destiny. We have discovered a new and powerful weapon, nonviolent resistance."

Nonviolent resistance, which had been pioneered by Mohandas Gandhi in India, became a cornerstone of King's strategy to gain full civil rights and equality for all people. Over the next 13 years, Dr. King achieved basic civil rights for African-Americans, desegregation, the annulment of Jim Crow laws and the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Dr. Martin Luther King Day allows us to reflect on the steps that we, as a nation, have made towards fulfilling Dr. King's dream. Dr. King's 1963 March on Washington was organized around numerous demands for civil rights, many of which are still very relevant today. One such demand was full and

fair employment, including a raise in the minimum wage from \$1.25 to \$2 at that time.

□ 1215

I am proud that last week is part of the 110th Congress' first 100 hours. The House of Representatives addressed this issue by raising the minimum wage from \$5.15 to \$7.25. This will significantly benefit a great many low-income families, including the 2.1 million African American minimum wage earners. Other legislation in the first 100 hours will improve health care and education for American families, including 3.9 million African American Medicare beneficiaries and 2.3 million African American college students.

This past weekend I commemorated the work of Martin Luther King, Jr., at the Jackie Robinson Park and at the Metropolitan Baptist Church in my district. At these celebrations my constituents and I examined our progress over the past 40 years since Dr. King's tragic death and remember his line from "I Have a Dream" about the fierce urgency of now. Dr. King preached then that now is the time to make justice a reality for all of God's children, and it is still that time now.

With continued and wide disparities and access to higher education, wages, and access to health care, we as a Nation still have much work before us. Now, even as we celebrate one of the truly great men in this Nation's history, it is time to recommit ourselves to the vision of Dr. King and bring about racial equality and opportunity for every American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

FIRST 100 HOURS OF THE NEW  
CONGRESS

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

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to stand here today and report to the American people that we have completed the 100-hours agenda. We are demonstrating that we have kept our promise. We have set a tone for the 110th Congress that is one of cooperation, consensus, and compromise that extends beyond party lines. From the ethics reforms to restoring fiscal

responsibility, to strengthening our national security, to giving more Americans a realistic shot at the American Dream, the new Democratic majority is committed to real and lasting results for the people that we serve.

On the opening days of the Congress, January 4, we adopted the most sweeping ethics package since the post-Watergate era. We restored tough pay-as-you-go budget rules, which will begin to reverse the record budget deficits that are passing on trillions of dollars to our children and grandchildren. We all recognize how important that is.

We recognize that we are some \$8.6 trillion in debt, that each one now owes over \$29,000. In fact, every child born now owes some \$29,000 in order for us to pay the debt.

In the remainder of the first 100 hours, we have turned to passing the Six for '06 agenda to meet the everyday needs of all Americans. We made America safer by the passage of a bill that implements the recommendation of the bipartisan 9/11 Commission, which were submitted by Congress in 2004.

We are extremely proud of that particular piece of legislation, because it allows us to address those needs that were identified by the commission, needs, especially, in south Texas, as we know, on border security, that are critical, other needs, such significant, although they might be considered not so important, but the importance of the agencies to be able to communicate with each other that was found to be one of the most difficult problems that we have still, but have not confronted.

We made our economy fair by passing a bill that increases the minimum wage from \$5.15 to \$7.25 an hour over the next 2 years, affecting approximately 900,000 employees in Texas. Texas is hit the hardest with this, with the minimum wage; and we are extremely proud to have passed that piece of legislation. It also impacts some of 28.6 percent of the jobs that pay below the Federal poverty line in Texas. We have improved health care by passing and extending the Federal funding for lifesaving embryonic stem cell research, which will help 110 million Americans suffering from diseases.

We have helped to make health care more affordable by passing a bill that directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct cost savings negotiations with the drug companies for lower prices for Medicare beneficiaries. That is essential. The way the legislation has been written is basically un-American, not allowing us to bargain with the pharmaceutical companies to get lower prices, very similar to what the VA does now.

We know that they are able to get prices at 60 percent lower than what we can for our seniors under Medicare. This particular piece of legislation is going to be out there, and it is going to help all of us, and especially the taxpayer that has to pay for Medicare. So we are extremely proud to have passed that piece of legislation in the last 100 hours.

We also make college more affordable by passing a bill that cuts the interest rates on subsidized student loans for undergraduates in half over the next 5 years. This is particularly important, also, for Hispanic Americans, since 50 percent of Latinos, undergrads, receive Federal aid affecting some 205,000 students throughout this country.

We are extremely proud to have done that. The interest rates on those loans for those students is essential, that we can lower them to a level where it has a direct impact on the cost of higher education. We also know that tuition has been increasing. No one knows that better than parents and young people that are going to college.

We set America on the path to energy independence by passing a bill that repeals \$14 billion in subsidies to big oil and gas companies and invests those funds, instead, in clean, renewable energy resources and alternative fuels.

This is just the beginning of the work we are going to be doing. I am really pleased.

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

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

#### THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TOOK BACK THEIR GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to lend my voice with all of the people who voted for a change for America, but especially to lend my voice with my fellow new Congressmen, the freshmen. I rise because I believe that we were sent here to pursue an agenda for America, to set our country on a new course, a new course which put the public good at the center of our efforts, a new course which said that politics must be in service to the average citizen.

This past November, the winds of change took on a gale force in American politics. American people took back their government. They sent a loud and clear message that the government was here for them, by them and of them. No more, no big contracts. No more legislation written behind closed doors by and for the special interests, no more whittling away the constitutional rights that we were fighting, and no more bridges built to nowhere. No more rubber-stamp administration.

We are going to have an active and engaged Congress that really believes in the principle of oversight, and no more escalating an oil war that we believe is sacrificing innocent young Americans for no legitimate purpose.

The American people voted in record numbers and demanded that their voices be heard. They wanted their government to respond to their needs, and their needs are not the needs of the big oil companies, the big pharmaceutical companies or the Halliburtons of this world.

American people want a new politics of inclusion, of generosity. The American people want a new politics which says everybody counts and everybody matters. The Democrats heard them.

In record time, 100 hours, we made history by passing a people's agenda. Yes, within 100 hours, minimum-wage workers were able to say that they were getting a raise; within 100 hours, lifesaving research, so that people could have a real chance at a cure for their loved ones and themselves. Within 100 hours, real implementation of the 9/11 Commission recommendations, and within the 100 hours we made a real statement about education being affordable for all Americans.

I am proud to be a Member of this new class of freshmen, proud to be a Member of these folks who came here to make a change to put the public interest first. The public interest is a very good idea, and I am very proud to say that I have been a part of it.

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

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

#### FRESHMEN 100 HOURS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, there are times when the people of this great Nation need and demand things of their government that politics make it impossible to accomplish. This has been the case far too often throughout the last 12 years. Through the last election, the people of this Nation have demanded that this government reexamine and change our priorities and our direction.

The people have asked us to respond to their hopes and their dreams and their needs. They have asked us to realize that there are good citizens of this Nation, honest people who work hard and play by the rules and who nonetheless struggle and live in poverty and toil in obscurity through no fault of their own.

The people have called us to recognize the equality of opportunity, the basis upon which this Nation was founded, the means of equal access to education, equal chances to go to college. The people have demanded that we never squash the hope of science with the politics of partisan personal gain, that we never play games with

the opportunity to save lives. They know that the minute that this great Nation stops being a beacon of hope and a champion of forward progress for the world, that we become something less than what we are.

The people have demanded that we never allow the concerns of special interests to collide with the public good, that there will come a day when the quality of our time will be judged not only on our ability to pioneer lifesaving drugs but our ability to make them available to all of our citizens.

The people have demanded that when you gather a group of our Nation's leading experts and ask them to take a hard look at what we need to do to keep our people safe and make our Nation stronger, that they take on that charge and honor their commitment, that you do everything necessary to implement their recommendations handed down to you; and the people have demanded that the conduct of our public officials be beyond reproach, that the great balancing act of our democracy rests upon a fulcrum of public trust that is fragile as it is vital.

But for the past 12 years, politics has demanded something different. Between the 104th and 109th Congress, 6,900 rollcall votes were taken, and politics prevailed almost every time.

In the very first few hours of the 110th Congress, the people have had their day. The people compelled us to raise the minimum wage, not politics. The people asked us to work to cut student loan rates in half, not politics. The people led us to expand stem cell research, not politics. Concern for those people made it imperative that we implement the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission and that we take away the tax breaks for oil companies that have made their profits on the backs of recent American suffering, that we start a process for real meaningful negotiation for prescription drugs, not politics.

The people move us to make immediate changes in the ethical rules that govern this Chamber. Their commitment to a new day in America, and a new day in Congress made it vital that we restore the public trust. We saw the faces and heard the needs of the people we were elected to serve; and in this first 100 hours, we have acted. We have brought in new leadership that recognizes that this was a Nation disconnected with its government, and they have taken immediate and bold steps to reconnect it.

I would be remiss not to commend the leadership's admirable example for the past 2 weeks.

The people were at the heart of what we have done here so far, and the people will be at the heart of the legislative agenda we champion in the days to come.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, these past 2 weeks have been times of great change, historic times that herald an era of American

politics unique in its tone and compelling in its vision. You can be sure that this was only the start, and that the people will regain their rightful role in this democracy in the days and years to come.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### WORKING TOGETHER TO MAKE PROGRESS FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am a new Member of Congress and proud to be part of an institution that has been the cradle of democracy, and very proud to be part of this new class of Republicans and Democrats that came here in the year 2007.

Mr. Speaker, in Vermont, and I think across America, average citizens were somewhat bewildered when they looked at what was happening in Washington. When they saw us go from a record surplus to a record deficit, the only conclusion they could come to was we had lost our way.

When they saw that the drug companies prevailed in actually getting legislation that prohibited price negotiation to get the best price for taxpayers and seniors, they thought America had lost its way.

When they saw that over the course of 9 years, Congress had allowed itself nine pay increases totaling \$31,000, but the minimum wage worker was stuck at \$5.15 an hour, they thought America had lost its way.

When they saw that when major legislation was brought before this body and the vote was extended for 3 or 4 hours in order to arm-twist, persuade people to change their votes, they thought Congress had lost its way.

I believe what this election was about across America was people in Vermont and people in districts from Vermont to California saying that they wanted Congress to start solving problems. What this 100 hours was about was making a down payment to America, where we are trying to give confidence to Americans that this Congress can do the work that needs to be done to improve the lives of average, everyday people. The strength of our democracy has always depended on a strong middle-class and opportunities for people at the low income level who want to climb the ladder of opportunity.

What we have done in this first 100 hours, frankly, working together with

many on the other side of the aisle, is establish that we actually can govern and we can pass legislation that will be meaningful. We have rejected politics as being about finding wedge issues that will divide us so that we can focus on economic issues that can unite us. And this is a beginning, it is not an end.

These first 100 hours, in my view, have been remarkable. We have changed the way Congress does business by enacting ethics reforms; no meals, no free trips, no free travel, and we did this with the support of 68 Republicans.

To return to fiscal responsibility, we adopted pay-as-you-go budgeting. That is going to impose itself on Republicans and Democrats, whether proposing spending increases for programs you favor or tax cuts you might want to advocate for. We did this with the support of 48 Republicans.

To help working families who have really been squeezed as our economy starts widening between those who have and everyone else, we passed cuts in student loan interest rates that will save the average student about \$4,400 over the life of the loan, and we did that with the support of 124 Republicans.

We passed, of course, the first minimum wage increase in 10 years, and that is going to help America's lowest paid workers, and we did that with all the Democrats and the support of 82 Republicans.

And on and on; on stem cell research, on the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, and the commonsense step of ending tax breaks for Big Oil that costs taxpayers \$14 billion, while it increased our dependence on foreign oil and put off the day when we embraced the challenge and obligation all of us know we have, to move towards alternative energy.

What we know is this: America has very severe challenges: Health care, 47 million Americans without it; health care for the Americans that do have it, that they are increasingly finding they can't afford; bringing our troops home from Iraq; restoring our budget to balance; moving in a new direction on energy.

What we know is true is that the only way we are going to solve those problems is if we work together. We are in it together, and it is by working together, as we have in these past 100 hours, that we can make progress for America.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BAIRD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

#### THE REST OF THE STORY WITH REGARD TO THE DEMOCRATS' 100 HOURS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for half the time remaining before 2 p.m. as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as always, I am profoundly pleased and honored to have the privilege to address you on the floor of the House of Representatives here in the United States Congress.

I have had the interesting observation here as I listened to the speakers that come from the other side of the aisle that there is another story, the rest of the story is out there, and a number of things need to be discussed, and one of them is what did we actually do here in the first 100 hours, as was referenced by at least three of the speakers.

In the first 100 hours, the point was made that they kept all of their promises that they would keep within the first 100 hours. We are going to disagree as to how we define that and what the results of it were, and I think it is appropriate in this democratic process that we have that is framed under this constitutional republic that we are, that we talk about and have open dialogue and debate. And that was one of the casualties, I would point out, Mr. Speaker, to this accelerated 100-hour process.

The 100-hour promise was something that sounded good politically. It had a nice ring to it. The bell tolled 100 hours, so therefore the image of accomplishing these things for America was going to get done in 100 hours.

Well, 100 hours can be counted a lot of different ways, and some people would have thought that at midnight, December 31, when you heard the band strike up Auld Lang Syne, then the 100 hours would begin and this harder working than ever Congress and more ethical than ever Congress and more open and more democratic than ever Congress was going to go to work, and in the first 4 days and 4 hours would accomplish these things.

No, I did not actually make that point either, Mr. Speaker. I think it is appropriate for us to have a real legitimate method of keeping track of the 100 hours. If that is going to be the one

promise that is sacrosanct, to accomplish these six things in the first 100 hours, then a legitimate clock is a good way to measure that.

So I put up a legitimate clock and kept track of the first 100 hours. And I am going to make this concession at this point, Mr. Speaker, that these six bills, H.R. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, were passed off the floor of this Congress within the first 100 hours of a legitimate clock.

My legitimate clock, and I am going to post this up here for the benefit of the people who are observing this process on the floor, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that a legitimate clock would be a clock that calculated from the moment we gavel in, the gavel in in the morning, the opening prayer, the pledge, and off into this process of floor action, until we gavel out in the evening; set your stop watch, click it on in the morning when the gavel gavels us in, shut it off in the evening when we gavel out, and then keep track of the hours.

If the 100 hours is sacrosanct, if all of the other promises were subordinated to this one, 100-hour promise trumps all, then let's watch that clock closely, because everybody is eager to get to an open process in this Congress.

And I point out also, Mr. Speaker, this first 100 hours has not been an open process. There has not been a legitimate hearing. There has not been a legitimate subcommittee meeting. There hasn't been a legitimate full committee meeting. There hasn't been an amendment accepted. There have been requests to offer amendments. There hasn't been an amendment that has been considered in this Congress. And there has not been a legitimate Rules Committee process that would set the parameters as to what amendments might be considered on this floor, how this debate might move forward.

So the open dialogue and debate, especially my sadness goes out to the freshmen who haven't had a voice in this process. That has all been subordinated to this 100-hour promise, get these things done in the first 100 hours and then give us a little break, Mr. COOPER from Tennessee says. Cut us a little slack on that one. We are going to get around to be an open process. We are going to get around to be a more fair, a more Democratic Congress than we have been.

Well, there is nothing that can be done about it, so I am going to take the gentleman from Tennessee at his word, and many other gentlemen and gentleladies from across the majority party, including the Speaker, at her word. Now, there are some reasons not to take her at her word, but I am going to take her at her word on this 100 hours.

So the clock has now ticked, Mr. Speaker, and I have had the stopwatch on it all along, from gavel in the 110th Congress to gavel out, a real legitimate means of checking the time, and it turns out to be this. Real clock, 100

hours ticked over at 11:44 a.m. today Eastern Standard Time. That was when the 100 hours was up. I would have liked to have heard a bell or whistle or maybe a cannon go off that says now, let's deploy out to our hearings and committee rooms and subcommittee rooms and let's start to consider bills and amendments and let's start having an open debate process and let's start to bring the brains of all of the people that have been elected by the 300 million Americans to bear here so that we can use the resources of the knowledge and the information base from all of our districts to improve legislation. Because if you don't do that, then there is this thing that always shows up in legislation called unintended consequences.

One of the unintended consequences has emerged here easily, and that was the unintended consequence of the political price, at least, that had to be paid for exempting American Samoa from the minimum wage. \$3.26 an hour is something that has been labeled sweatshop labor by many people on the other side of the aisle as they demagogued the issue when they were advocating for an increase in the minimum wage. But when it came time to actually put it into play, there was an exemption for American Samoa.

I happen to have a soft spot in my heart for American Samoa. My father spent some time there 60-some years ago during the Second World War and spoke fondly of American Samoans, the people, their heart, their happy spirit, and I appreciate the gentleman who represents American Samoa here on the floor of Congress. But that was an unintended consequence, I believe, that they had to pay politically, because we didn't have an open committee process.

But the real 100 hours clicked over at 11:44 a.m. Now we are at about 102 hours, as I check this clock, Mr. Speaker. But the odd part of it is that there is real time, and then there is Pelosi time, Mr. Speaker. And her clock has only clicked over to 42 hours as of 11:44 this morning. I don't know if she shut it off or not. I don't know how they are actually keeping hours.

We have been checking with her hours on a regular basis throughout the work here in this 110th Congress to try to understand what their rationale is for when they turn their clock on and when they turn their clock off. And they refuse to give us a single criteria of what that measure might be.

So, Mr. Speaker, I can only conclude that this 100-hour clock was if things got bogged down here, was going to have to be a clock that would run out of time when the six pieces of legislation, H.R. 1 through 5, were passed, if they needed to stretch it that far, and that the rules could be changed along the way and when the clock was clicked on and off. I have tried my best to divine the rationale that only gets you to 42 hours, when we have gavelled in and gavelled out now to about 102 hours.

But I do know this: This is going to be the hardest working Congress in history. That was a point also, Mr. Speaker, and at least a harder working Congress than the 109th. And you are going to measure that by being here more days. We are going to do 5 days instead of 2 or 3 days. Actually, I am thankful, Mr. Speaker, because I wanted to do 5 days here.

□ 1245

I would like to do 5 or 6 days here, and I would like to do it for 2 or 3 weeks in a row, hard and intense. I want Members in this town so that I can network with Members of Congress and that my staff can network with their staff and we can get things done.

I will point out that the individual Members are far more representative of their district if they have access to other Members of Congress and more days to carry on that kind of network and dialogue and debate and deliberation and information sharing than if there is only going to be a gavel in here for 2 days or perhaps for three. No matter how busy we are back in the district Members of Congress are more effective when they have longer periods of time here, and I would submit give us some time, Mr. Speaker, to go back to the district so that we do not lose touch with the soul of the people in our district.

We have got to have the feel of the rhythm. We have got to know what the economy is doing. We have got to know the rhythm of the issues that come up. We have got to have town meetings so that people can stand up and have their voice represented here in Washington.

So I am glad we are here more time, but the way it is calculated out by the Pelosi clock is this hardest working Congress may be hardest one in history, actually has only by the Pelosi clock worked 4.2 hours a day. Now from an administration that ran on a campaign of harder working, these are days that we have gavelled in. This is not any kind of stretch. We were here for 10, 11 days actually pounding this out of actually being in session, Pelosi clock only clicks over 4.2 hours. That is not a lot of time, and there are not too many folks in my district that can work 4.2 hours a day on a 5-day week or a 2-day week or a 7-day week and still feed their family.

So what is the measure going to be? I have said often the people in the district need to measure this by going to the polls.

But what got accomplished in these 100 hours that are, gavel in to gavel out, real clock or the 42 hours of Pelosi time, what got accomplished? Six pieces of legislation. She met that goal within a legitimate clock. Should have just had a legitimate clock. It all would have looked even better, but here is the cost to the country as this points out.

This is my infinity piece, Mr. Speaker, in that we cannot quite measure this cost to the country because it has

gone on too far and it has been too much.

H.R. 1, cost to the taxpayers of about \$6 billion, and this is the cost of some of the changes that were passed that were the 9/11 commission's recommendation, not the promise of all of the changes recommended, but some of the changes recommended, and most of this is the additional cost of examining every piece of freight that comes in from overseas. But it does not include the recommendation of the 9/11 Commission to set up a committee that is going to bring all of our homeland security appropriations process under one set of scrutiny. That was a recommendation, too, of the 9/11 Commission. That one was ignored.

So all of the recommendations? No. That was a promise. The reality was spend more money, \$6 billion, on something that is right now impossible to achieve, and we have set up a system that has done a very good job to inspect these freight-sealed containers in foreign ports before they are loaded on ships so we know what is coming here.

Second item, H.R. 2 was the minimum wage passage. 25.8 million small business owners in America who create three out of every four new jobs are now being told you are going to have to give a \$2.10 raise to all of your employees, and I have been an employer for over 28 years. I have met payroll for over 1,400 consecutive weeks. I have never paid anybody minimum wage, but I met the payroll, and I know this, that we pay on merit. So we have different levels of our wages depending upon the job they do and the level of their efficiency and their proficiency within the job. But my lowest person on the totem level, the one who is entry-level wages, if I give him a \$2.00 an hour raise or a \$2.10 an hour raise, I guarantee you every employee is lined up outside my office wanting their wages to go up \$2 an hour, too, all the way up to the top of the chain, including everybody but the CEO who has to then take it out of whatever your net profits are.

So you make a decision. Do I have as many people? Do I go buy a machine to replace some of these laborers? I am going to be innovative here. I cannot afford to give this raise to everybody because I cannot compete with my competition and sometimes my competition is illegal labor which makes it all the harder because there is not going to be a limitation on wages paid to illegal workers. 25.8 million small businesses punished in that.

Meanwhile, the representative from American Samoa stands over here at this microphone within the last hour and a half and makes the argument that the economy in American Samoa cannot sustain the minimum wage. Now, why is it that Democrats can understand supply and demand and the empirical rule of supply and demand in minimum wage law that if you raise wages it will cost jobs? Why is it they can understand it when they have got

it in a microcosm of American Samoa, about 60,000 people there, but they cannot understand it when it is infused out across an economy of the United States of America that is 300 million people? You take it out of that 300 million people and take it over here and say here is what happens in American Samoa, what is the impact? The impact is 5,000 more jobs lost in American Samoa by some allegations. Could understand that in a microcosm, but not in a broader sense of the overall economy.

That is a scary thing to think about people in charge that do not understand the basic elements of free enterprise and supply and demand and the market system.

H.R. 3 forces taxpayers to pay up to \$135 million to fund research that takes innocent human lives, the embryonic stem cell research mandate. Right now there is no prohibition in America against doing embryonic stem cell research with private dollars or with public dollars of any kind out there. We just were not going to appropriate your Federal tax dollars to do this. So, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is immoral to compel taxpayers to fund scientific operation that ends innocent human life for the sake of someplace down the road 50 years speculating that someone's life would be improved.

There is not a sound basis for this science. This turned into a political argument. It is not a scientific debate. This has already been lost by that side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, long ago, within the last year or two, with more mountains of real scientific evidence building up that cord blood stem cell research, or that also amniotic stem cell research, much of that far more promising. If embryonic stem cell research had merit, it would attract private investment dollars. It is not. That is why they have got to come here. They have turned it into a political argument, not a scientific argument and refuse to debate the science of it. That is the cost of \$135 million to taxpayers that will be spent to take innocent human life.

I have, Mr. Speaker, held those little snowflake babies in my arm. I looked Sam and Ben in the eye and I looked David in the eye here a year ago, giggly, laughing, bubbly little children that were for 9 years frozen, and now they are happy, human lives that are enriching the lives of everyone around them. Parents who could not have children are now parents of real children they nurture and love. These are also adoptable embryos.

Next, H.R. 4, Part D, the prescription drug that commands the Federal Government to negotiate the value of prescription drugs. There is nothing government can do to improve Part D that was passed here a couple or 3 years ago. The cost of that has gone down. It was projected to be \$43 billion a year on average. Now, it is down to \$30 billion a year on average. We would have never passed a Medicare policy without including prescription drugs if we had

anything more than aspirin so awful back in 1965, but because there has been profit in the prescription drug industry, we now have a broad array of innovative new drugs that save thousands and thousands of American lives and improve the American lives. That is because of research and development that has been invested.

This will shut down some of the research and development, and it is a mandate that puts the Federal Government in the business of these negotiations. The Federal Government does a lousy job of that. I mean, look at the price of hammers and toilet seats. You can look for the same kind of thing to be what you get with prescription drugs. Only research and development slows down, gets shut down, and that means the progress in health is diminished.

H.R. 5, cost to taxpayers, \$7.1 billion, and it will not help 84 million Americans with current student loans. \$7.1 billion. But that \$7.1 billion translates into higher tuition rates, Mr. Speaker, higher costs for education. When I have high school students who will say to me in an auditorium what are you going to do to lower my tuition costs, I ask them, what are you doing to shop for the best bang for your tuition dollar? Are you looking at the cost of the richest institution versus the private school versus the community college? Are you paying attention to take some college courses while you are in high school so you can shorten up that window of time to get your 4-year degree? A lot of them will look at me and say, well, I never thought of that; I never thought I had to be the invisible hand of the consumer when I went to college.

It never occurs to them they can have more to say about the cost of tuition increase if they are smart consumers of that education and higher education. So this will raise the price of tuition, and ultimately, it does not help the problem. It makes it worse because everybody will pay more tuition, and some, a few, a small few will get a short break for a narrow window that looks to me like it is about 6 months over a 6-year period of time.

H.R. 6 increases our dependence on Middle Eastern oil and hurts families and seniors with higher energy prices. We finally after years of struggle, Mr. Speaker, last year marginally opened up some of our drilling offshore in the 181 area down off of the Florida panhandle coast. We have 406 trillion cubic feet of natural gas on the outer continental shelf known reserve. That is just the stuff we know, and we have not been able to drill and explore to the fashion we need to.

We have a lot of oil on the outer continental shelf as well. The political barrier to going into that natural resource has been foreboding because there is an environmental political caucus over here that if anything comes up and they say, oh, that is a green issue, their brain shuts off, the

curtains come down over their eyeballs. You cannot talk to them anymore because it is a green issue, and they are going to vote green.

For example, a lot of them believe that ANWR is this pristine, arctic wilderness that somehow or another if we go up there and drill an environmentally friendly well will be destroyed forever and the tourism dollars for the Eskimos would never show up. Well, truthfully, and they know they have to live there, tourism is never going to be their salvation. What if we drilled an environmentally friendly well in ANWR of Alaska and no one came there to see it, then my question is, like when a tree falls in the forest, if no one hears a noise, did it make a sound? Well, if you drill an environmentally friendly well in ANWR and no one looks at it, did it damage the scenery? Not if nobody's looking, Mr. Speaker.

But even if someone is looking, even if thousands are looking, no, it does not damage the scenery. I have challenged the greens on this side of the aisle. We can fly you over the north slope of Alaska today and challenge you to point out the oil fields. I can fly you over them at 4,000 feet, and you can look down there, and unless somebody is giving you a crib sheet, you are never going to know it because these are not derricks sticking up in the sky. These are not pump jacks pumping oil out of the ground, leaking oil and spilling it into the soil, that idea of the old wildcat days you see in the movies from 80 years ago in Texas.

No, these are well casings that have submersible pumps in them. You do not even see their collector pipes that go on off over to their refinery. This is as an environmentally friendly as it gets. We need to open up all of these resources, and instead, this energy initiative that passed here, H.R. 6, cuts down on the amount of energy available to Americans that can do no other, and it changes the deal, Mr. Speaker. It changes the deal.

Where I come from, if you are going to put your capital on the line, a deal has to be a deal. When you look somebody in the eye, whether or not you shake their hand and you say I will do that for X money, that is a deal. We buy cattle out of the window of the pickup on main street of our towns, two or three pot loads of cattle. Yeah, that is fine, I will take these because I trust you. You keep your word; you will bring me what I want.

We should do the same thing out of this Congress, but the system that is set up out there and the conditions by which some of the findings that are off in the gulf coast, and I am thinking of Chevron that has that field, appears to be something that will increase U.S. domestic oil supply by 50 percent, when that finding is opened up, those kind of deals now are no longer a deal with this piece of legislation because it directs a renegotiation of those leases to punish the very people that are pro-

ducing the supply of oil that is driving down the price, that has taken us from \$75 a barrel down to \$53 a barrel. The more that is on the market, the lower the price gets.

Now a deal is not a deal out there in the gulf coast, Mr. Speaker. A deal gets changed, and H.R. 6 says to government, go force, I say this force, renegotiation of those leases because the hook in that is that if you do not renegotiate then you will not be eligible for new leases in areas that might be the most massive oil find in the history of America.

□ 1300

This is debilitating, and the argument was made a little bit ago that they have reduced the dependence on foreign oil. Good night, Mr. Speaker. It couldn't be any more off than 180 degrees by our measure. It has increased our dependency on Middle Eastern oil and it has reduced our availability of oil and gas onto the domestic market, when we can be pumping it out right between us and Hugo Chavez. It is going to slow down that development.

And that is just some of the things on my mind as this 100 hours concludes. I hope the Speaker keeps her promise now and we can come back to work, I think on Monday, and we can gavel in here, and some of these freshmen can have a voice in this process. Not a single freshman has introduced a single amendment. They have not had a bit of impact on one word of all of this legislation that has come through. No freshman has changed one word in anything that has been passed in these first real 100 hours or the 42 hours by the Pelosi clock.

I know there is a lot in the gentleman from New Mexico, and I am very interested in hearing it emerge here on the floor of this Congress, Mr. Speaker. So I would be very pleased to yield so much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico. And I would point out that we are splitting the time between now and 2:00.

Mr. PEARCE, I would thank the gentleman from Iowa, and consider his comments to the fullest.

I would congratulate my friends across the aisle for their attempts at activity in the first 100 hours. The truth is that, like my friend from Iowa, I am in business. My wife and I had a small business that we bought in, and we had four employees; 14 years later we had 50 employees. We sold that business when we came here. But I understand the creation of jobs and I understand the impact of taxes, the impact of what we do here in Washington. And I like the idea that we would move to bold action. I like the idea that we would compel these United States to be different and new and think differently. But I will tell you, there are some things that in the last 2 weeks have concerned me greatly.

Several years ago I had the opportunity to visit Egypt. When I was in

Egypt, I noticed that almost every building had rebar and unconstructed pieces on top. So I mentioned to a friend of mine who was in the embassy that, why are all the buildings unfinished here? His comment was that they do not tax the buildings until they are complete, and so no one ever finishes their house, their home, the building they live in. The top floor is always under construction. And if they get that floor finished, they continue on and put rebar out onto a new addition that may never actually take place.

The truth is, that is a great example of one of the fundamentals of economics: The things that we tax more of, we have fewer. We tax complete houses, so in Egypt we have fewer full, complete houses. That same principle works here.

Now, yesterday on the floor of the House we heard much language that certainly appeals to many people in this Nation, that we are going to get back at those big greedy oil companies, that we are going to tax the people who have taken advantage of the American consumer. I would just point to the photograph on my right, this is what we are taxing. If the principle holds that we have fewer of what we tax, then we would understand that there are going to be fewer of these monstrous oil rigs. This is about a \$1 billion to \$1.5 billion project that sits out either in the Gulf of Mexico or off of the California coast and they produce tremendous amounts of oil.

I am from an oil producing State, New Mexico, but our oil wells are single wells coming up out of the ground. This one may have 20 or 30 wells that diverge out once it gets under the ocean. Our single wells may produce 50 barrels a day, and that would be a good well in New Mexico. These billion dollar investments might produce thousands or tens of thousands of barrels of oil per day. So like my friend from Iowa said, they contribute greatly to lowering the price of oil and, therefore, lowering the price of gasoline.

Now, in our friends' enthusiasm across the aisle to raise the taxes on those oil companies that have produced so much, what they are actually going to do is raise the taxes on these facilities so that we produce fewer of these and fewer gallons and barrels of oil and gallons of gasoline, which means simply that the price is going to go up at the pump.

Now, I am struck when we are faced with the comments that my friend from Iowa made; I am struck by the comments that he found issues in almost every bill that were like this, that had been poorly thought out yet not subject to the full complement of congressional hearings that they should have gone through, not subject to any amendment. And as I am thinking about his observations, I am drawn to a comment in the Detroit Free Press, and I would submit for the RECORD this entire document. But let me highlight this one quote. This is

Mr. DINGELL speaking, talking about the new greenhouse special committee that is being suggested by the new Speaker. And Mr. DINGELL says, "We should probably name it the Committee on World Travel and Junkets." Mr. DINGELL told the Associated Press, "We are just empowering a bunch of enthusiastic amateurs to go around and make speeches and make commitments that will be very difficult to honor."

[From the Detroit Free Press, Jan. 19, 2007]

#### DINGELL IS OVERSTEPPED ON CLIMATE

(By Justin Hyde)

WASHINGTON.—The battle among House Democrats over global warming heated up Thursday as House Speaker Nancy Pelosi announced the formation of a special committee to hold hearings on climate change, a job that had been under the watch of U.S. Rep. John Dingell, D-Mich.

Dingell, who has long opposed tougher fuel economy standards because of concerns about their effect on Detroit automakers, will still maintain significant control over any global warming bill through his chairmanship of the House Energy and Commerce Committee. He has already asked former Vice President Al Gore to testify on climate change and told members last week that climate change would be a top priority through a series of hearings to be held soon.

But the special committee reflects concern by Pelosi and other Democrats who want fast action on global warming that Dingell might object to provisions they support. Many House Democrats support setting higher fuel economy targets on vehicles as part of any effort to reduce carbon dioxide emissions linked to a warming of the Earth.

Dingell said he had not seen a detailed list of the committee's responsibilities.

Pelosi's move increases the likelihood that Democrats will propose far tougher constraints on greenhouse gas pollution than the Bush administration wants. She also has outflanked for now—and angered—a few Democrats who head important House committees.

"We should probably name it the committee on world travel and junkets," Dingell told the Associated Press. "We're just empowering a bunch of enthusiastic amateurs to go around and make speeches and make commitments that will be very difficult to honor."

Pelosi announced Thursday that she would form a Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming, which would hold hearings and seek suggestions for ways to address climate change. She said Congress needed the committee "to communicate with the American people on this important issue," and that Democrats would come up with bills by July 4.

"The science of global warming and its impact is overwhelming and unequivocal," Pelosi said in a statement. "We already have many of the technology and techniques that we need to reduce global warming pollution, and American ingenuity will supply the rest. With this new select committee, we demonstrate the priority we are giving to confront this most serious challenge."

Pelosi and her aides did not disclose who would head the committee or how many members it would have, but no members of Dingell's Energy and Commerce Committee will apparently be included. While the committee will hold hearings around the country, Pelosi told members Thursday it will not have the ability to write legislation—the key power of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

What concerns Dingell and his allies is that Pelosi is using a select committee rather than a simple task force to highlight climate change. Under House rules, a select committee will have to be created by a House vote, and Pelosi aides say the committee will have Republican members—features that sound more like a legislative body than a Democratic communications tool.

The California Democrat has long backed environmental issues and has asked Dingell and other committee chairmen to submit their ideas for climate change legislation by June 1.

But once the select committee issues its findings, Pelosi could rely on that for legislation or use it instead of what Dingell's committee produces.

Energy issues already appear to be the hottest topic on Capitol Hill. House Democrats celebrated the end of their 100-hour legislative blitz by passing a bill raising about \$15 billion in fees and royalties from oil companies. The revenue is aimed at financing research for alternative fuels and energy conservation.

President George W. Bush's aides have said energy issues will play a key role in Bush's State of the Union address on Tuesday.

White House spokesman Tony Snow told reporters Thursday that the President's speech would address the "needs of security and, at the same time, also the environment."

U.S. Rep. Bart Stupak, a Menominee Democrat and member of Dingell's committee, said the select committee could be useful to "highlight the importance of global warming" and that it won't prevent Energy and Commerce from holding its own hearings.

"However, the legislative writing ability has to remain within the Energy and Commerce Committee," Stupak said. "If suddenly there was a special committee . . . that had legislative writing powers, I'd be very concerned because that's a direct assault on a sitting committee."

Now, when I see our friends who I know don't intend to undermine the economy of this country make decisions like they did yesterday, I am concerned that Mr. DINGELL is very accurate, that we have empowered a bunch of enthusiastic amateurs, that they do not understand the full consequences of their actions.

If we look at the Tunagate scandal where we have now exempted from all of America just one piece of America, SunKist and Del Monte as the parent corporation; every corporation in America, according to the minimum wage law, must, whether they can afford it or not, pay a new higher minimum wage. That is the potential of the majority. And yet they came in, the Speaker gave an exclusion to one company, one company based in her district.

Now, we have heard a lot about the ending of special favors and ending the culture of corruption, and yet one of the first things we do is get a special interest. That does not speak so well for the full intent to follow through in this new beginning that we have been given.

I would also point out that one of the greatest arguments made in the renegotiation, allowing government to negotiate the prices on medical prescription drugs, I would point out that one of the harshest criticisms of this

bill yesterday, the energy bill, H.R. 6, was that government negotiators failed to get it right; that government negotiators failed to put the provisions in. They did not even ask the oil companies to put those provisions into the contracts, and yet it is the same type of negotiator who we are going to turn loose and say that now we are going to get better prices than what the private negotiators have. I simply don't believe it. I voted the other way. But we will see if our enthusiastic amateurs have gotten it right, or if we in fact do not increase revenues to the Treasury and in fact begin to limit access to prescription medications, which is what I have been told.

For an example, we can go and look at the Veterans Prescription Drug List, and we see that I think the number is only 30 percent of the drugs that have been introduced in the last 5 to 10 years are actually on the list for veterans. They don't have the same access that people on the Medicare prescription drug program do. So that would be a terrible shame if, in their enthusiasm to create a better plan, our friends have instead created a worse plan. I am certainly willing to work with them and see, but in the meantime I do worry.

Now, there is a piece of the legislation yesterday that we all must read. If you have access to your computers, you can always look up H.R. 6, and go to page 10. That is section 2, title II, and we are under the section 204 and we actually then begin a long series of pages and we come to page 10 under section 204, item C. And I will read this, because you as colleagues will find this stunning that it is actually in print. That transfers item C, line 4, page 10: A lessee shall not be eligible to obtain any economic benefit of any covered lease or any other lease.

So President Clinton's team had negotiated bad leases, and now our friends are saying that those bad leases must be stopped. We simply need to stop them. We don't need to unravel them. We don't need to go through the thorny process of making it right for both sides as we unravel. We simply are going to punish you by not allowing you to derive any economic benefit from this type of installation. I will tell you, that undermines the full faith and credit of the United States. If we cannot depend on the word of the United States, then what do we have? I would draw parallels to things that other countries have done.

In Venezuela, Hugo Chavez in 2001 raised the royalty rates from 1 percent to 16 percent just like that. Now, I will tell you as a business guy, if you know that a cost is going to be 1 percent or 16 percent, it is sort of irrelevant, but you must know that the cost is steady. When he raised those rates just at a single point with no ability to redesign these types of infrastructures, then he severely limited the interest of people to invest in that country, and certainly

that is exactly what is happening. Foreign firms are already curtailing their investments in that country.

So in Venezuela we see that there is an attempt to change existing contracts, very similar to the way that we changed yesterday on the floor of this House of Representatives, and it has affected the desire of people to invest in Venezuela.

In Bolivia we have the same thing. The Bolivian government threatened to expel oil companies from that country in 2006 if they did not agree to new government terms on existing contracts. What has happened? I think you could forecast what has happened. What is done is that foreign investors are now beginning to reconsider whether or not they will actually be a part of the Bolivian economy or not. This is the thing that all shareholders, they will live with any certainty in life, but they will not live with uncertainty. And when we begin to change the contracts, they begin to pull their investments out and go to places where certainty is more of a potential.

In Russia we have seen the same thing. Companies such as Shell, Exxon, BP have had valid oil and gas leases in Russia for years. President Putin had a number of government agencies threaten to pull these leases for a number of suspect reasons. By threatening to pull these leases, Shell was forced to give up assets that were worth billions of dollars. So we see in Russia this attempt to maneuver contracts, to manipulate contracts much as what we did yesterday, and the effects are very bad. Long term, Russia will not have people who are willing to come and invest in that country.

In 2001, I had the opportunity to go as a company; my wife and I had a small company that dealt in oil and gas, repairs of oil wells. Russia was looking for such capability. So in 2001, I went with a team of people who did various different projects. We were the ones who did down hole repairs on oil wells. They took me, they showed me files of maybe 6,000 or 8,000 wells that were simple to correct, yet they in their technology in 2001 did not have access to even the basics that my father had seen here in the United States in the early 1950s when he was working in the same industry. My father retired from Exxon; his whole life was work.

So when I went back, I showed him the videos of the equipment that was in Russia in 2001. He said, "Son, in 1950 we were more advanced than what we are seeing here."

When countries are unwilling to allow people to have stable returns, it doesn't have to be high returns, low returns, but there must be stability and there must be predictability. When countries do not allow that, there will be no investments. And so here Russia was with over 6,000 wells asking me in 2001 to come and fix because they did not have anyone that was capable of fixing them.

I determined that the environment was very, very unsettling in Russia, so

we actually opted not to become a part of the team that went there. There was a company that was about 10 times our size located in Abilene, Texas. They did go. That was about maybe a \$50 million company, maybe a \$100 million company. Within 2 years, they were selling everything at bankruptcy because the Russians, as you can predict, said, "No. These assets are going to belong to us."

So this contracting problem that was attempted to be cured yesterday in legislation I think is going to be, instead of a fix, is going to cause prices to be higher at the pump, investments to be less, and at the end of the day we are going to wonder if maybe we did not empower a bunch of enthusiastic amateurs to go around and make commitments on behalf of the Federal Government. We shall see. I wish my friends well.

I would say that I am not the only one who wonder about the contracts. Just day before yesterday the Washington Post had an editorial which declared that these elements that are included in the bill, the ones that begin to undo the contracts that we voted on yesterday and pushed by the majority in this House, the Washington Post declared those solutions to be ones that Russia and Bolivia would be proud of.

Now, that is not exactly the new direction that the American people were promised as we came into this session. So I would encourage my colleagues to please open the process up. With debate in committee, these shortcomings in bills could have been brought out. The rough edges could have been knocked off the bills. Instead, we have been faced with bills that have no amendments allowed, no debate in committees, no consideration in committees. And so I worry that our friends are circumventing democracy.

□ 1315

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for bringing his expertise to the floor. I listened with fascination to the Russian narrative. That is one I wasn't aware of. I look forward to looking into that in further detail in the future.

I see we have some freshmen who have come to the floor, apparently poised to proceed with a Special Order over the next 60 minutes. I trust this is in a great celebration of the first 100 hours and the accomplishment of the 100 hours now being in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and you are here to celebrate you are finally going to have a voice in this process. Maybe next week one of you can offer an amendment and go to a subcommittee meeting and go to a hearing or do a markup, and you can get into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some of the things you promised your voters you were going to do.

I have to believe you didn't think you would be muzzled for the first 100 hours, and you thought there would be a process for you to be allowed to offer

amendments, engage in debate, go to subcommittee and committee meetings, and maybe even go before the Rules Committee and make a request and have it granted that you could bring your pet issue to this floor of Congress and actually accomplish the things that you pledged you would do.

If any of you have had any of that voice up to this point, I think it would be interesting to hear that. I suspect, no, you are full of frustration, quietly, and now we are going to hear your voices, full throated, maybe in the next hour, hopefully next week. Pelosi time only says 42 hours. I am not sure if you are going to give that chance.

Please make that request so we can go to real-time. Congratulations, you got it all done in the first real 100 hours. You didn't need Pelosi time. I want to hear your voice in the amendment process. Welcome to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this great honor to speak to you this afternoon. I also thank the gentleman from New Mexico.

#### FRESHMEN DEMOCRATS CELEBRATE COMPLETING 100-HOUR AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES) is recognized for 42 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here in the House of Representatives. It is an honor and privilege to rise to represent my State of New Hampshire, and also as a new Member of the Democratic majority to celebrate the 100-hours agenda that has recently been completed.

I note with interest that the gentleman from Iowa suggests that somehow the new Democratic Members have not had great input into the agenda for America that the 100 hours was meant to advance and did advance, and somehow the suggestion might be that we haven't participated fully with our leadership in the Congress in determining the new course and a new direction for this country.

I would correct that gentleman because the new Democratic majority and the new Members that are here have had great input with the leadership because the American people have sent us here with a mandate for change. As we campaigned this fall all across this country, nothing was clearer from the American people than they wanted change. They wanted change in the way government did its business. They wanted change in the direction of this country, and we are now privileged and honored to be part of history and be here on the floor of the people's House to help make that change happen. Today, in some sense, we come to celebrate the 100-hours agenda.

My colleagues across the aisle have made much over the past 2 weeks about

hours and minutes. The gentleman from Iowa produced a chart that counted hours and counted minutes and they have counted seconds.

But the American people, Mr. Speaker, have counted years. They have been waiting for years for a new direction for this country. They have said to us in clear and unequivocal terms that they wanted honest leadership and open government. We heard time and time again about a culture of corruption, concern from the American people that the House of Representatives and the Members in this House seemed more concerned about themselves than representing the people of this country.

And so in the American agenda that the Democrats advanced and has been advanced, we pledged honest leadership and open government. We pledged to restore government as good as the people of this country deserve starting with real ethics reform.

So, Mr. Speaker, one of the first things that happened here in the 110th Congress was through the rules process we advanced significant ethics reform to restore honest and transparent leadership in the House of Representatives.

The American people spoke clearly to us about their concerns about what was going on not only across the sea in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. They are concerned about real security for America. They are concerned that although the 2001 attacks had been the subject of a bipartisan commission, the 9/11 Commission, to determine what needed to be done to make our homeland safe, to keep the people of this country safe from attacks here, that this Congress somehow had stalled in making those promises, in keeping those promises and making the homeland safe.

So in H.R. 1 as part of the 100-hours agenda, we voted to implement the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to protect Americans at home and lead the world by telling the truth to our troops, our citizens and our allies. We believe in a strong national defense. And we believe in being tough and smart. But we realized that homeland security must be a priority, and so we voted to implement homeland security.

We were concerned about economic prosperity and educational excellence. We wanted to create jobs that stay in America and restore opportunity for everyone, and that means all Americans, Americans earning all kinds of incomes. I can't tell you, Mr. Speaker, how many times as I walked my district door to door and met people in coffee shops and factories and schools and libraries, everywhere I went the subject of the minimum wage came up time and time again because the good people of this country recognized that the minimum wage was an important factor for millions of Americans. Single moms raising families were trying to do it on a minimum wage that hadn't been raised in 10 years.

I always find it interesting when my colleagues from across the aisle com-

plain about raising the minimum wage, and yet so many voted with us, they voted themselves increases in their salaries for 10 years before raising the minimum wage. We accomplished that in H.R. 2.

We were able to introduce important medical research with stem cell research, to expand stem cell research in a careful and appropriate way, in the way that the American people wanted.

We started to help reform Medicare part D in H.R. 4.

We helped our students go to college in this country by cutting the rate of student loans in half, and we started a move towards energy independence by rolling back tax breaks for big oil companies.

In the last Congress, that Congress voted to cut taxes, give tax breaks to huge oil and gas companies while they saw record prices at the pump, and at the same time cut \$12 billion in aid for our college students when we need to send people to college. So we passed H.R. 6, which started to pave the way for energy independence.

Having advanced that agenda, at this time I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to comment on the good feeling of having the 100 hours' strong start and the issues that we touched upon. Many have talked about it today, but I believe it was very much an important part of fulfilling our promise to the voters throughout our campaigns in '06 to be able to come here in '07 and make a difference.

In less than 100 hours, we were able to move some major legislation, things like prescription drug negotiations with the Health and Human Services Administration, being able to negotiate, which just makes sense. When it is done on everything else that we buy in America, it is actually part of the way business is done, and why there is this protection to keep that from happening, I have no idea. It has been a great opportunity I think to see, and I think it will be a great benefit for seniors. There are so many things that have happened in this 100 hours. And even though the other side says it is not perfect, it is not; but it is certainly a good start.

To do something as simple as enacting the 9/11 Commission, to have the recommendations for safety and scanning our containers that go onto our boats and containers that go into our airplanes so that we know that we are not allowing illegal things into our country and things that can hurt us, this is just a really positive move in the right direction; and I believe it is a good one.

And the minimum wage, to do that raise for the working families of our country that have been neglected for 10 years, it is the right thing to do. I am so proud to be a part of the minimum-wage increase.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, what we did on energy planning yesterday in stop-

ping the royalties that are being given to the large oil companies that are exhibiting exorbitant profits, and to be able to do something where we can say we are going to work towards energy independence in this country. We are going to look at options and how we can do ethanol.

I have an ethanol plant in my State of Ohio that we are trying to get up and running. We want to have alternative fuels. Coal-to-liquid is very exciting. In the Ohio Valley that I represent, we have an abundance of coal, coal that we will be able to use in a liquid plant to be able to produce fuel that could be used by the military. They are working on that contract as we speak.

One of the things that I like about the coal-to-liquid process is it is going to be a long-term investment. As leaders in government, we need to provide the leadership that needs to be done because we can't make the investment in coal-to-liquid plants and then have oil go down to \$36 a barrel. It has to be a long-term investment for people to invest in it. It has to be an opportunity where we can work toward our energy independence.

I believe it is a very significant thing, Mr. Speaker. And to know that, again, it is one of the important things that we have done in this 100 hours.

And to know that by reducing the interest on student loans we have provided more students with access to college and higher education, that is what it is about. This is the kind of thing that I believe helps us give people opportunities because so many times we have had bright people who just can't afford to go to higher education. By cutting the loans \$4,400 for the average student in their college expense, I think it is a great opportunity.

Last but not least, to finish up with the ethics part, to know that we have done something, to shine the light on the ethics that is in this very body, and that we are going to operate a Congress that is going to be above board and we are going to do things right.

In our first 100 hours, although it is not perfect, it is certainly a great first step in the right direction.

Mr. HODES. I thank the gentleman from Ohio. In terms of the energy independence, the program we are going to advance as leaders in this Congress is designed to unleash the entrepreneurial spirit of this country.

Mr. Speaker, last year the Federal Government only spend \$2 billion, one week in Iraq, on all of its research into alternative and renewable energy forms. By setting up the kind of reserve we have now, rolling back the subsidies for Big Oil and putting it into a reserve for Federal research and research into alternative energy, just think about how we are going to unleash the entrepreneurial spirit of this country for new jobs and economic prosperity on into the century.

It is now my pleasure to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. I want to congratulate you on your election as the president of the Democratic '06 class. You are doing great so far.

Mr. HODES. I appreciate the congratulations. Some would say condolences.

Mr. COURTNEY. I want to follow-up on your opening comments on the heels of the prior group that was here that seemed to suggest that freshmen were being suppressed in the opening 100 hours of the 110th Congress. As we all know, nothing would be further from the truth.

Our level of participation in the floor debate and in the design of this agenda could not have been more robust and full from the beginning of the process to the end.

□ 1330

Where we, I think, learned our information about the content of that agenda was on the campaign trail talking to the people in our district. These are ideas that have been out there for a long time. If anything has been suppressed or held back, in fact, it was the 100 hours agenda, not the process or the new Members of Congress that are again beginning our time here in the House.

As an undergraduate in Boston, I used to walk by Powder House Square in Cambridge past the home of Tip O'Neill who at that time was Speaker of this body, the predecessor of the gentleman in the chair. He was a wonderful man. He is certainly not maybe the typical blow-dried politician of the 21st century but he had a street wisdom that I think still resonates to this day. Of course, he coined the most famous phrase, which is that all politics is local. I was asked by a local reporter about where does this 100 hours agenda fit into the district. When are you guys going to start dealing with the Second Congressional District where I come from, eastern Connecticut.

The fact of the matter is if you go down this list of the 100 hours agenda, you can find exactly where in eastern Connecticut it matters, starting with homeland security. In my district, we have the Port of New London. We have more of Long Island Sound than any other congressional district in Connecticut. There are thousands of container cargo ships that every month pass up and down the Race in Long Island Sound. Today we have a situation where only a tiny fraction of those containers have been screened before they have reached that point. This is a large population center in our country. Yet despite the fact that the 9/11 Commission recommendations were out there telling us that we need to go a safer direction in terms of screening that cargo, it wasn't done by the prior Congress.

Secondly, the commission recommended that we would have funding based on need, not politics. It was one of the recommendations that the Chairs of the commission in their fifth

year anniversary of 9/11 pointed to as the biggest failing of the prior Congress. Yet in the State of the Connecticut where we received almost \$60 million funding in homeland security funding 3 years ago, it had dropped to \$15 million last year, leaving first responders high and dry in terms of the investment that they were trying to make in communications equipment and systems that would actually protect the people of our area. New York and the World Trade Center is not very far from my district. We lost people in the Second Congressional District on 9/11 and H.R. 1 right out of the box did everything in the world for my local community, my district, in terms of making us safer and stronger as a district and as a State.

In terms of student loans, my district is the home of the University of Connecticut, Eastern Connecticut State University, three community colleges, Mitchell College, Conn College. As Mr. WILSON indicated, this bill will literally make a difference between whether or not students go to college and stay in college or not. It is as simple as that. There was probably no other decision of the 109th Congress that was more out of touch than the decision to cut by \$12 billion aid for student loans. What we did a couple of days ago was take a big step in terms of reversing that damage to the system.

On the Education and Labor Committee on which I sit with Congresswoman HIRONO from Hawaii, we are going to follow up on that down payment to address Pell Grants, to revise the reauthorization of the Higher Ed Act to make sure that we build a system that will create a workforce for the 21st century.

Those are just two small examples where we kept faith with the voters. And with Speaker O'Neill's famous words about all politics is local, I think our class was a big part of that process over the last week. It has been terrific working with all of you and I think it is going to be a great time ahead of us in the 110th Congress.

Mr. HODES. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut. It is an honor to be a member of a class with such distinguished people in it of such skills and talents who are ready to move this agenda and move this country forward for the people, because we understand that it is the people's business that we are here to do and we are putting the people back in the People's House. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut.

I yield at this time to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I feel exhilarated at the end of this week. As I was campaigning through my district, the First District of New Hampshire, over and over again I kept hearing questions about what can Congress do to help the middle class and what can Congress do to help grow the mid-

dle class, to lift people into that robust middle class that we all want. And certainly this week we have shown what we are capable of doing. People are worried about Congress being able to get together and pass any legislation that would actually help the people. This week we have shown that we know how to get this job done. It certainly is an exhilarating feeling to be part of this.

We watched out for the taxpayer this week. We passed a PAYGO, pay-as-you-go. We said to the taxpayers of this country, we know your taxes are high, we know that you're worried about the highest deficits in American history, and we're going to do something about it. We're going to pass some programs that help you and we're also going to make sure that we don't drive up the deficit.

And then we looked at people who have children in college and we said, we know that you need help and we're going to help you. We cut the interest rates in half. Yet it didn't cost the taxpayer a dime. That is awesome. I feel wonderful and proud of the leadership, the Democratic leadership that brought this forward, and I am delighted that so many Republicans joined in that vote, because I think that it helps all of us.

Then we took a look at Medicare part D and we knew there was something wrong with Medicare part D. What was wrong with it was that the American taxpayer was not at the table when that was passed. It was the insurance companies, it was the pharmaceutical companies, but senior citizens were not there and neither were the American taxpayers. And so we said, we're changing this legislation so we will make sure that they have to negotiate the price of prescription drugs.

Now, we did hear a lot of hollering that this wouldn't help, but I will tell you something, you would never find the CEO of a company ordering their purchasing department not to negotiate the price of anything. We all know, children know when they are little, they take their lunches and they try to cut the best deal for themselves trading. We understand that you negotiate if you want the best deal for the American public and that is what we did.

So we can go back to our districts and we can look at everybody and say, we understand, because we come from you. We're the freshman class that have been out there listening to the issues and we have come to the floor of the House and with the help of the Democratic leadership and certainly some Republicans that joined forces with us, we have passed some pretty significant legislation. So when my child goes back to college next year and the American children go back to college next year, they know that when they leave college, we have reduced their debt \$4,000 over the terms of their loan. And when senior citizens go to their pharmacies for their prescriptions, they know that we did the best

that we could for them this week. It's a beginning. There will be more to be done, of course, but it is an impressive beginning. And when people go to the gas pump, which is the other way that we saved money for the American taxpayer, they know that we are not going to subsidize the oil companies anymore, that we are not going to take taxpayer money and give them a subsidy. This is what we have been asked to do and this is what we delivered this week.

I congratulate everybody who had a part in this and I urge the American people to stay tuned, because we are going to continue to deliver what the American public has asked us to do and what they need us to do. While we do that, we are also going to be paying attention to the international scene. We know that we have to have a strong national defense. We understand that we have enemies in this world and that we have to be careful. That is why we made sure that we will have containers that are inspected and that is why we looked very carefully with the 9/11 Commission and we said, yes, they're right and we need to do this now. On September 11, 2001, I was on the Beltway in Washington, D.C., and it was a terrifying place to be, no question about it. But I would go out to my district and say, we can't live in fear but what we have to do is be sensible and take action to keep us safer. We can't cower in fear but we can pass legislation that will protect all of us. We need to be on the world stage. We need to be bold. We need to take action to make sure that we are safe, but we also have to make sure that we don't terrify Americans.

So this week we said, here is some legislation that is going to protect you at the airports, it is going to protect you at the ports, it is going to protect our Nation and we are moving forward on every direction. I am delighted. It has been a wonderful couple of weeks and I know with all these good people working hard that America can continue to be reassured that we will lead the country in the right direction.

Mr. HODES. I thank the gentlewoman from New Hampshire. I just want to say how proud I am that now New Hampshire has two Democratic Congress Members serving our great State and we will be working hard on behalf of our constituents as I know all our members of the new Democratic majority-makers are going to be doing. I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to be here today. It is an honor for all of us to be here today, to be Members of Congress. We were all sent here, I think, to bring change to this Nation and bring a new direction to this Nation. I am proud that we have been a part of really a bipartisan effort. As

Democrats, we have been part of a bipartisan effort to change the way this country is being run. In this last 100 hours, with NANCY PELOSI really pushing us to the maximum, we have taken care of things that have been stymied, stalled and stopped in prior Congresses.

We have dealt with minimum wage that sat on the shelf for 10 years. We dealt with renewable energy which for my district is fantastic. We have the National Renewable Energy Lab. It is time for us to change our priorities and have a more diverse portfolio of energy sources so that we aren't relying on the Middle East all the time. It is good for national security, it is good for the climate, it is good for jobs.

We dealt with student loans. As I said a couple of days ago, I was at a dive meet this past weekend, one of my kids was in a dive meet, and a woman came up and thanked me because we were reducing the rate of interest on student loans because she had one daughter in college, another one coming up, a single mom, and this was going to help their family educate and really build for the future.

One of the things that I was most proud of, and I am talking to the gentleman from Tennessee because he participated in this, was on the stem cell bill. I felt so proud because that is what Congress, that is what the democratic system is all about. There was a bipartisan bill that passed legislation to allow for further stem cell research that holds out so much promise for so many people. One of my kids has epilepsy. We talked about that. DIANA DEGETTE and MIKE CASTLE, one a Democrat, one a Republican, worked very well together to bring about a bipartisan solution to something that will help so many people across this country.

There were other things. There was 9/11. I am a member of the Homeland Security Committee. And for us to finally pass the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission after years of it sitting there without any implementation by the Republican Congress was a great change. I am just happy to be here, Mr. Speaker.

I don't know exactly how you would like me to proceed, but I wanted to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he feels that there has been the activity and the action and the change in direction of this country that the people in his district elected him to bring change.

Mr. HODES. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Thank you. I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado posing the question and the gentleman from New Hampshire yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, indeed the people of the Ninth District in Tennessee have felt the differences in this Congress. It has been a great honor to be here as a representative of the Ninth District of Tennessee. Bob Dylan said, "Senators, Congressmen, please heed the call." I think this class has heeded the call.

The call is, people felt that Congress was not a place that the American people intended it to be and our Founding Fathers intended it to be. It had fallen to one of the lowest levels of appreciation or lack of appreciation of any body or group in this country. It had a 34 percent, 33 percent approval rate. That is going to go up. The reason is, I think, because this Congress is going to look to the future and the Democratic Party looks to the future.

Most of y'all probably have heard the same stories I have heard. Politics is kind of like cars. If you want to go forward, you put your car in D like Democrat, in drive. And if you want to go in reverse, you put it in R like Republican, you go in reverse. We are in D and the Democrats are going forward and it is about the future. Most of this legislation has been about the future. It has been about the future of people never having to work for \$5.15 an hour.

People have come up in this well, Mr. Speaker, and they have talked about watch out for your pocketbook or watch out for your wallet. Folks making \$5.15 an hour can't hardly afford a wallet. So when they are talking about look out for your wallet, they are not thinking about the people that are performing the jobs that are necessary to keep this country moving forward that most of us don't want to participate in. Those people will be getting \$7.25 in a couple of years and they will have something to put in their pocketbook.

Regarding stem cell research, the gentleman from Colorado mentioned his child. My father had Alzheimer's. Lots of people have family members or friends who have had illnesses that might be cured. That is the future. There will be cures or there will be treatments for diseases because of the legislation that was taken and passed during this 100 hours by this House, and we hope the Senate will concur.

If you look at stem cell research, that is the future. The minimum wage, that is the future. Certainly on oil and fuels and new ideas on energy and getting us independent of Middle Eastern oil, that is defense. That is the future. So if you want to go forward, you put your car in D, you support Democrats and go forward. I am happy to be a part of this Democratic class. It has been an exciting experience. It has been a great 100 hours. We have got a great Speaker, historic, the first woman Speaker. Next week when the President delivers his State of the Union address, there will be a woman behind him. Behind every successful man, there is a woman, and even behind this President there is going to be a woman, and there is going to be a great woman, Speaker PELOSI.

Mr. HODES. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his remarks and for quoting a great American artist, Bob Dylan. It is important that we bring art and culture down to the floor of the Congress and make sure that the people of America know that we are connected not only to the past but to the

future. I also note that the 100 hours agenda as it turned out was subject to full debate here on the floor of the House.

□ 1345

Now our colleagues across the aisle, from time to time, raised complaints about procedures. They claimed they were cut out. But they were all here and had the opportunity to debate the 100 hours agenda. And, in fact, when it came to votes on the 100 hours agenda, Mr. Speaker, we averaged 67 Republican votes for what we passed in terms of the 100-hour agenda. We averaged 67 votes from our colleagues across the aisle. So while they may have raised their voices about the procedure, we were fulfilling promises to the American people. We knew it was important. They joined us. And so I think we all should be proud of the fact that the 100 hour agenda really was an American agenda. It is an American agenda. It is a down payment on what we are going to do to keep on moving this country forward. And I am proud and glad that our colleagues from across the aisle had the wisdom, the courage, and just the plain smarts to join us on what the American people know is right for America as we move forward in the 21st century.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize and yield to the gentleman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO).

Ms. HIRONO. I just wanted to make a comment about what you just said. You know, there is rhetoric, and then there is action. So while we had hours and hours of debate on all of these bills that we dealt with in the first 100 hours, when it came down to action, so many of the Republicans voted with us. So as the saying goes, "Where's the beef?" And frankly, I just want to share with my colleagues from the majority-making class, of which I am very proud, there was an article written in a local newspaper back home about me and how I am doing here, and they quoted a professor from University of Pennsylvania, a political science professor. I don't know why they asked somebody from the University of Pennsylvania. But he teaches a class on how Congress works. And he said, basically, freshmen are hardly ever seen and they are never heard from. Well, nothing could be further from the truth in our class. Not only were we seen, but we were heard from. We were encouraged to speak out. And I think every single one of us had an opportunity to speak on all of these bills, as I certainly did. And so I came here because I really wanted to be responsive to the American people. And as the New York Times only yesterday said, that the House has now approved legislation directly addressing public concerns. And I think that is why we feel really gratified to have been a part of this historic session and to be reminded that prior Congresses, the 104th, 105th, 106th, 107th, 108th, 109th Congresses in the month of January, were taking a break. And we didn't.

Mr. HODES. I thank the gentleman from Hawaii for the remarks, and pointing out how important what we are doing really is to the future of this country.

And at this time I would yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) with whom I am very proud to serve.

Mr. SARBANES. Thank you very much. I appreciate that. I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire for his amazing leadership of our class. And I am just so excited to be here and to be part of this debate. You will excuse me for looking at the clock every so often. The reason I am doing it is I am so amazed at what we were able to accomplish in 100 hours. I mean, it is almost unprecedented in terms of legislative activity to produce the results that we have.

Congressman COURTNEY earlier cited Tip O'Neill and the notion that all politics is local. And I think that it is difficult for a lot of folks in this country to understand the connection between what we do here, the action we take, and what happens in their daily lives. But I believe that what we did over the last 10 days is directly connected to making life better for millions of Americans.

All over this country, every day, Americans get up and what do they do? They work hard and they play by the rules. They work hard and they play by the rules. And all they ask, all they expect, and it shouldn't be a tall order, is that we do the same thing; that the people they send here to represent them work hard and play by the rules. We took a step right from the onset by passing an ethics reform package that really is going to make a difference in terms of the way things operate here. And that was the right thing to do. And the message that came from the American people that we needed to do that was loud and clear.

We also decided that we ought to conduct business here in the same way that an average household is conducted, and that is, you make your checkbook balance. So we implemented rules related to fiscal accountability. That makes perfect sense. That makes perfect sense.

Let me talk a little bit more, though, about this connection to people's daily lives in terms of the things that we did. It starts at 6:00 in the morning. If you are a senior citizen in this country, the first thing you do, the first thing you do is you take your prescription medicine. Now, is that an experience that is causing you anxiety because you don't know what trick is coming around the corner next? Or do you feel like your interests are being looked after?

Last week we took the vital step of allowing the Medicare program, on behalf of its beneficiaries, to negotiate drug prices with the pharmaceutical industry. That is going to bring drug prices down and that is going to do right by our seniors. So it matters what we do here in terms of people's daily lives.

The working mother who gets up at 6:00 in the morning, gets her two children off to school, and then goes to a job that pays the minimum wage. What we did last week, in passing an increase in the minimum wage is going to make a difference for that person and millions of people around this country just like her.

Families all over America who wake up every day burdened with the worry and the anxiety about a loved one who is suffering from a debilitating disease or condition where the hope that science can provide for treatment is something that can lift them up. We took the step last week, with significant bipartisan support, of approving the Federal funding of embryonic stem cell research. That was the right thing to do for those families.

We have heard about the issue of security. We took steps last week, out of respect for the families of the victims of September 11, we took steps to implement, finally, the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission.

My blood pressure is going down now because when I go to a gas station to fill up my car I am not seething at the fact that I am paying all this money for gas, and, meanwhile, the oil industry is getting big tax breaks, because we took steps to repeal those because they weren't fair. They weren't fair.

And lastly, we took action on student loans. I have said it before in this Chamber, but I have got to say it again because it is imprinted on me. A woman came up to me whose children are trying to go to college, and she looked me straight in the eye, and this is what she said. She said, I did everything they told me I was supposed to do. My husband and I worked three jobs between us, we saved our money and we told our kids if you work hard and you study, you can make it in America. And now we can't pay for college. We have a problem in this country if people are looking at us and saying, we did everything they told us we were supposed to do and we can't make it. We have to restore the bargain with Americans.

And let me finish by noting this, and it is something we should take to heart as people who have been sent here to make policy. Policymakers can get up in the morning and they can head in one of two different directions. They can get up and they can think about what can I do today as, sadly, I think this administration does, what can I do today to help people who don't need any help? If do you that, you make bad public policy.

But if you get up in the morning and, as I think all of us here do, and you are thinking, what can we do today to help people who really need help, to help the working families of America? Then, you know what? We won't get it perfectly right every time, but most of the time we are going to make good public policy. And that is what we did last week and that is what we did this week. We made good public policy for

the American people. I am proud to have been part of that effort. And I am proud to serve with my colleagues who stepped up and made this 100 hours so meaningful for the American people.

Mr. HODES. We thank the gentleman from Maryland for speaking with such passion about the important connection between what we are doing here to make a positive difference in the lives of this country and what it means to every single American that we represent from around this country, what impact it will have on their daily lives, because, as the gentleman from Maryland rightly understands, we are dedicated to making a positive difference for all the people of this country, not just those at the very top, but all the people, those who need it the most, doing the most good for most of the people all the time.

And I would yield briefly now to the distinguished representative from Pennsylvania, Mr. CARNEY, a gentleman who, Mr. Speaker, has served his country in the military with great distinction, and, Mr. Speaker, a gentleman who has the distinction, as a new Member of Congress, of now leading a subcommittee on the Homeland Security Committee, a distinct honor worthy of his experience, skill and talent. I am very proud to serve with him and I yield to Mr. CARNEY.

Mr. CARNEY. Thank you, Mr. HODES, and thank you for your leadership in this class. It is going to be a historic class. I think we have already proven that in the last 100 hours.

Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 weeks in the new Congress we have already taken remarkable action to pass this first 100 hours legislation.

Now, as I traveled across my 10th District of Pennsylvania, I heard from so many families who were struggling to make ends meet. Our working families needed an increase to the minimum wage, and we provided that. Our working families needed affordable education. We provided that relief. Our seniors need lower prescription drug prices. We took steps to make sure they can have them. Our children need to know that they are growing up in a country that is safe, and we provided to enhance the security of this Nation.

Two weeks into this new Congress and already I am proud of what this House of Representatives has achieved in a bipartisan and civil manner. We are listening to the concerns of our constituents and passing meaningful legislation on their behalf.

I encourage our colleagues in the Senate to pass our legislation and for the President to sign it into law. Two weeks into the new Congress, and already I have heard from so many of my constituents who are appreciative of our concerns and their concerns being addressed. But they also remind me that we have only just begun. Two weeks in and still so much left to accomplish.

Mr. HODES. Thank you very much, Mr. CARNEY.

Mr. Speaker, I note the hour. I thank the Speaker for your service today and in this august body, we thank the American people for giving us the privilege to serve the people of this country, to have served in this historic time, to move the 100 hours agenda from a promise into reality, to make good on our promises to the people of this country that we care about all the people, that we are going to make a positive difference as we move forward.

I thank my colleagues, new Members. We have been called majority makers, and I am proud that we are, and we are going to work in a bipartisan way to move this country forward.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. SIMPSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of medical reasons.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEFAZIO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TAYLOR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ELLISON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. SUTTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, Janu-

ary 22, 2007, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

333. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification stating that the emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process is to continue in effect beyond January 23, 2007, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 110-8); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

334. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-594, "Consumer Security Freeze Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

335. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-593, "Consumer Personal Information Security Breach Notification Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

336. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-598, "Expansion of Substance Abuse and Mental Illness Insurance Coverage Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

337. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-597, "Summary Enclosure of Nuisance Vacant Property Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

338. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-596, "Definition of Persons With Disabilities A.D.A. Conforming Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

339. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-595, "Disability Rights Protection Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

340. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-603, "Alcohol and Narcotics-Related Claims Liability Exclusion Repeal Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

341. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-602, "Mount Vernon Triangle BID Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

342. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-601, "NoMa Improvement Association Business Improvement District Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

343. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-600, "PILOT Authorization Increase and Arthur Capper/

Carrrollsborg Public Improvements Revenue Bonds Approval Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

344. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-599, "Office of Ex-Offender Affairs and Commission on Re-Entry and Ex-Offender Affairs Establishment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

345. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-615, "Nuisance Properties Abatement Reform and Real Property Classification Temporary Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

346. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-614, "Lower Income Homeownership Cooperative Housing Association Re-Clarification Temporary Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

347. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-612, "Closing Agreement Temporary Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

348. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-611, "Old Engine Company 12 Deposit of Sale Proceeds Temporary Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

349. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-610, "Washington Convention Center Advisory Committee Temporary Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

350. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-609, "Tenant-Owner Voting in Conversion Election Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

351. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-608, "Department of Transportation and Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs Vending Consolidation of Public Space and Licensing Authorities Temporary Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

352. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-607, "Ballpark Parking Completion Temporary Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

353. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-606, "Vacancy Conversion Fee Exemption Reinstatement Temporary Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

354. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-605, "Rent Administrator Hearing Authority Temporary Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

355. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-604, "Office of the People's Counsel Term Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

356. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-590, "Green Building Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

357. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-591, "Mental Health Civil Commitment Extension Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

358. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-592, "Additional Sanctions for Nuisance Abatement and Office of the Tenant Advocate Duties Clarification Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

359. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-637, "Comprehensive Plan Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

360. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-617, "Advisory Neighborhood Commissions Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

361. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-616, "New Town at Capital City Market Revitalization Development and Public/Private Partnership Temporary Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

362. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-587, "District Government Injured Employee Protection Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

363. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-588, "Department of Insurance, Securities, and Banking Omnibus Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

364. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-589, "Unemployment Compensation Contributions Federal Conformity Amendment Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

365. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-613, "Real Property Tax Benefits Revision Temporary Act of 2006," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of January 18, 2007]

By Mr. EMANUEL:

H. Res. 73. A resolution electing Members to a certain standing committee of the

House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PUTNAM:

H. Res. 74. A resolution electing minority members to certain committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. EMANUEL:

H. Res. 75. A resolution electing Members and Delegates to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

[Filed on January 19, 2007]

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself and Mr. MOLLOHAN):

H.R. 576. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to revise the regulations under the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 to require that belt haulage entries not be used to ventilate active working places in mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PAUL, Mr. POE, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H.R. 577. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3903 South Congress Avenue in Austin, Texas, as the "Sergeant Henry Ybarra III Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland):

H.R. 578. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for qualified equity investments in certain small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS (for himself and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.R. 579. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to prohibit certain increases in fees for military health care; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 580. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 28, United States Code, to provide for a 120-day limit to the term of a United States attorney appointed on an interim basis by the Attorney General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. GINGREY):

H.R. 581. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to establish a Social Security Surplus Protection Account in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund to hold the Social Security surplus, to provide for suspension of investment of amounts held in the Account until enactment of legislation providing for investment of the Trust Fund in investment vehicles other than obligations of the United States, and to establish a Social Security Investment Commission to make recommendations for alternative forms of investment of the Social Security surplus in the Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 582. A bill to provide the Secretary of Education with authority to give preference, in the distribution of certain grants under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, to local educational agencies and certain public or private nonprofit organizations that provide training to regular education personnel to meet the needs of children with disabilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself, Mr. PICKERING, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico):

H.R. 583. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to make the provision of technical services for medical imaging examinations and radiation therapy treatments safer, more accurate, and less costly; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. POE, Mr. REYES, Mr. BACA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OBEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WATT, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 584. A bill to designate the headquarters building of the Department of Education in Washington, DC, as the Lyndon Baines Johnson Federal Building; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. HERSETH (for herself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

H.R. 585. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the number of individuals qualifying for retroactive benefits from traumatic injury protection coverage under Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HINCHEY:

H.R. 586. A bill to restore fairness in the provision of incentives for oil and gas production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 587. A bill to improve the safe operation of aircraft; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. HOOLEY (for herself, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. STARK, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 588. A bill to extend the period during which members of the Armed Forces deployed in contingency operations may request and receive reimbursement for helmet pads, which are designed to better protect the wearer from bomb blasts than military-issued pads, that are purchased by or for the use of such members; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HONDA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 589. A bill to promote the development and use of plug-in hybrid electric vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

H.R. 590. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the annual contribution limit to Coverdell education savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

H.R. 591. A bill to amend the Cache La Poudre River Corridor Act to designate a new management entity, make certain technical and conforming amendments, enhance private property protections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. HARE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. LEE, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 592. A bill to provide for disclosure of fire safety standards and measures with respect to campus buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 593. A bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to provide grants to promote innovative outreach and enrollment under the Medicaid and State children's health insurance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. BAIRD):

H.R. 594. A bill to regulate over-the-counter trading of energy derivatives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 595. A bill to provide for expedited rescissions of budget authority; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 596. A bill to encourage partnerships between community colleges and four-year colleges and universities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 597. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to enter into agreements with private for-profit organizations for the provision of work-study employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 598. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitations on

the maximum amount of the deduction of interest on education loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution honoring women's health advocate Cynthia Boles Dailard; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BECERRA, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H. Res. 78. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to permit Delegates and the Resident Commissioner to the Congress to cast votes in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GINGREY (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HAYES, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 79. A resolution recognizing the establishment of Hunters for the Hungry programs across the United States and the contributions of those programs efforts to decrease hunger and help feed those in need; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. CLARKE):

H. Res. 80. A resolution commending Wilfred George Gooden for his distinguished career of service, humanitarian efforts, and philanthropy dedicated to assisting the people of Jamaica and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WU:

H. Res. 81. A resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the maximum Pell Grant should be increased to \$5,800; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H. Res. 82. A resolution commending the University of Louisville Cardinals football team for their victory in the 2007 Orange Bowl; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 14: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 17: Mr. SIRES, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BUCHER, Mr. STARK, Mr. NUNES, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 22: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 25: Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 36: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 111: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 213: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 232: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

- H.R. 278: Mr. BOREN and Mr. STUPAK.  
 H.R. 292: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 293: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 303: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. BOREN.  
 H.R. 359: Mr. WYNN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. REYES.  
 H.R. 380: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. PETRI, and Ms. HARMAN.  
 H.R. 381: Mr. KUHL of New York and Mr. MANZULLO.  
 H.R. 402: Mr. CUELLAR.  
 H.R. 406: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Ms. WOOLSEY.  
 H.R. 411: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MACK, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.  
 H.R. 471: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.  
 H.R. 476: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. TIAHRT, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. SPACE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. KIND, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. NOR-TON, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SESTAK, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. MITCHELL.  
 H.R. 477: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NOR-TON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 489: Mr. HENSARLING and Mrs. BLACKBURN.  
 H.R. 493: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. POE, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. DEFazio.  
 H.R. 507: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. CASTOR, and Mr. STARK.  
 H.R. 510: Mr. UPTON and Mrs. BIGGERT.  
 H.R. 548: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. MARSHALL.  
 H.R. 556: Mr. HOEKSTRA.  
 H.J. Res. 3: Mr. BOREN.  
 H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. LINDER.  
 H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.  
 H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. WELCH of Vermont and Mr. RAHALL.  
 H. Res. 29: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. REYES, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mrs. BIGGERT.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN MEMORY OF NAOMI GRAY

**HON. NANCY PELOSI**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, with deep sadness, I rise to pay my respects to one of San Francisco's most beloved and admired community leaders. Naomi Thomas Gray died peacefully on December 29 at Laguna Honda Hospital in San Francisco after a lifetime of service to our City and our Nation.

Born in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, Naomi earned a Master of Science Degree in Social Services at Indiana University. She moved to New York to work for Planned Parenthood as a field organizer, quickly rising to Vice President for Field Services. For two decades, she crisscrossed America developing community education and organizing programs for Planned Parenthood. She lived among migrant workers where she taught family planning. She forged links with black communities in the rural South by winning over Baptist preachers. She served as a consultant to family planning programs around the globe.

Upon retirement in 1972, she turned her knowledge and might to San Francisco, where she became a champion of the African American and health communities.

Naomi served as a consultant to numerous family planning and health organizations. She founded and served two terms on San Francisco's Health Commission, where she worked to increase access to health care for our City's most vulnerable and disadvantaged residents and she strengthened the affirmative action programs at the San Francisco Department of Health. She warned of the danger of HIV/AIDS to the black community and founded the Black Coalition on AIDS and the African American AIDS Leadership Group.

She was an intrepid champion of the African American community. As founder and president of the Institute for Urban Affairs, she focused on issues of concern to African American children and families. As Executive Director of the Sojourner Truth Foster Family Service Agency, she advocated for and mentored children in the foster care system. She was President of the Black Leadership Forum, member of the Black Chamber of Commerce, and Chair of the Mayor's Task Force on Public Housing and the Mayor's Task Force on Children, Youth and Their Families.

An advocate for excellence in education, Naomi Gray founded the Twenty-First Century Academic School and co-founded the African American Education Leadership Group.

She received awards and commendations too numerous to list. For 30 years, I have been blessed with her support, advice, and friendship. It is an honor to stand before the House to celebrate the life of San Francisco's beloved Naomi Gray.

I hope it is a comfort to her loving nieces, nephews, and other extended family that so many people are mourning her loss and praying for them at this time.

HONORING CHRISTY WALSH

**HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today to remember and honor Christy Walsh. Christy was Woodland Middle School counselor in Franklin, TN. After a life dedicated to helping mold the youth of America and a valiant 4-year battle with cancer, Christy finally has peace and rest.

We all know how important counselors and educational officials are to our communities. In our school systems throughout America, counselors are there for our children, to guide them, advise them through their education and life choices, and to celebrate with them in good times and comfort them in the bad. Christy was innovative, energetic, and dedicated to our kids and we can't thank her enough for that.

Christy served as a Students Taking a Right Stand (STAR) counselor where she led a movement to help guide students away from drug abuse and held support groups for children with social issues such as grief and anger. Her dedication to STAR has had a tremendous positive impact on these students and left a ray of hope for the children she influenced.

I invite my colleagues to, again, join me in extending our condolences to her son Brennan and the entire Walsh family and keep them in our thoughts and prayers. May Christy and her work live on in the hearts of her family, friends and the children that she helped throughout her life.

HONORING MUHAMMAD ALI ON  
HIS 65TH BIRTHDAY

SPEECH OF

**HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 17, 2007*

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 58, to honor Muhammad Ali, global humanitarian, on the occasion of his 65th birthday. Mr. Ali was crowned "Sportsman of the Century" by Sports Illustrated in 1999 and has traveled around the world working for hunger and poverty relieve, supporting education efforts of all kinds, and encouraging people to respect and better understand one another.

Muhammad Ali was born in Louisville, KY, on January 17, 1942, and was named Cassius Marcellus Clay, Jr. He later changed his name after joining the Nation of Islam and subsequently converted to Sunni Islam in 1975. He won the World Heavyweight Boxing championship three times, and won the North American Boxing Federation championship as well as an Olympic gold medal.

Ali received the Presidential Medal of Freedom at a White House ceremony on November 9, 2005, and the prestigious "Otto Hahn peace medal in Gold" of the United Nations Association of Germany in Berlin on December 17, 2005, for his work with the United States civil rights movement and the United Nations.

Ali, since retiring from boxing, has devoted himself to humanitarian endeavors around the globe. It is estimated that he has helped to provide more than 22 million meals to feed the hungry. He travels, on average, more than 200 days per year to promote his humanitarian efforts. Please join me in support of this bill honoring Muhammad Ali and extending best wishes to him and his family on the occasion of his 65th birthday.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF  
H.R. 6, CLEAN ENERGY ACT OF  
2007

SPEECH OF

**HON. TODD TIAHRT**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 18, 2007*

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the bill being considered before the House today that would raise taxes on the energy industry, encourage American jobs to go overseas and cause us to become more dependent on foreign sources of oil and gas. H.R. 6 can only make energy more expensive for the American people. And I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this anti-manufacturing bill.

Raising taxes on a legitimate American manufacturing industry, regardless of its size or profitability, is not good for our economy or for creating and retaining more domestic jobs. H.R. 6 would siphon billions of dollars out of the energy economy that otherwise could have been reinvested into jobs and domestic energy projects.

In the past few years when fuel prices skyrocketed, I heard regularly from my constituents who were experiencing financial hardship due to these high energy costs. Farmers and ranchers were stuck with rising energy bills, small businesses were forced to raise prices for their products and services and American families were forced to spend more of their disposable income on gasoline.

Rather than focusing on ways to continue lowering energy costs, the Democrats are intent on doing precisely the opposite. Raising taxes on the American manufacturing industry that produces our oil and gas is not the way to help lower energy costs for consumers.

Not only could H.R. 6 lead to higher gasoline prices by raising taxes, but it could also bring about more expensive natural gas. Higher natural gas prices are a very real possibility if natural gas investment, exploration and production fall. Americans already pay more for

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

natural gas than any other country in the world. Higher natural gas will not just be an inconvenience; it will cost more American jobs.

Because we pay as much as 600 percent more for natural gas than other countries, American businesses are often at a competitive disadvantage when trying to compete with foreign businesses.

As elected officials sent to Washington to represent the interests of our constituents, we cannot afford to pass legislation that harms jobs and raises the cost of doing business for domestic manufacturers of energy. Singling out one domestic industry and excluding it from manufacturing tax breaks that other manufacturers are entitled to use is nothing more than pandering by the Democrats for political gain.

Instead of voting to raise taxes on energy manufactures, we should instead be considering proposals today that would encourage more domestic energy, which in turn would produce more American jobs and would boost our economy. We should be voting on legislation that would help America increase its refining capacity. We should be making it easier for energy companies to invest in American jobs by exploring for new sources of domestic oil and natural gas. Instead, we are voting on a Democrat energy bill that will encourage more dependence on foreign sources of oil and gas.

This bill is especially harmful for small and medium refineries that are reinvesting their profits to expand refining capacity. In a time when America imports 10 percent of its refined fuel, we should be encouraging expansion of our own refining industry, not raising their cost of doing business. When we raise taxes, we discourage reinvestment and make it more likely the United States will become more dependent on foreign countries for our refined energy products.

As many have already pointed out, the United States dependency on foreign oil is already more than 60 percent, and growing. When we become even more dependent on unstable regions of the world for our oil and gas energy needs, we are placing more of our security into the hands of unpredictable and often hostile foreign governments and dictators.

As a member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, I can tell you placing more of our energy security into dangerous regions of the world is the wrong path for America.

I am a supporter of both using and investing in alternative forms of energy as one way to decrease American dependency on foreign oil. The State of Kansas has great potential for being a leader in wind energy production and being a supplier of biomass for biofuel production.

But while our present economy depends largely on safe access to dependable sources of oil and natural gas, we must not penalize these manufacturing industries that provide us with the energy we all use.

I urge all my colleagues who care about keeping American jobs, boosting our economy and treating manufacturers tax equity to vote against this misleading Democrat energy bill.

## COLLEGE STUDENT RELIEF ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

**HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 17, 2007*

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the College Student Relief Act. America's economy continues to change, and a college education has grown increasingly more important. Unfortunately, it has also grown increasingly more expensive, with tuition and fees for a four-year public college rising 41 percent—after inflation—since 2001. Federally subsidized loans provide a crucial helping hand to middle class students and families. This legislation will lessen the burden on hard-working students and families by cutting interest rates on federally subsidized student loans in half over a period of five years, from 6.8 percent to 3.4 percent.

In California, the average college student with federally subsidized loans graduates with more than \$15,000 of debt. The costs of college are such that it is simply unaffordable for many students without help. Over the next decade, 4.4 million high school graduates will be prevented from attending a 4-year college by financial barriers. Our Nation's economic competitiveness relies upon having the best educated workforce possible and investment in postsecondary education will yield great societal benefits.

Madam Speaker, this legislation will make a difference in the lives of millions of young people, helping to put them on secure financial footing as they move from college to the working world. And it does so responsibly, within the structure of the PAY-GO rules that ensure that the entire \$6 billion in costs will be paid for by reasonable offsets. I urge a "Yes" vote on this important legislation.

## IN REMEMBRANCE OF ARTHUR F. WESTFALL

**HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Arthur F. Westfall, whose personal service to the Valley View community in Ohio is a shining example of the commitment and devotion that holds this great country together. Arthur's life was marked by his dedication to country, community, and family.

Arthur graduated from Cuyahoga Heights High School and worked as a homebuilder as a young man, before he was elected mayor in 1971—a position he held for almost 30 years before he retired in 1999, along with being a public insurance adjuster. During these years, his work and commitment as a mayor helped Valley View prosper and become one of the main economic power centers in Northeast Ohio.

Throughout his life Arthur was enthusiastic about and devoted to the citizens of his community. As a public insurance adjuster, he did appraisals that helped claimants receive compensation from insurance companies following

catastrophes. And, as a devoted citizen and mayor, Arthur studied law enforcement and criminology at Case Western Reserve University to inform development of a strong police department.

Arthur also helped to improve infrastructure for the citizens of Valley View by building capacity in the water supply, developing a transportation program, as well as a number of benefits for the elderly, things that were not available for the small farmland village back in 1971.

Arthur's legacy continues through his wife, Helen; three children, Sharon White, Randall and Lance; six grandchildren; and three great-grandchildren.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring the memory of Arthur F. Westfall as a loving community leader. Arthur's lifelong commitment to both community and family is a great example of how one man can dedicate his life to helping others.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Madam Speaker, on January 9 and 10, 2007, I was absent and missed rollcall votes 12–18. For the record, had I been present on January 9, I would have voted: rollcall vote 12—"yea"; rollcall vote 13—"no"; rollcall vote 14—"yea"; and rollcall vote 15—"yea".

Further, had I been present on January 10, I would have voted: rollcall vote 16—"no"; rollcall vote 17—"no"; and rollcall vote 18—"yea."

I support an increase in the minimum wage. The last time the minimum wage was increased was 10 years ago and workers deserve to have the minimum wage increased to \$7.25.

I am pleased the House of Representatives passed the initial version of H.R. 2 and look forward to voting on its final passage in the coming weeks.

## CONGRATULATING BISHOP HENRY BARNWELL FOR RECEIVING THE CALVIN C. GOODE LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

**HON. ED PASTOR**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. PASTOR. Madam Speaker, I rise before you today to congratulate Bishop Henry Barnwell for receiving the Calvin C. Goode Lifetime Achievement award during the 21st Annual Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Awards Breakfast in Phoenix. This award, named after Phoenix City Councilman Calvin C. Goode, recognizes an exceptional individual who has made Phoenix a better place through a lifelong dedication to promoting social and economic justice, defending civil rights, and enhancing the dignity of all people. Bishop Barnwell exemplifies all of these qualities.

Bishop Barnwell is the retired pastor of the First New Life Missionary Baptist Church, a

position he held for over 40 years. As pastor, he was an advocate for human and civil rights and the less fortunate. He mentored and was a role model for other men in his parish, urging them to help those in need. Bishop Barnwell also led the effort to declare Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday a State holiday. Even before this occurred, I remember Bishop Barnwell bringing us together to celebrate Dr. King's birthday at Phoenix's Patriot Square Park.

Bishop Barnwell continues to be an active member in many Phoenix community organizations. For example, he serves on the Boards of the Phoenix Opportunities Industrialization Center, OIC, and St. Mary's Food Bank. He is also a member of the Mayor's Human Relations Commission, the Maricopa County branch of the NAACP, and the Sheriffs Religious Advisory Committee of Maricopa County. Bishop Barnwell will add the Calvin C. Goode Lifetime Achievement award to a long list of local, state, and national recognitions, including Arizona Pastor of the Year, 1989, the Blue Cross Blue Shield Ageless Hero Award, and Honorary Citizen of Tucson, AZ.

Born and raised in Florida, Bishop Barnwell first arrived in Phoenix to attend Grand Canyon College and the Arizona College of the Bible. In 1954, he enlisted in the U.S. Air Force, from which he retired after 20 years of service. Bishop Barnwell is the devoted husband of Sheila Yvonne Barnwell; he is a proud father and grandfather.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to recognize Bishop Barnwell for this award and to thank him for his enduring commitment to improving the lives of Arizona's citizens.

---

#### HONORING TRO JUNG-BRANNEN

---

### HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2007

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in the acknowledgement of the architectural and design firm TRO Jung-Brannen located in Shelby County, TN.

On October 19, 2006, TRO Jung-Brannen was awarded the Export Achievement Certificate given by the United States Department of Commerce in recognition of the firm's export excellence, increased export sales, and the opening of new international markets.

TRO Jung-Brannen is an architectural and design firm with 325 people on staff with billings in excess of 50 million. The Shelby County office has 13 architects and 38 additional employees. The firm specializes in designing healthcare, educational and commercial facilities. The firm was established in 1909 and has served over 500 clients with projects totaling more than six billion dollars.

Please join me in honoring TRO Jung-Brannen on their wonderful award and remarkable record of accomplishments.

#### OBSERVING THE BIRTHDAY OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

SPEECH OF

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 2007

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to enter into the RECORD my strong support for H.R. 61, in observation and celebration of the birthday, life and legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; his life of service in promoting peace and justice for all people of every nation, and the preservation of his legacy in our continued efforts to ensure peace and justice to every man, woman, and child.

In celebrating the birthday of Dr. King, we are reminded of his sacrifice and leadership in ensuring that this great nation live up to its highest potential by acknowledging and practicing the self-evident truth "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed, by their Creator, with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

As we are engaged in a war that has taken the lives of thousands of American soldiers and hundreds of thousands of Iraqi lives, we must revisit Dr. King's stance of nonviolence and his opposition to the Vietnam war; a war that oppressed the poor and voiceless, a war that obstructed the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Dr. King would have us on the frontlines of the anti-war movement, questioning whether our actions in Iraq and around the world are doing more than just creating more chaos and violence. He would ask us to attack the root causes of poverty, building bridges between the private sector and non-profits to provide educational and work opportunities to everyone. He would challenge us to put the fate of our brothers and sisters ahead of property and profit, to invest in people and ideas, not guns and violence.

On April 4, 1967, a year to the date of his death, Dr. King addressed the Clergy and Laity Concerned at Riverside Church in New York City, condemning the Vietnam war and urging his fellow citizens to break their silence. His message echoes the plight that we face today in Iraq; his words, etched in history, serve as a guide that we must heed.

Dr. King stated that ". . . Somehow this madness must cease. We must stop now. I speak as a child of God and brother to the suffering poor of Vietnam. I speak for those whose land is being laid waste, whose homes are being destroyed, whose culture is being subverted. I speak for the poor of America who are paying the double price of smashed hopes at home and death and corruption in Vietnam. I speak as a citizen of the world, for the world as it stands aghast at the path we have taken. I speak as an American to the leaders of my own nation. The great initiative in this war is ours. The initiative to stop it must be ours."

One need only substitute the word Vietnam with Iraq to recognize the analogous gravity that our Nation is engaged in. We must embrace Dr. King's legacy to achieve equality for the poor and to promote peace.

The invasion of Iraq has led the poor in our country to bear the brunt of military responsibility, while the children of government officials

and the wealthy make no sacrifice. Dr. King's remarks serve as a mirror to this country's unwillingness for all to make a sacrifice in engaging in war. He said "perhaps the more tragic recognition of reality took place when it became clear to me that the war was doing far more than devastating the hopes of the poor at home. It was sending their sons and their brothers and their husbands to fight and to die in extraordinarily high proportions relative to the rest of the population. We were taking the black young men who had been crippled by our society and sending them eight thousand miles away to guarantee liberties in Southeast Asia which they had not found in southwest Georgia and East Harlem."

We must take this day to get our national priorities back in order. We must recognize our obligation to the citizens of this country, and our responsibility to promote peace around the world.

Now is the time to grab a comfortable pair of shoes for a new journey of activism. If we truly want to honor our king, we must renew our commitment to the world congregation that he loved. To follow footsteps as large as his is definitely difficult, but not beyond our hearts and minds. The task may well prove to be easier if more of us can take them together.

I want to especially thank the Baptist Ministers Conference, the National Action Network, and the 16th Council District's Annual MLK Memorial for allowing me to honor the life of Dr. King with them, and to follow in his footsteps.

---

#### MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICE NEGOTIATION ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

### HON. TODD TIAHRT

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 2007

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for our Nation's seniors. In 2003 this body passed historic legislation that provided America's senior citizens with a true prescription drug benefit under Medicare Part D. I was pleased to vote for this bill. Since enactment, this program has been extremely successful. More than 38 million Medicare beneficiaries now have drug coverage, either through Medicare or another source. This represents about 90 percent of all Medicare beneficiaries.

We have been able to provide seniors with low cost, life saving medicines. In fact, the program has been so successful in encouraging private sectors to compete for enrollment, that the cost to seniors is much lower than anticipated. In fact, seniors are saving, on average, \$1,200 a year on prescription drugs. And the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid (CMS) reports that prices are continuing to decrease, due to this competition in the private sector. The 'bids' by the prescription drug plans are 10 percent lower, on average, in 2007 than 2006. At the same time, Part D recipients saw a 13 percent increase in the number of medications available.

I strongly support the Republican motion to recommit which will ensure that the progress of the past several years continues. I will vote for the proposal to assure continued access to covered Part D drugs and pharmacy networks,

and to protect against increasing drug prices for veterans.

I cannot support H.R. 4 for one important reason: it will limit access to prescription drugs for senior citizens. The Washington Post shares these concerns, "A switch to government purchasing of Medicare drugs would choke off this experiment before it had a chance to play out, and it would usher in its own problems."

The Democrats want you to believe that this legislation will not limit the number of drugs available on a Medicare Prescription Drug Plan's formulary. They point to programs like the Veterans Administration and Medicaid to assure the public that access to drugs won't be limited. But the truth is that both the VA and Medicaid programs restrict patients' choice of drugs. Veterans have access to less than one-third of the prescription drugs available under Medicare Part D plans. State Medicaid programs also routinely limit the number and types of drugs that patients can receive.

In addition, and of particular concern to my constituents, the VA distributes 70 percent of its medications by mail. Seniors deserve the right to speak to their local pharmacist about their prescriptions, and not having that opportunity is a potential health risk. In contrast, the current Part D plan uses mail for less than 2 percent of its medications. We should not alter this important program.

As Leslie Norwalk, the Acting Administrator for CMS said, "The bottom line from the news today is that beneficiaries are paying less in premiums and taxpayers are seeing billions of dollars in lower costs, without the need for government to interfere and reduce access or convenience for beneficiaries." As in many areas, the best thing the government can do is to step back and allow the current trend to work. Government interference would risk the value of this important benefit to our seniors. I encourage my colleagues to join me in standing up for low cost and full access to prescription drugs for senior citizens and vote against H.R. 4.

STEM CELL RESEARCH  
ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

**HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 11, 2007*

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3, the Stem Cell Research Advancement Act of 2007.

In California, we have devoted State funds, nearly \$300 million a year, to pursuing research on embryonic stem cells, and it has helped make California a destination for researchers on the cutting edge of biotechnology. But the promise of stem cell therapies will not benefit just the people of California, but all Americans, and indeed the entire world. Shutting the National Institute of Health out of this research is misguided, and turns our back on the many millions who may benefit from the cures it may provide.

More than five years after the Administration instituted restrictions on Federal funding of embryonic stem cell research, the promise of this potential line of treatment is greater than ever.

There are those who suggest that research on adult stem cells is equally promising and has produced new therapies—and I welcome further research in that area. But we, as legislators, should not prejudge which avenues are most promising. We should leave the science to the scientists.

Embryonic stem cells have the potential to transform the way we treat diseases that afflict millions of Americans. There is not a person in America who doesn't know someone who suffers from diabetes or Alzheimer's or cancer or heart disease, and embryonic stem cell research hold tremendous promise for the treatment of each of those, along with many other potential therapies.

Medical and biological ethics are a serious issue and we can have differences of opinion, but I believe that a commitment to lifesaving medical research that holds the potential to cure diseases like diabetes and Alzheimer's is consistent with a commitment to the sanctity of human life.

Last year, I voted to override the President's veto of this important legislation. I hope the President will reconsider his opposition, and it will not be necessary to vote on an override again.

IN RECOGNITION OF DON  
SCHIRMER

**HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Don Schirmer and his many years of service to the community of Maple Heights as a high school varsity football referee. Don's five decades of tireless dedication to the game of football is a testament to his heartfelt love of sports and the Maple Heights community.

Don began his tenure as a referee in 1954 in Maple Heights, where his knowledge of sports translated into a position as a varsity official. Over the years, the students playing the game changed, but their referee, Don Schirmer, remained a staple of the community. Through all the victories, losses, and dramatic twists of the sport, one man has stood behind it all.

More than just a referee, Don served as a pillar of his community by volunteering, often cooking for the homeless. It is this spirit of giving, sharing, and brotherly love that Don Schirmer has contributed to the community of Maple Heights. A modest man of many accomplishments, Don can count being an umpire in Major League Baseball, a veteran of the U.S. Navy, and the Captain of the Maple Heights Fire Department all as notches in his all-American belt of experience.

Even at the ripe age of 79, Don's energy, passion, and love of life are at an all-time high. An avid hunter, Don is giving up his striped referee uniform for an orange vest. Though nearly an octogenarian, his zesty vigor keeps him active in the outdoors.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Don Schirmer as a true American sportsman. His undying presence on the field has been a joy, honor, and privilege to the students of Maple Heights for over 50 years.

INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDENT  
FINANCIAL READINESS ACT OF  
2007

**HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing a very important piece of legislation that will provide additional relief for families as they plan for the financial cost of their children's education.

The cost of college tuition continues to rise in the United States. In fact, over the past 5 years, the cost of obtaining a college education has increased by 35 percent. The higher cost of college should not prevent individuals from receiving an advanced education.

That is why I am introducing the Student Financial Readiness Act of 2007, which will increase the annual tax-free contribution a family or an individual may contribute to a student's elementary, secondary, or college expenses.

Coverdell Education Savings Accounts allow families to make an annual tax-free contribution of \$2,000 to assist each of their children with their education. The money can be spent on both K-12 education and college. By allowing families to make tax-free contributions to education savings accounts, we promote ownership of education. Families that save for their children's education are empowering their children. However, the current \$2,000 annual limit needs to be adjusted with the increasing tuition rates. The Student Financial Readiness Act of 2007 would permit a contribution level of \$5,000 annually and index the contribution amount by the cost-of-living adjustment.

We must give families the option to provide the very best education possible for their children. Our Nation's future depends on educating our children and they must be given every chance to receive the highest education. Our children deserve a competitive advantage in our Nation's job market.

Madam Speaker, I respectfully request the support of my colleagues for this important piece of legislation that will ensure the future success of our Nation's children.

CONGRATULATING MR. CALVIN C.  
GOODE ON HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

**HON. ED PASTOR**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. PASTOR. Madam Speaker, I rise before you today to proudly bring to your attention the 80th birthday of a fellow Arizonan who is one of the most respected leaders in my home State and city—Mr. Calvin C. Goode. Calvin Goode is celebrating his 80th birthday this month and, therefore, it is the perfect time to pay tribute to this well-revered public servant who is best known for dedicating 22 years of his life as a Phoenix City Councilman. He has been equally dedicated to the promotion of education and the advancement of civil rights and continues to stand up to injustice, even in his retirement.

Goode's family came to Arizona to work in the agricultural fields when he was an infant,

and he remembers picking cotton as a boy. Calvin graduated from eighth grade in Gila Bend and then moved to Prescott to attend high school. When he was a junior, he was diagnosed with a heart condition and was expected to live only a year. He moved to Phoenix for his health, where he enrolled in Carver High School, the only high school in Arizona built exclusively for African American students. Upon graduating from Carver High in 1945, he attended Phoenix College for two years, and went on to Arizona State University where he earned a business degree in 1949. He later earned a Master's degree in education at ASU.

Goode recalls his earlier years as a time when African Americans were not allowed to eat in many restaurants, housing was restricted to certain areas, and jobs were limited. Under these conditions, Goode returned to Carver High as the school accountant. When Phoenix schools were integrated in 1954, Carver High was closed, but Goode continued working in the Phoenix Union High School District for a total of 30 years. During those years, he also ran a tax accounting business—Calvin Goode and Associates—which began with people coming to his home and receiving help over the kitchen table. He kept prices low to help those who needed it.

In 1960, Calvin married Georgie, a school teacher. Together they raised three sons, Vernon, Jerald and Randolph—a family which has now grown to include six grandchildren. During these years, he served on the local school board and chaired the Phoenix LEAP Commission to improve education and job training opportunities. In 1971, Goode was persuaded to run for a seat on the Phoenix City Council. With strong community support, the soft-spoken Goode was elected and came to serve a total of 11 terms—a record 22 years. As a councilman, Goode became the “Conscience of the Council,” using his voice to raise questions and push for support to neglected parts of the community. In honor of those efforts, the Phoenix Municipal Building bears his name.

Although retired, Goode continues to serve his community. He is president of the Phoenix Elementary School Board and worked on the transition committee for Governor Janet Napolitano. He is active with his local neighborhood improvement association and the Booker T. Washington Child Development Center. Goode is also helping bring back his high school alma mater as the George Washington Carver Museum and Cultural Center, which will showcase the achievements of African Americans in Phoenix and Arizona.

These represent only a handful of the achievements that have earned him the Phoenix Urban League's Most Distinguished Citizen Award and the Black Heritage Celebration Griot Award, which is given to people who perpetuate the African storytelling tradition. Further recognition has resulted in the Calvin C. Goode Lifetime Achievement Award which is given annually at the Phoenix Martin Luther King Jr. Breakfast to recognize individuals who have made Phoenix a better place to live.

Madam Speaker, there is no doubt Calvin C. Goode is an exemplary leader and a profoundly committed individual who is a true role model for the Nation. He has effected change that has improved the lives and broken down barriers for many Arizonans. Therefore, I am pleased to pay tribute to my friend Calvin C.

Goode, and I know my colleagues will join me in wishing him continued success.

#### HONORING HOUSTON HIGH SCHOOL

### HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, it is a privilege for me today to take a moment and honor the group of dedicated students and faculty of the Houston High School Marching Band and their remarkable 2006 marching season accomplishments.

With a history of academic and competitive success, the Houston High School Band has contributed a sturdy foundation for the students involved with this distinguished family. Director Jim Smith continues this program of good works through instilling lessons of citizenship, character, and team-building as the current director of the Houston High School Band.

The Houston High School Marching Band's show, “An American in Paris,” earned championships in the Dixie Marching Band Championship, Vanderbilt Marching Invitational, Briarcrest Marching Invitational, and JCM Marching Invitational. These triumphs have certainly earned Houston High School the well deserved title of Champion Marching Band of the Mid South.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Jim Smith and the Houston High School Marching Band of Germantown for their dedication of success during the 2006 marching season.

#### A TRIBUTE TO JANE BOLIN—THE FIRST BLACK WOMAN JUDGE

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life and legacy of Jane Bolin, the first African-American judge in the United States, who left this world at the age of 98 years and to enter into the RECORD an article in the New York Times by Douglas Martin entitled “Jane Bolin, the Country's First Black Woman to Become a Judge, Is Dead at 98.”

Jane Bolin was born in Poughkeepsie, NY, daughter of the late Gaius C. Bolin and the late Matilda Emery. Her father was the first black graduate of Williams College, had his own legal practice and was president of the Dutchess County Bar Association. She grew up enamored of her father's shelves of leather-bound books on the law and went on to be the first Black woman to attend Yale Law School, after graduating with honors from Wellesley College.

Bolin was appointed to Domestic Relations Court—now the Family Court—of New York in 1939 by Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia, where she served with distinction for 40 years. As judge, two major changes she accomplished, along with Judges Justine Wise Polier and Hubert Delaney, were the assignment of probation officers to cases without regard for race or religion and a requirement that private child care

agencies that received public funds had to accept children without regard to ethnic background.

Bolin served on the board of the Wiltwyck School for Boys, the Child Welfare League of America, the Neighborhood Children's Center, the New York State Board of Regents, and took an active role in the local and national NAACP. Judge Bolin has received honorary degrees from Morgan State University, Western College for Women, Tuskegee Institute, Hampton University, and Williams College.

Even though Jane Bolin passed away on January 8, 2006, her contributions to the practice of law brought revolutionary changes to New York's legal bureaucracy and her legacy will live through all those families she touched throughout her years on the New York family court bench.

[From The New York Times]

JANE BOLIN, THE COUNTRY'S FIRST BLACK WOMAN TO BECOME A JUDGE, IS DEAD AT 98

(By Douglas Martin)

Jane Bolin, whose appointment as a family court judge by Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia in 1939 made her the first black woman in the United States to become a judge, died on Monday in Queens. She was 98 and lived in Long Island City, Queens.

Her death was announced by her son, Yorke B. Mizelle.

Judge Bolin was the first black woman to graduate from Yale Law School, the first to join the New York City Bar Association, and the first to work in the office of the New York City corporation counsel, the city's legal department.

In January 1979, when Judge Bolin had reluctantly retired after 40 years as a judge, Constance Baker Motley, a black woman and a federal judge, called her a role model.

In her speech, Judge Motley said, “When I thereafter met you, I then knew how a lady judge should comport herself.”

The “lady judge” was frequently in the news at the time of her appointment with accounts of her regal bearing, fashionable hats and pearls. But her achievements transcended being a shining example. As a family court judge, she ended the assignment of probation officers on the basis of race and the placement of children in child care agencies on the basis of ethnic background.

Jane Matilda Bolin was born on April 11, 1908, in Poughkeepsie, NY. Her father, Gaius C. Bolin, was the son of an American Indian woman and an African-American man. Her mother, the former Matilda Emery, was a white Englishwoman.

Mr. Bolin, who was the first black graduate of Williams College, had his own legal practice and was president of the Dutchess County Bar Association. His daughter grew up enamored of his shelves of leather-bound books on the law. But her comfortable girlhood was profoundly shaken by articles and pictures of lynchings in Crisis magazine, the official publication of the N.A.A.C.P.

“It is easy to imagine how a young, protected child who sees portrayals of brutality is forever scarred and becomes determined to contribute in her own small way to social justice,” she wrote in a letter at the time of her retirement in December 1978.

She attended Wellesley College, where she was one of two black freshmen. They were assigned to the same room in a family's apartment off campus, the first instance of many episodes of discrimination she said she encountered there.

At her graduation in 1928, she was named a Wellesley Scholar, a distinction given to the top 20 students of the class.

When she broached the subject of a law career to a Wellesley guidance counselor, she

was told that black women had little chance. Her father also discouraged her at first, saying that lawyers had to deal "with the most unpleasant and sometimes the grossest kind of human behavior."

But Mr. Bolin did not know she had already been admitted to Yale Law School, and he eventually agreed to her career choice.

At Yale, Ms. Bolin was one of three women in her class and the only black person. In an interview with *The New York Times* in 1993, she said that a few Southerners at the law school had taken pleasure in letting the swinging classroom doors hit her in the face. One of those Southerners later became active in the American Bar Association and invited her to speak before his bar group in Texas. She declined.

After graduation, she practiced for a short time with her father in Poughkeepsie. She then married a lawyer, Ralph E. Mizelle, and the two practiced in New York. He died in 1943. In 1950, she married Walter P. Offutt Jr., a minister; he died in 1974. In addition to her son, she is survived by a granddaughter and a great-granddaughter.

In 1937, six years after her graduation from Yale, she applied for a position in the New York City corporation counsel's office. An assistant there was initially dismissive, but the counsel, Paul Windell, walked into the office and hired her on the spot. She was assigned to Domestic Relations Court, renamed Family Court in 1962.

On July 22, 1939, she was told that Mayor La Guardia wanted to see her at the New York City building at the World's Fair, which had just opened. She worried that she was going to be reprimanded. Instead, she was sworn in as a judge. The ceremony made news around the world.

In an interview with *The New York World-Telegram* the next day, she said she hoped to show "a broad sympathy for human suffering," adding, "I'll see enough of it."

Her cases included homicides and other crimes committed by juveniles; nonsupport of wives and children; battered spouses; neglected children; children in need of supervision; adoptions; and paternity suits. She chose not to wear judicial robes in order to make children feel more comfortable.

She was reappointed to 10-year terms by Mayors William O'Dwyer, Robert F. Wagner Jr. and John V. Lindsay. When she resigned in December 1978 because she had reached the mandatory retirement age of 70, she complained, "They're kicking me out."

After her retirement, she was a volunteer reading instructor in New York City public schools for two years, and was appointed to the Regents Review Committee of the New York State Board of Regents.

She was outspoken on civil rights issues of many kinds. When she returned to her hometown of Poughkeepsie in 1944 as a judge and something of a local heroine, she pointed out that the city government, schools and hospitals remained segregated.

"Poughkeepsie is fascist to the extent of deluding itself that there is superiority among human beings by reasons solely of color, race or religion," she said in an interview with *The Poughkeepsie New Yorker*.

In 1958, speaking on women's rights, she said, "We have to fight every inch of the way and in the face of sometimes insufferable humiliations."

## ON INTRODUCTION OF THE "HOME-OWNERSHIP FOR AMERICA'S VETERANS ACT OF 2007"

### HON. WALLY HERGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2007

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join my fellow Californian in introducing the Homeownership for America's Veterans Act. This bill proposes to make an important change to our Nation's tax laws in order to assist thousands of veterans, in the State of California and elsewhere, realize the American dream of owning their own home.

Currently, a provision in the federal tax code allows states to issue tax-preferred Qualified Veterans Mortgage Bonds, or QVMBs, to provide favorable financing on home mortgages for certain veterans. In California, these bonds are used to help provide low-cost mortgages through the California Department of Veterans Affairs, or Cal-Vet, home loan program.

As written in the tax code, two of the five states that use QVMBs, California and Texas, are prohibited from using this bond-generated revenue to provide mortgages to veterans who entered military service after 1977. Obviously, this significantly limits the usefulness of these bonds to provide mortgages to subsequent generations of military servicemen and women. In fact, according to Cal-Vet's own estimations, only 4.1 percent of California's total veteran population is eligible for home loans financed through QVMBs.

I want to thank my California colleague, Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS, for her work on this important legislation. Like her, I believe it is important for us to open this bonding authority to allow QVMBs to be used to support home loans for more recent members of the armed forces, who have served our country so ably and with such determination. I look forward to continuing to work on this issue, and am pleased this bill has the strong support of California's veteran community, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, and the California Department of Veterans Affairs.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6, CLEAN ENERGY ACT OF 2007

### HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2007

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 6, the Creating Long-Term Energy Alternatives for the Nation—CLEAN Energy—Act. At a time of record profits for the oil and gas industry, H.R. 6 repeals many incentives that I have not supported over the years and it takes a vital first step in bringing the energy policies of the United States into the 21st century. By recouping Federal revenues through the repeal of nearly \$13 billion in subsidies and tax breaks to oil and gas companies, H.R. 6 appropriately dedicates this revenue to create a research and development fund for renewable energy sources including solar and wind energy, alternative fuels like ethanol and biodiesel, efficiency efforts, and conservation incentives.

H.R. 6 rightly creates an incentive for offshore fuel producers to renegotiate leases issued in the late 1990s; an error that has not yet been corrected, which allowed companies to skirt royalty payments because no price threshold was included in lease agreements. It also repeals provisions that authorize additional royalty relief, as well as two tax breaks benefiting oil companies. This is not a tax increase as some may lead you to believe, it is sensible governing. I opposed legislation authorizing the subsidies in the first place and this is why I strongly support directing this money towards conservation and investment in the development in alternative sources of energy.

Continued and increased investment in renewable and alternative fuels, efficiency, and conservation domestically is critical to severing the United States' dependence on fossil fuels, which has been linked to national security concerns as well as significant environmental harm, including global warming pollution.

With the negative impacts of climate change on the security, economy, environment and health in our Nation and around the world abundantly clear, we can no longer delay in implementing policies to address the damaging effects of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. We also need to set reasonable CAFE standards, which I believe are both achievable and valuable to a good energy policy.

I remain committed to broadening the energy debate to sound and balanced proposals to meeting America's energy needs—while still acting as a steward of the environment. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 6.

## RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MESQUITE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

### HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2007

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam. Speaker, I rise on behalf of my constituents in Mesquite, Texas, to recognize the Mesquite Chamber of Commerce on its 50th Anniversary. Tonight, we will celebrate this profound accomplishment at the 28th Annual Chamber of Commerce Banquet in Mesquite.

The Mesquite Chamber of Commerce was founded in 1956. The first group of businessmen who comprised the Chamber made the decision to incorporate what had previously been known as the "Mesquite Merchants' Association."

For the past 50 years, the Mesquite Chamber of Commerce has worked to improve the City of Mesquite by promoting the free enterprise system and developing the community. Through their hard work and sense of civic pride and duty, the membership of the Mesquite Chamber of Commerce has helped make Mesquite a wonderful place to live and work for the past half century.

I offer my congratulations to the general membership, past and present, along with the current Board of Directors, who will lead the Chamber into the next 50 years of success. This year's Board of Directors Officers include: Todd Price; Greg Loshier; Robert Bowmer; John Bass; Gary Bingham; Cathy Rideout; Sharon Hoskin; and Mark Miller. I would also like to recognize President Terry McCullar.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Mesquite Chamber of Commerce for their hard work and effort on behalf of Mesquite and the State of Texas. I wish them the best of luck as they enter into the next 50 years of service benefiting the City of Mesquite. They truly do know the meaning of Real. Texas. Business.

A TRIBUTE TO FRANCES  
WILLIAMS

**HON. ROBERT A. BRADY**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise in mourning for one of Philadelphia's most well-known and loved moms. "Mom" Frances Williams, a mother of five sons and a civic leader in her own right, left us to go home on January 12, 2007 at the age of 94.

Born in Philadelphia on February 7, 1912, "Mom" was a devoted member of Mount Zion Baptist Church since the age of 12, and over the years generously contributed her time and talents to the church. As a member of the Mt. Zion family, she was the longest serving president of the Young Women's Industrial Club and initiated the first "Get Set" program for children in the church.

"Mom" was considered a surrogate mother to countless young people she mentored over the decades. Many can attest to having found their first jobs with the help of "Mom" Williams. Numerous young people entered college and joined the church because of her guidance. She often went into her pocketbook, cupboard, and closet to help someone else.

She served her community and city as a block captain, committee person and civic leader. Later in life, she directed her energy towards helping seniors in need. She was a member of many organizations and boards. "Mom" founded and served as president of Save Our Senior and Concerned Citizens. She served as a board member of the Philadelphia Corporation of Aging and commissioner on the Philadelphia Commission of Human Relations.

"Mom" ran for City Council At-Large in 1979 on a platform that pledged housing programs for seniors, crime-reduction programs, and initiatives to serve and empower at risk youth and people with disabilities. She also gave our city two generations of leaders in her son former State Sen. Hard Williams and grandson State Sen. Anthony Hardy Williams.

In March 1999, article in the Philadelphia New Observer she explains "It's all very simple. Keep yourself clean and if something makes you sick, don't eat it. Tell the truth and don't follow the crowd. Most of all have faith."

She is survived by one sister, Ruth Lacy of Philadelphia; five sons: James Williams (Gloria) of Blackwood, NJ; Hardy Williams, Fredrick A. Williams (Ernestine); Theodore; and Ali Robinson (Ramona) of Philadelphia; one niece, Vivian Whitt; one nephew, Carl Lacy, both Philadelphia; twenty one grandchildren; numerous great and great, great grandchildren; and a host of grand and great grand nieces and nephews.

I know that all my colleagues will join me in honoring her memory today.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT B.  
GILBERTSON, JR.

**HON. ADAM H. PUTNAM**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. PUTNAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the work of Robert B. Gilbertson, Jr., the innovative leader of the Tampa Metropolitan Area YMCA. After more than 20 years with the Tampa YMCA, Bob is leaving Florida for Seattle in order to serve as the CEO of the YMCA of Greater Seattle.

During his tenure, Bob, led an effort to greatly expand the Tampa YMCA by the creation of 12 new branches throughout Hillsborough County. The expansion effort has resulted in the YMCA membership growing from 5,000 to 130,000 members and their yearly budget has grown from around \$1,000,000 to over \$33,000,000. More importantly, this expansion has provided the opportunity for the YMCA to expand its charitable mission of building strong kids, strong families and strong communities. No child or family is turned away from the YMCA due to their inability to pay. Today, scholarships are provided to over 30,000 children and families so they can enjoy one of the largest social service charitable organizations operating in Hillsborough County.

I met with Bob recently at the Brandon Family YMCA where he introduced me to some very special children who were involved in the foster care system. I was proud to play a role in ensuring that the U.S. Department of Labor provided the Tampa YMCA with funding to create a job training program for youth aging-out of the foster system. This extremely important program will be one of Bob's lasting legacies in Tampa.

Bob Gilbertson has certainly made his mark in Tampa and I am grateful for the leadership he has provided. I wish him great success as he moves to Seattle.

FEDERAL MINE VENTILATION ACT  
OF 2007

**HON. NICK J. RAHALL, II**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, one year ago today tragedy struck for the second time in less than three weeks in the coalfields of West Virginia. A fire broke out along the conveyor belt in the Aracoma Mine, at Alma, Logan County, taking the lives of two good men and turning the national spotlight on a sorely risky industry practice.

The use of the belt air entry to ventilate a mine, as was the case at Aracoma, is egregiously dangerous. The belt entry—the tunnel through which the coal conveyor belt runs—has long been recognized as the dirtiest, most fire-prone entry in the mines. To use it to draw air to the working face exposes miners to higher levels of health-endangering, flammable coal dust and noxious gases. And, although saving operators the cost of adding more entries into the mine, it limits the escape routes for miners trying to evacuate in an emergency—an unacceptable tradeoff.

For at least 35 years, from the time the Mine Act was signed into law, the use of the conveyor belt entries to draw fresh air into working areas of coal mines was effectively "ruled out" as an acceptable standard practice. The use of belt air, during all that time, was considered to be the exception.

Under an initial Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) rule, issued decades ago, mines could use the method, but only after obtaining an exemption through a petition process—a process that, at least, required high-level scrutiny on a mine-by-mine basis. The idea was that, if a mine wanted to take a higher degree of risk, it had to provide a higher level of safety precautions and prove that it was doing so.

Over time, however, MSHA allowed a growing number of mines to use this suspect practice, until in 2004, when the existing, more cautious rule was replaced. The new rule superceded the prohibition Congress had written into law, and opened the door wide to belt air ventilation and all of the dangers it brings with it.

That 2004 rule was a symptom of a shifting set of priorities at MSHA that put promotion of coal production above the protection of miners. That rule should be jettisoned.

Madam Speaker, the Aracoma fire of a year ago, demonstrates how the deteriorating mine safety policies at MSHA have combined with insufficient numbers of inspectors and lax enforcement to intensify the dangers associated with the use of belt entry air.

In issuing that 2004 rule, MSHA decided that the use of modern air monitoring technologies had improved to a degree in recent years to sufficiently reduce the risk posed by belt air ventilation. But at Aracoma, the air-sensing technology failed. The agency put faith in presence of water systems to suppress the outbreak of fires. At Aracoma, the water system malfunctioned. Portions of a wall needed to separate the conveyor belt from the miners primary escapeway, although on the mine map, were missing.

At every turn, some safety measure that should have been taken to protect lives at that mine failed. Even the inspections, on both the state and federal levels, failed.

The problems in our Nation's coalfields are thickly layered and will take years to sufficiently unravel. It makes no sense for the MSHA to retain a rule that allows broad use of this dangerous ventilation method in the midst of an inspector shortage and an overhaul of the mine safety system.

I am at a loss to understand why MSHA has failed to withdraw the 2004 rule, even temporarily. The fact that it has failed to do so demonstrates to me that MSHA is still not putting its duty to protect our miners above the profits of the industry.

So today, Madam Speaker, I, along with my colleague from West Virginia, ALAN MOLLOHAN, am introducing the Federal Mine Ventilation Act of 2007. The bill simply requires the Secretary of Labor, "no later than 90 days after enactment of this Act," to revise: regulations to require, in any coal mine that belt entries "not be used to ventilate active working places." I note that it is my intention with this bill to return to the pre-2004 rulemaking procedure, where the use of belt-entry ventilation was generally prohibited, while retaining the petition process and the associated heightened safety controls.

If MSHA will not act to correct its mistakes then the Congress must.

COLLEGE STUDENT RELIEF ACT  
OF 2007

SPEECH OF

**HON. JOE WILSON**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 17, 2007*

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I oppose H.R. 5 as it is written and support the alternative proposal by Ranking Member BUCK MCKEON. As the father of three college graduates and a college freshman, I am all too familiar with the financial burden higher education poses to families and students. That is why I am proud of Republican efforts to expand college access and increase affordability.

During the past decade, House Republicans under the leadership of John Boehner and BUCK MCKEON tripled overall Federal aid to a record \$90 billion, helping millions of Americans achieve their dream of a college education.

In addition, Republicans increased new aid for Pell students more than \$4 billion over 5 years, establishing the first ever grant program for high achieving Pell students in their first and second years of college. The program also provides grant aid to low income, high achieving students pursuing degrees in math, science, and critical foreign languages in their third and fourth years.

As lawmakers, our number one concern with regard to higher education should be to ensure that college is affordable for any student. Unfortunately, as H.R. 5 is currently written, it pits the Federal Family Education Loan Program, FFEL, against the Direct Loan program, DLP, and by doing so creates an imbalance in the student loan industry that is so lopsided only the largest FFELP lenders will survive.

While the Democrat bill was well-intentioned, its focus on interest rate reduction does not expand college access for new students which the McKeon alternative does. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it, because it truly expands college access for young Americans.

I encourage Congress to help foster an environment that will build a student loan marketplace and not play politics with college educations.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG  
PRICE NEGOTIATIONS ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

**HON. ALBERT RUSSELL WYNN**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 12, 2007*

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, today, the House will take up, H.R. 4, the Medicare Prescription Drug Price Negotiations Act of 2007. H.R. 4 will require the government to negotiate with pharmaceutical companies in order to obtain reduced drug prices for seniors enrolled in the Medicare Prescription Drug Program. The bill prohibits, that in conducting these negotia-

tions, the government may not restrict access to certain drugs by requiring a particular list of covered drugs, otherwise known as a formulary. Under the Republican majority, the government was prohibited from engaging in any negotiations to utilize its buying power to reduce costs to consumers.

I have been assured by my colleagues that H.R. 4 will not involve or allow restrictions on patients' access to medicines during the negotiation process. Specifically, I have been assured that H.R. 4's prohibition against government mandated formularies is intended to protect against all forms of government imposed restrictions on patients' access to needed medicines, and that no such restrictions will be allowed under the Medicare Modernization Act as amended by H.R. 4. In casting my vote for H.R. 4, I am relying on these assurances because I firmly believe that all patients must have unrestricted access to doctor prescribed medications.

Overall, I am optimistic about this bill. While the government should have the ability to negotiate on behalf of the 43 million seniors on Medicare, we must be careful that negotiations do not result in reduced access to prescriptions. We must strike a delicate balance to ensure that lower prices do not cause drug companies to withdraw vital drugs from the Medicare Prescription Drug Program. As H.R. 4 moves forward to conference, I ask that the conferees affirmatively strengthen and clarify the rules against government imposed restrictions. If implemented properly, this bill has the potential to cut the cost of health care and improve access to medicines for millions of seniors on Medicare.

According to Families USA, while providing some relief, the current Medicare Prescription drug law has failed to slow the rapid growth in drug prices. As a cosponsor of H.R. 4 and a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I will be exploring additional legislative measures designed to reduce costs for seniors, without reducing access to life saving drugs.

INTRODUCTION OF STIMULATING  
LEADERSHIP IN CUTTING EX-  
PENDITURES ("SLICE") ACT

**HON. MARK UDALL**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I disagree with President Bush on a number of things, but we agree that a constitutionally-sound version of a line-item veto could help increase fiscal responsibility and Congressional accountability.

In fact, I first introduced such legislation even before the president first proposed it, and last year I joined in helping win House passage of a line-item veto bill.

Unfortunately, the Senate did not complete action on that bill before the end of the 109th Congress.

So, I am today again introducing a similar measure—the "Stimulating Leadership in Cutting Expenditure, or "SLICE" Act of 2007, co-sponsored by Representative RYAN of Wisconsin.

Over the last 6 years we've seen a dramatic change in the Federal budget—a change for

the worse. We've gone from budget surpluses to big deficits, and from reducing the national debt to increasing the "debt tax" on our children.

There's no mystery about how this happened.

Partly, it was caused by a recession. Partly, it was caused by the increased spending needed for national defense, homeland security, and fighting terrorism. And in part it was caused by excessive and unbalanced tax cuts the president pushed for and the Republican-led Congress passed.

Some of those tax cuts—for example, eliminating the marriage penalty, fixing the 10 percent bracket and extending child care tax credits—were good. I supported them because they gave a reasonable boost for the economy and increased the fairness of the tax laws. But overall they were excessive.

Many of us warned against reducing the surplus so recklessly. We urged the administration and Congress to be more responsible, and we voted for Blue Dog budget resolutions that would have set a better course.

But our pleas for restraint were ignored, and since the attacks of 9/11—which led to increased spending on homeland security, a military response in Afghanistan, and a war in Iraq—the budget has nosedived from surplus into deep deficit. And, even in the face of national emergency, neither the president nor the Republican-led Congress has called on Americans for any sacrifice, and instead of temporarily scaling back some of the tax cuts the president has insisted on making all of them permanent even as Federal spending has skyrocketed.

So we have gone on putting the costs of war and everything else the government does on the national credit card—but the debt is owed not just to ourselves (as in the past), but to China, Japan and other foreign countries.

Why have we allowed things to get so far out of hand?

Part of the answer is that budget and tax policy in Washington has been so captive to very partisan and extreme ideological voices that it has been hard to find common ground and moderate consensus.

Even in this time of war, extremists in the Republican Party view tax cuts as almost a religious calling, while some in my party tend to reject any spending cuts. And the Vice President has dismissed complaints by saying "deficits don't matter."

But this cannot go on forever. Sooner or later, something has to give. And, if the result is a new sense of responsibility, sooner is better—because there is an urgent need to rethink and revise our budget policies, including both taxes and spending.

Last year, the House did belatedly take one step forward, by passing a bill similar to the "SLICE" bill I am introducing today.

And already this year, under our new leadership, the House has taken another good step by restoring the "PAYGO" rules that helped bring the budget into balance in the past—something the Republican leadership refused to even consider last year.

But I think we also should take the step of again passing a constitutionally-sound line-item veto—like SLICE—because it also can help to promote transparency and accountability about spending.

We have heard a lot of talk about spending "earmarks"—meaning spending based on proposals by Members of Congress instead of the

Administration. And here, too, the new leadership of the House has made possible important changes in our rules that will increase their transparency and our accountability—changes I supported.

But while some people are opposed to all earmarks, I am not one of them.

I think Members of Congress know the needs of their communities, and I think Congress as a whole has the responsibility to decide how tax dollars are spent. And earmarks can help fund nonprofits and other private-sector groups to do jobs that federal agencies are not able to do as well. In short, not all earmarks are bad. In fact, I have sought earmarks for various items that have benefited Coloradans—and I intend to keep on doing that.

Still, we all know some bills have included spending earmarks that might not have been approved if they were considered separately.

That's why President Bush—like many of his predecessors—has asked for the kind of line-item veto that can be used by governors in Colorado and several other states.

And that's why about ten years ago Congress actually passed a law intended to give President Clinton that kind of authority.

However, in 1998 the Supreme Court ruled that the legislation was unconstitutional—and I think the Court got it right.

I think by trying to allow the president to in effect repeal a part of a law he has already signed—and saying it takes a two-thirds vote in both Houses of Congress to restore that part—that Republican-led Congress of 1998 went too far. I think that kind of line-item veto would undermine the checks and balances between the Executive and Legislative branches of the government.

But the SLICE bill is different. It is a practical, effective—and, best of all, constitutional—version of a line-item veto.

It is not unprecedented. It follows the approach of legislation passed by the House of Representatives in 1993 under the leadership of our distinguished colleague, Representative SPRATT and others, including our former colleagues Charlie Stenholm, Tom Carper, Tim Penny and John Kasich.

Under SLICE, the president could identify specific spending items he thinks should be cut—and Congress would have to vote, up or down, on whether to cut each of them.

Current law says the president can ask Congress to rescind—that is, cancel—spending items. But Congress can ignore those requests, and often has done so.

SLICE would change that.

It says if the president proposes a specific cut, Congress can't duck—it would have to vote on it, and if a majority approved the cut, that would be that.

So, it would give the president a bright spotlight of publicity he could focus on earmarks, and it would force Congress to debate those items on their merits.

That would give the president a powerful tool—but it also would retain the balance between the Executive and Legislative branches.

Madam Speaker, presidents are elected to lead, and only they represent the entire nation. My SLICE bill recognizes this by giving the president the leadership role of identifying specific spending items he thinks should be cut.

But, under the Constitution it is the Congress that is primarily accountable to the

American people for how their tax dollars will be spent. The bill respects and emphasizes that Congressional role by requiring a vote on each spending cut proposed by the President.

Of course, without knowing what the president might propose to rescind, I don't know if I would support some, all, or any of his proposals.

But I do know that people in Colorado and across the country think there should be greater transparency about our decisions on taxing and spending. And I know that they are also demanding that we be ready to take responsibility for those decisions.

That is the purpose of this bill. It will promote both transparency and accountability, and I think it deserves the support of all our colleagues.

For the information of our colleague, I am attaching an outline of the bill.

STIMULATING LEADERSHIP IN CUTTING  
EXPENDITURES (SLICE) ACT

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate Presidential leadership and Congressional accountability regarding reduction of other spending to offset the costs of responding to recent natural disasters.

The bill would amend the Budget Act to provide as follows—

The President could propose rescission of any budget authority provided in an appropriations Act through special messages including draft bills to make those rescissions.

The House's majority leader or minority leader would be required to introduce a bill proposed by the president within two legislative days. If neither did so, any Member could then introduce the bill.

The Appropriations Committee would be required to report the bill within seven days after introduction. The report could be made with or without recommendation regarding its passage. If the committee did not meet that deadline, it would be discharged and the bill would go to the House floor.

The House would debate and vote on each proposed rescission within 10 legislative days after the bill's introduction. Debate would be limited to no more than four hours and no amendment, motion to recommit, or motion to reconsider would be allowed.

If passed by the House, the bill would go promptly to the Senate, which would have no more than 10 more days to consider and vote on it. Debate in the Senate would be limited to 10 hours and no amendment or motion to recommit would be allowed.

IN RECOGNITION OF CHARLES  
CURTIS JOHNSON ON HIS RE-  
TIREMENT

**HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. HASTERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Charles Curtis Johnson on his retirement from the United States Capitol Police. With devotion, professionalism, and expertise, from September 16, 1974, until his retirement on December 31, 2006, Sergeant Johnson, or "CC" as he is called by his friends, has fulfilled the mission of the United States Capitol Police to protect the Congress, its legislative processes, Members, employees, visitors, and facilities from crime, disruption, or terrorism. I would like to wish him and his family all the best as he embarks upon this new chapter of his life. He will be truly missed.

Sergeant Johnson was first assigned to the Capitol Division and served there as an officer for 14 years, performing various law enforcement duties and assisting Members of Congress, congressional staff, and the general public. In 1998, he was promoted to sergeant and, for 3 years, supervised officers in and around the House and Senate Chambers. In 1992, he was assigned to the First Responder Unit and supervised the officers assigned to the outside of the Capitol as well as serving as the administrative sergeant.

In 2004, Sergeant Johnson earned a post as one of the supervisors of the U.S. Capitol Police Horse Mounted Unit. In addition to undergoing the rigorous training and maintenance of skills required of all members of this elite unit, Sergeant Johnson also supervised and directed all operations of the unit, including maintaining the unit's budget and equipment procurement. With the loss of the unit in 2005, Sergeant Johnson moved to the Patrol/Mobile Response Division and used his considerable expertise and institutional knowledge to supervise and direct the patrol officers within the Capitol Police primary and extended jurisdictions. A tireless performer and distinguished law enforcement professional, Sergeant Johnson deserves the admiration of all who come into contact with him.

In addition to his commitment to the U.S. Capitol Police, Sergeant Johnson is the devoted husband of fellow USCP member Captain Shirley Jo Johnson, and the proud father of three daughters and one son: Angie, Becky, Rachael, and Daniel. He is also the proud "Papa" of three granddaughters and one grandson: Kiera, Sydney, Nate, and Kaylie. He is the proud father-in-law of Greg Lawrence.

In his upcoming retirement, Sergeant Johnson plans on spending plenty of time with his family and is especially looking forward to "Grandbaby Day." Last, but certainly not least, he also plans to buy himself a horse so he can truly ride off into the sunset.

Thank you, Sergeant Johnson, for your exceptional service to the United States Capitol Police, the Congress, and the American people, and congratulations on achieving this important milestone.

INTRODUCTION OF THE "TEACHER  
TRAINING EXPANSION ACT OF  
2007"

**HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, in this country we have made a commitment to fulfill the promise that all students will receive a high quality education. As part of this commitment, assessments mandated under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) require, among other things, that all students will have access to classrooms led by highly qualified teachers. In its implementation of the law, the Department of Education has made good on this promise, holding students that have traditionally been allowed to slip through the cracks, such as students with disabilities, to a high standard.

Students with disabilities, under NCLB and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), are increasingly being integrated into

general education classrooms. We have seen great progress from this practice. By holding students with disabilities to the same high standards that we hold general education students, we encourage them to achieve at higher levels. As with all students, students with disabilities respond well to being challenged.

Unfortunately, too many children with disabilities are underserved in general education classrooms because general education teachers often are not trained to meet their needs. As more of these children enter general education classrooms, it is critical that curricula be adapted to suit them. General education teachers and personnel must be equipped to collaborate with special education teachers to ensure that these students receive the best available education.

That is why I am reintroducing the "Teacher Training Expansion Act," legislation that is designed to support training programs for teaching students with disabilities. Specifically, this legislation would authorize the Secretary of Education to give preference, in the distribution of certain grants under IDEA, to local educational agencies and certain public or private nonprofit organizations that provide such training.

Under current law, institutions of higher education are already granted this preferential status in the distribution of these grants. However, I firmly believe that most also make eligible the local educational agencies and public or private nonprofit organizations that are at the forefront of training teachers who work with disabled students.

Madam Speaker, by supporting this legislation we will help our teachers gain the skills they need to work effectively with disabled students in general education classrooms and help make good on our promise to provide a quality education to all students.

In conclusion, let us be vigilant in leveling the playing field for our disabled and special needs communities in any way that we can. The Teacher Training Expansion Act would help in furthering this goal and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor it.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6, CLEAN ENERGY ACT OF 2007

**HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the CLEAN Energy Act of 2007. We must be mindful in the creation of long-term energy alternatives for the future of our nation, as the acronym CLEAN denotes. I am honored to be among my many esteemed colleagues as an original cosponsor of this legislation.

At this juncture, we must move beyond the obvious motivations for responsible energy policies. As my colleagues have acknowledged, scarcity of resources, national security, greenhouse gas emissions, and the impact of oil exploration top the list of concerns addressed by this legislation. However, we must also acknowledge the true impact of these challenges on our nation's most vulnerable populations. In this sense, progressive energy

policy is inextricably linked with the pursuit of true environmental justice.

Madam Speaker, my support for this legislation is founded in a profound desire to confront the diminishing life changes and debilitating health conditions attributed to polluting energy sources. Asthma has significantly increased over the past few decades, especially among African American populations. In 2004, 17 percent of African Americans under the age of 18 lived with asthma compared to only 11 percent of their white counterparts. On behalf of our children, we must understand the root cause of this disparity and take action to pursue alternative sources of energy for posterity.

Furthermore, I support the thrust of this legislation because it discourages extraction from offshore oil and natural gas reserves. I stand with many of my constituents in acknowledging that the pursuit of these resources has the potential to cause life-threatening accidents and irreversible environmental damage to our Outer Continental Shelf. Rescinding incentives for this form of oil and natural gas production set forth in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act will undoubtedly protect our fragile marine ecosystems and stimulate the quest for alternative energy sources.

Madam Speaker, complemented by other pieces of legislation, the CLEAN Energy Act of 2007 will bring accountability to the industries responsible for many environmental injustices and shift our nation away from a defunct paradigm of reliance on irresponsible energy sources. A new age for energy use is upon us.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, because of a death in the family, I was absent for roll-call votes 24 through 33.

If I had been present for these votes, I would have voted as indicated below.

Rollcall No. 24—"Yes"; Rollcall No. 25—"Yes"; Rollcall No. 26—"Yes"; Rollcall No. 27—"Yes"; Rollcall No. 28—"Yes"; Rollcall No. 29—"No"; Rollcall No. 30—"No"; Rollcall No. 31—"Yes"; Rollcall No. 32—"Yes"; and Rollcall No. 33—"Yes."

IN HONOR OF THE JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE

**HON. SAM FARR**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the 75th anniversary of the Japanese American Citizens League of the Monterey Peninsula. On January 25, 1932, two years after the national Japanese American Citizens League was formed, 18 charter members organized this local chapter to fight against discriminatory legislation and racial prejudice, and to help their first generation citizens (Issei) navigate through the American bureaucracy in such matters as alien registration.

Throughout the 1930's, the chapter involved itself in the larger community. In 1937, they made a giant American Flag to carry in the Independence Day parade. They reasoned that only a few people could ride on a float but 60 people could carry this huge flag. Another way they assimilated into the community was to participate in organized sports. The JACL-sponsored Monterey Minato established a formidable reputation and broke records in several sports because of its gifted athletes. From 1934 to the outbreak of World War II, the Monterey Minatos virtually dominated all other teams within the Central California Coast Counties Athletic Association. In 1938, just three Minato trackmen won nine of the eleven events at the YMCA Olympics at Kezar Stadium in San Francisco.

Built in 1927, the JACL Hall was originally the Japanese Association building, erected for the purpose of creating a community center for immigrant Japanese. In 1942, the leaders of the Japanese Association gifted the building to the JACL as a way to keep it serving the community. During World War II, the building was used by the National Guard, and after the war it became a hostel for returning internees. Today the Hall plays host to the JACL Japanese Language School, Nisei Memorial Post 1629 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Chinese Language School, Nisei Bowling League, Monterey and Satsuma Bonsai Clubs, Mugen Shinshu Daiko (Japanese Drum) classes, Tai Chi, and Jazzercise. The JACL Hall has truly become an Asian Cultural Center.

Today the chapter continues to fight for tolerance and diversity, helps its members preserve their cultural heritage, and assists new immigrants assimilate into society. As they begin their eighth decade, they will build on their 75-five year commitment to redress racism in our society, so that the next generation truly experiences equal justice under law.

Madam Speaker, I know all our colleagues join me in applauding the JACL and in wishing them continued success for these most admirable goals.

COLLEGE STUDENT RELIEF ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

**HON. HEATHER WILSON**

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 17, 2007*

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, access to quality affordable higher education is a national imperative and should be a priority of this Congress. Yet despite the clear necessity of an accessible higher education system, the ever rising cost of a college education continues to put more students at risk of not being able to afford to pursue their dreams. I supported this legislation because I believe it will give relief to middle-class graduates on the interest rates they pay on student loans. But, unfortunately the legislation before us today does little to address students' immediate needs such as rapidly rising tuition costs.

This bill instead provides for a limited benefit for a limited number of borrowers already through college. Student loan programs are a critical piece of the education financing puzzle. They have served millions of students who have relied on them to achieve their dreams of obtaining a postsecondary education.

In New Mexico, students and families are served by the New Mexico Educational Assistance Foundation; a not-for-profit organization that doubles as a loan provider and a student service provider. As a not-for-profit organization, the New Mexico Educational Assistance Foundation reinvests its revenue in students and the programs that serve them. That includes loan forgiveness programs, outreach, college planning and rate and fee relief. I want to be sure the services and programs by organizations like NMEAF are not hampered by this legislation; these programs make a real difference in the real lives of students.

College affordability should be at the top of our agenda. This bill does nowhere near enough in that regard. I hope we will have an opportunity to make a real difference for students as we move forward with discussions on how best to address the high cost of a college education in this country and encourage more young Americans to go to college.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. CHARLIE NORWOOD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. NORWOOD. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 27, on motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Con. Res. 31, honoring the Mare Island 21ers, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 41, on motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 62, congratulating the Grand Valley State University Lakers for winning the 2006 NCAA Division II Football National Championship, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 40, on passage of H.R. 6, Creating Long-Term Energy Alternatives for the Nation Act, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 39, to table appeal of the ruling of the Chair on H.R. 6, Creating Long-Term Energy Alternatives for the Nation Act, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 38, on motion to recommit with instructions H.R. 6, Creating Long-Term Energy Alternatives for the Nation Act, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 37, on consideration of the bill H.R. 6, Creating Long-Term Energy Alternatives for the Nation Act, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 36, on agreeing to the resolution, providing for the consideration of H.R. 6, Creating Long-Term Energy Alternatives for the Nation Act, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 35, on ordering the previous question, providing for the consideration of H.R. 6, Creating Long-Term Energy Alternatives for the Nation Act, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 34, on motion to adjourn, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 33, on motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 58, to honor Muhammad Ali, global humanitarian, on the occasion of his 65th birthday and to extend best wishes to him and his fam-

ily, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 32, on passage of H.R. 5, College Student Relief Act, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 29, on ordering the previous question for H. Res. 65, providing for the consideration of H.R. 5, College Student Relief Act, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 30, on agreeing to the Resolution for H. Res. 65, providing for the consideration of H.R. 5, College Student Relief Act, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 31, on motion to recommit with instructions H.R. 5, College Student Relief Act, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 28, on motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 434, to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 through December 31, 2007, and for other purposes, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

#### HONORING MS. LAUREN LAUSTERN

### HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Ms. Lauren Laustern for her academic achievement in receiving the Homeland Security Scholarship from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security Science and Technology Directorate. This scholarship will be used to further her studies in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics at Rice University in Houston, Texas. Ms. Laustern and each of the other 200 scholars and fellows visited Washington, DC for an orientation in November of 2006 to formally introduce the Scholars and Fellows to the Department of Homeland Security and other DHS-affiliated organizations and facilities. The Department of Homeland Security Scholars and Fellows Program was developed to inspire, stimulate and support students conducting research relevant to homeland security. The DHS provides many opportunities and resources to a variety of students from all over the county. The program offers two years of support at the undergraduate level and three years of support at the graduate level. In addition the students are also required to complete a 10-week internship to complete their studies. Today I commend her for her hard work and dedication in furthering her education.

#### TRIBUTE TO BYRON WOOD

### HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to bring to my colleagues' attention the retirement of a man dedicated to the U.S. Space

program. The President of Pratt & Whitney Rocketdyne, Byron Wood, has announced his retirement after 44 years of service, not just to Rocketdyne, but to the people of the United States.

Byron has seen his career go full circle, from his early work on the J-2 engine for the Apollo moon program, to his leadership today in resurrecting the J-2 for America's return to the moon. In between, Byron was instrumental in the development of the space shuttle main engine, which has served our national space program flawlessly for 25 years. Byron is the proud recipient of two NASA awards; the Exceptional Engineering Achievement medal and the Public Service medal.

During his career, Byron also made valuable contributions to the national security needs of the United States. His leadership in the development of the RS-68 engine for the Delta IV launch vehicle will help ensure that America's military will maintain information superiority through the reliable launch and placement of our national space based assets. His continued support for the development of small liquid propulsion systems has greatly strengthened our missile defense capability through Rocketdyne's contributions to the Theater High Altitude Area Defense System.

America will miss Byron's service. As we refocus our efforts to return humans to the moon and beyond, and as space systems continue to become more vital to the national security of our country, wisdom and leadership of the type possessed by Byron will be ever more essential. Please join me in wishing Byron the best in his retirement and in thanking him for his work.

#### SUPPORT FOR THE SAFE COMMISSION

### HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, earlier this week I reintroduced legislation in the House of Representatives aimed at addressing the looming financial crisis facing the Nation, the Securing America's Future Economy (SAFE) Commission Act. The bill would establish a national bipartisan commission that will put everything—entitlement spending as well as all other federal programs and our Nation's tax policies—on the table and require Congress to vote up or down on its recommendations in their entirety, similar to the process set in 1988 to close military bases. Mandating congressional action on the panel's recommendations is what differentiates this commission from previous ones.

Support for the bill is coming from both sides of the aisle. I submit for the RECORD letters from several former Members.

This legislation will be good for the future of America.

THE BLACKSTONE GROUP,  
*New York, NY, June 28, 2006.*

HON. FRANK WOLF,  
*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. WOLF: Thank you for sending me a summary of your bill creating a bipartisan commission on long-term fiscal policy and for the excellent statement you made in introducing the bill. I read both with great interest and I wholeheartedly approve of what

you are trying to do. I understand that George Voinovich has introduced a similar bill in the Senate.

While I would like to think that the economic and moral case for serious reform is compelling enough to spur action without resort to another commission, I fear that the reality is otherwise. Given the harsh partisan environment you note in your letter, I have come to believe that a new commission could serve a very useful trust-building purpose—so long as it is truly bipartisan and all policy options are on the table.

You clearly agree with these principles, which is one reason I think your bill could help break the political gridlock. It is an added bonus, in my view, that your bill would require the commission to hold public hearings around the country and compel congressional consideration of the commission's recommendations. As one who has sat on many commissions, including the Kerrey-Danforth entitlement and tax reform commission more than 10 years ago, I think all of these special attributes bode well for the success of a commission formed pursuant to your bill.

As you may know, I serve as President of The Concord Coalition. Former Senators Warren Rudman (who I know you have spoken to about this) and Bob Kerrey are co-chairs of The Concord Coalition. We have been urging bipartisan action to bring about a more sustainable and generationally equitable fiscal policy for many years. Our executive director, Bob Bixby, has sent you a letter with our approval on behalf of The Concord Coalition expressing our appreciation and commending you for your leadership in drawing attention to one of the nation's most daunting challenges. To that, let me add my personal thanks and encouragement.

Sincerely,

PETER G. PETERSON.

MANATT JONES,  
GLOBAL STRATEGIES,

Washington, DC, June 26, 2006.

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,  
*House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLF: Thank you for your letter and for sending me a copy of your legislation, H.R. 5552. I can't speak highly enough in commending you for leading this much needed effort and for the comprehensiveness of your proposal.

As a former House Budget Committee Chairman who subsequently headed the American Stock Exchange among other business activities since leaving the Congress, I have been appalled and discouraged by the recklessness and disregard of our government's fiscal policy. These unconscious deficits and mounting federal debt load financed primarily by foreigners are an economic time bomb waiting to explode. If I were managing a private company this irresponsibly, the shareholders should demand my resignation.

We hear much talk about our national security and energy security. But to put our economic security so much in the hands of foreign interests is gambling at its worst.

In addition to the economic dangers, this is also a moral issue in that our generation is saddling our children and grandchildren with the responsibility for paying off our profligacy. That can only reduce the standard of living of future generations. How can we justify such immorality?

I am so proud that you are stepping forward to try to pass legislation with teeth to force both the Congress and the Executive Branch to make hard choices to get our fiscal house on a path to responsibility. I hope that you will make this a bipartisan effort. I will be pleased to support you in every way I can and to urge my fellow Democrats to join you in this effort.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES R. JONES.

THE URBAN INSTITUTE,  
Washington, DC, June 22, 2006.

Representative FRANK WOLF,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WOLF: In response to your letter of June 16, I strongly support your bill to establish a national bipartisan commission on entitlement spending and tax policy. Although many are cynical about the prospects for the success of any commission, I think that you are right that the current political climate is not conducive to passing constructive legislation without some prodding from the outside.

I also believe that the American public is not ready to accept the sacrifices necessary to avoid a crisis, because the dire nature of the situation has not been well communicated by policy makers. Therefore, I particularly commend your idea of holding town meetings across the country and I would hope that the commission has a large budget for this purpose, because I believe that we need lots of meetings. Ideally, the commission would first produce a white paper that could be discussed at the meetings. It would outline the problem in the most objective way possible and describe the major options for solving it.

It is interesting to note that Canada had such meetings prior to a significant reform of their social security system and Canadian officials will tell you that they were extremely helpful in finding a solution. Similarly, Britain is in the midst of reforming their public pension system and they used large focus groups to test their options. I would prefer a town meeting to a focus group format, but however one proceeds, the involvement of the public is absolutely crucial.

I wish you success in getting your idea enacted and would be willing to help in any way that I can.

Yours sincerely,

RUDOLPH G. PENNER.

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL  
CENTER FOR SCHOLARS,  
Washington, DC, July 7, 2006.

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR FRANK: Thank you for sending along your excellent proposal to establish a national bipartisan commission on America's looming fiscal crisis. I agree that we must hastily address the very grave financial challenges before our Nation. You have laid out a thoughtful and effective way forward. In particular, it is important to put everything on the table—entitlement spending, federal programs, and tax policy. Mandating congressional action would also ensure that a prospective commission does not issue a report that gathers dust on a shelf.

On another note, the Iraq Study Group continues to make excellent progress, and I once again thank you for your leadership and support of our efforts.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON.

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION,  
Washington, DC, July 14, 2006.

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,  
*House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR FRANK: I am writing to express my hope your bill, H.R. 5552, Securing America's Future Economy (SAFE) Act, will be swiftly enacted. You and I have discussed this bill and the impending fiscal crises it is designed to avoid.

I am not able to detail in a single page all the fiscal difficulties we face, nor to list all the arguments in favor of H.R. 5552, but I believe it offers the Congress an opportunity

for a comprehensive fiscal solution, so the country will not have to face an ongoing series of crises, each demanding a patchwork, probably temporary, and certainly painful, response.

While the BRAC-type Commission necessarily forces Legislation action, H.R. 5552 does provide unusual, extra Legislative discretion by giving the Congress opportunities to enact alternatives not suggested by the Commission.

H.R. 5552 has my enthusiastic endorsement. I hope the House passes it first.

Sincerely,

BILL FRENZEL.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. KEVIN MCCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2007

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 33, H. Res. 58, "To honor Muhammad Ali, global humanitarian, on the occasion of his 65th birthday and to extend best wishes to him and his family."

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

### MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICE NEGOTIATION ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

### HON. GARY G. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 2007

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to vote on H.R. 4, the Medicare Prescription Drug Price Negotiation Act of 2007 because I had to travel back to California due to a death in the family. I would like the record to reflect that had I been here, I would have voted "no" on H.R. 4 and "aye" on the Motion to Commit. H.R. 4 will not, as some claim, save Medicare beneficiaries money on their prescription drugs. All that this ill-conceived bill will do is to restrict beneficiary access to necessary drugs, stifle medical advancements, and limit the pharmacies that seniors can utilize.

In the last year, seniors have been able to enjoy outpatient prescription drug coverage under Medicare for the first time in the program's history. Every Medicare-eligible senior now has access to a voluntary, affordable prescription drug benefit, with extra help available for low income seniors. Consumers in my state of California can choose from over fifty national, state and regional plans, which cover brand name and generic drugs. The hallmark of this program is choice. Under the current system, covered seniors can continue to visit their neighborhood pharmacies and have access to the medications that have been prescribed to them by their doctors.

Recent data indicates that the current system of incorporating private sector principles into the prescription drug plan is working to control costs, while providing prescription drug coverage to millions of seniors who did not have it previously. Independent estimates for the Medicare Part D prescription drug benefit for Fiscal Year 2008 show that net costs are thirty percent less than were originally predicted when the benefit was created four

years ago. In addition, based on strong, competitive bids by health care plans for 2007, average monthly premiums will be approximately \$22 for beneficiaries, a drop from last year's average premium and well below initial premium estimates.

The bottom line is that consumer choice is working. There are currently many different drug plans available to seniors. These plans compete with each other and negotiate prices with the pharmaceutical companies. As we have seen, this competition has resulted in lower costs for the program than originally expected. Such cost savings have been achieved while preserving the ability of seniors to obtain the drugs their doctor has prescribed from a local pharmacist of choice.

The misguided proposal before us today to put the government in charge of negotiating prescription drug prices does not serve the interests of seniors. Government controls will lead to restrictive formularies, denying seniors coverage for the drugs their doctors prescribe. While seniors will have fewer prescriptions to choose from, they will not realize savings from this reduction in prescription options. The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) affirmed that government negotiation will only yield savings if access to medicines is restricted.

H.R. 4 will limit seniors' choice of plans and access to necessary treatments; what's more, it will stifle innovation. In examining ways to control the costs of prescription drugs, we must not forget that innovations by pharmaceutical companies lead to the development of newer and better treatments. Price controls create barriers to pharmaceutical innovation that can hurt patients and slow the potential for innovative therapy discovery. Some estimates find that almost 200 new drugs would go undiscovered over the next two decades as an indirect result of federal price negotiations.

We all want to ensure our seniors can get the prescriptions they need at the lowest cost. The debate before us today is about who we think is most effective in negotiating with the drug companies to achieve this low cost. We do not need to speculate on the answer to this question. The current program of senior choice and market competition has already lowered costs by forty percent in one year. In contrast, the CBO has said that the proposal to move toward socialized medicine will not save seniors any money unless access to needed medications is limited. I cannot support limiting access and choice for the 66,000 Medicare Part D beneficiaries in my district and as such strongly oppose H.R. 4.

CORRECTING THE COLLOQUY OF  
JANUARY 19

**HON. DAVID DREIER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, during this afternoon's colloquy between the Republican Whip and the Democratic Leader, I was in a bipartisan meeting of the leadership of the California delegation. However, I understand that the distinguished Majority Leader indicated that I had objected to consideration of the member pension bill today. While I am flattered that my colleagues believe that I still

wield that level of influence now that I am the Ranking Republican of the Rules Committee, I simply want to clarify that at no time did the Republicans object, but simply pointed out to the new majority that a meeting to consider a rule would need to be an "emergency" meeting under the committee rules.

TRIBUTE TO KANSAS BUREAU OF  
INVESTIGATION DIRECTOR

**HON. DENNIS MOORE**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated public servant and individual of the highest integrity, Larry Welch, who has announced he is retiring after 12 years as director of the Kansas Bureau of Investigation and a lifetime of public service in law enforcement.

A graduate of the University of Kansas, with undergraduate and law degrees, and of the FBI Academy, Larry Welch served as an FBI agent and supervisor from 1961–1986 in Tennessee, Washington, Florida, Puerto Rico, Texas, Missouri and Kansas. From 1986–1989, he served as deputy director of the Kansas Law Enforcement Training Center, where he also served as director from 1989–1994. In 1994, he was named director of the Kansas Bureau of Investigation; his longevity in that post is exceeded only by the first director, Lou Richter, who served from 1939–1956.

The KBI has approximately 300 employees, including about 80 agents posted across Kansas. It has four forensic labs, with 53 forensic scientists at the labs in Topeka, Great Bend, Pittsburg and Kansas City. The labs provide technical support to local police agencies in areas including DNA analysis and fingerprint analysis.

Larry and Shirley Welch have three grown children and eight grandchildren. During my twelve years as District Attorney of Johnson County, I worked closely with Larry in his capacity as administrator of the Kansas Law Enforcement Training Center. He is a public servant of unquestioned dedication and skill. The people of Kansas have been extraordinarily lucky that he has served them in a series of sensitive, important law enforcement positions in our state.

Madam Speaker, I include with this statement a column by the editor of the Lawrence Journal-World, Dolph Simons, Jr., entitled "Welch has run KBI with integrity and professionalism." I couldn't have said it better myself, and I commend the career of Larry Welch to all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

[From LJWORLD.COM, Jan. 13, 2007]

SIMONS: WELCH HAS RUN KBI WITH INTEGRITY  
AND PROFESSIONALISM

(By Dolph C. Simons, Jr.)

Kansas and the residents of the state are losing the services of an excellent lawman.

At the end of May, Larry Welch will step down as director of the Kansas Bureau of Investigation.

He has done a superb job as KBI director since assuming the role in 1994 at the invitation of then-Attorney General Bob Stephan. Welch became the KBI's 10th director and served in this position under four Kansas attorneys general, including the recently sworn-in Paul Morrison.

Whether Welch's decision to leave at this time has anything to do with the new attorney general is anyone's guess. However, his announcement about plans to retire said nothing to indicate he has any differences with the new leadership in the AG's office.

The KBI does not have a high public profile, and it is obvious Welch has directed the agency with the goal of being an excellent arm of the law enforcement business, conducting its affairs and efforts in a professional manner, not trying to capture headlines and public attention. Welch and his associates have been far more interested in capturing those who violate the law rather than tooting their own horns or patting themselves on the back.

Welch is a professional and served as a Federal Bureau of Investigation agent before moving into the KBI director's office. He has put together an effective, efficient and lean staff and has gained the respect and high regard of Kansas legislators. He has kept lawmakers informed about KBI activities, and his annual reports detail the work of his agents, scientists and other members of the KBI team.

In his latest report, he notes the success of the KBI in identification and seizure of meth labs in 2006. Over the past five years, the number of meth labs seized and put out of operation has dropped from a high of 846 in 2001 to an estimated 155 for 2006. He attributed this success to the support of Kansas legislators and Gov. Kathleen Sebelius and the legislation that provided funding and manpower to discover, seize and destroy the labs.

He points out, however, "Before we form a circle, hold hands and sing 'Kumbaya,' let me hasten to admit that even one meth lab, with all its dangers and attendant dire consequences is too many, and let me also remind you that, as I have been advising you since 1997, the majority of methamphetamine in Kansas, probably more than 80 percent, has always been of foreign origin, mostly Mexican, and not manufactured locally."

Welch tells the lawmakers the effort to seize and shut down meth labs "remains one of the most dangerous of all law enforcement activities."

He added there still will be meth labs to seek out, investigate, seize and prosecute, but with the effectiveness of the current program, KBI agents will be able to spend more time on efforts to reduce the importation, trafficking and interdiction of methamphetamine in Kansas. He noted, "We will not completely solve our state's methamphetamine problem, of course, until our nation's Southern and Southwest borders are better secured, in my opinion. If that's ever possible."

Not only has Welch's professionalism added stature and respect to the KBI, but also his personal manner has reflected credit on the organization.

The public must have respect for those in the law enforcement business. They don't have to like a local police officer, a member of the sheriffs staff, a local judge, a KBI agent or judges on high state and federal benches, BUT it is essential that citizens respect these men and women. Those in the law business, at whatever level, must perform in a manner that reflects credit on their respective agencies if our system of laws is to work and be effective.

Larry Welch certainly has done this in how he supervised and led the Kansas Bureau of Investigation. All law-abiding Kansans are better off and safer today because of the efforts of Welch and his fellow agents.

The state will miss Welch, and it is important he be succeeded by an equally committed, effective and professional individual.

This is no place for political games to be played; the KBI office should never be used as a means of passing out a paycheck or IOU for some previous political or monetary favor.

TAIWAN PRESIDENT CHEN SHUI  
BIAN'S VISIT TO THE UNITED  
STATES

**HON. THOMAS G. TANCREDO**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. TANCREDO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to applaud our government's decision to allow Taiwan President Chen Shui Bian to visit the United States earlier this month. As you know, President Chen visited both Los Angeles and San Francisco as part of a larger North American trip.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, the government of Mexico was not nearly as hospitable to our democratically elected friend.

While President Chen was on his way to Los Angeles, however, he was informed by Mexican authorities that his plane was prohibited from flying over Mexican air space. This unexpected notification forced the President's plane to make a detour over the Pacific Ocean, extending his flight time to Los Angeles from 5 to 10 hours. This arbitrary decision delayed some of President Chen's meetings with U.S. officials, and more importantly, put President Chen and the other passengers on his plane in danger.

Mexico had given Chen permission to fly over Mexican air space on Chen's way to Nicaragua, so why did Mexican officials refuse to grant Taiwan's democratically elected President the same courtesy on his return flight? I think we all know the answer to this question, Madam Speaker.

In all likelihood, Mexico's sudden change of heart is attributable to pressure exerted by the People's Republic of China. Beijing has been relentless in its efforts to isolate our democratic friends on Taiwan, and this shameless move by the mainland is just the latest in a long series of indignities that the Beijing authorities have visited on the Taiwanese people.

Madam Speaker, communist China is always quick to talk about how much they respect the "Taiwan Compatriots" across the Taiwan Strait. Unfortunately, their hostile actions never reflect that deceptively rosy rhetoric. By continuing to insult and disrespect Taiwan's democratic government, China insults and disrespects the people of Taiwan who elected that government.

By outsourcing their campaign of intimidation to other countries like Mexico—who seem more than willing to subcontract their foreign policy to Beijing—China continues to drive the people of Taiwan further and further away.

I hope that the next time Taiwan's democratically elected president visits the United States; we can host him here in Washington.

And finally, Madam Speaker, I hope next time Taiwan's democratically elected president visits North America, that other democratic countries in our region will treat him with the courtesy and respect they would afford to any other democratically elected head of state.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL ROBERT E.  
LEE

**HON. JIM MARSHALL**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to General Robert E. Lee in celebration of the bicentennial of his birthday. A U.S. war hero, Lee has been lauded by past presidents and historians and as one of our nation's greatest men and greatest generals.

His birthday has been celebrated in Georgia as a state holiday since 1889 and the Georgia Division of the Sons of Confederate Veterans will be marking the occasion this year with a birthday celebration at the Georgia State Capitol. It is my pleasure to also recognize this event within our nation's Capitol.

Robert Edward Lee was born on January 19, 1807, in Virginia to parents who played instrumental in some of our country's early history.

Lee also dedicated himself to his country—graduating from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and accepting a commission as a 2nd Lieutenant with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Lee's first assignment was in Georgia, where he supervised the construction of Fort Pulaski on Cockspur Island.

While Lee is probably best remembered as a commanding officer in the Confederate States Army, he also played a key role in defending our country during the Mexican-American War, protecting settlers on the Texas frontier and educating future leaders as superintendent of West Point.

Following the Civil War, Lee accepted a position as president of Washington College in Lexington, Virginia. As president, Lee worked to rebuild the war-ravaged South and stressed the importance of moving forward as a nation of united Americans. Lee also is credited with transforming the college, which has since been renamed Washington and Lee University, into one of the nation's finest institutions of higher education.

Lee continued to serve as president of Washington College until his death on October 12, 1870. Years later during the unveiling of the Robert E. Lee Memorial Statue, President Franklin D. Roosevelt would call Lee "one of our greatest American Christians and one of our greatest American gentlemen."

Madam Speaker, I am confident my colleagues will join me in recognizing the accomplishments of this great American.

IN RECOGNITION OF RABBI WIL-  
LIAM ABRAHAM GREENEBAUM II  
ON HIS 50TH YEAR AS A RABBI

**HON. TOM LANTOS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 19, 2007*

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the achievements of Rabbi William A. Greenebaum of Monterey County, CA, who is celebrating 50 years in the Rabbinate. From the American Civil Rights movement to the Allocations Panel for United Way, Rabbi Greenebaum has spent his days working to

improve the lives and spirits of the elderly, the powerless, and the poor.

Rabbi Greenebaum was born in Philadelphia to a rabbinical family that included a grandfather and great uncle who held prominent positions in the Jewish community. Rabbi Greenebaum received his bachelor's degree in Ancient and Medieval History from the University of Cincinnati in 1948, and earned bachelor's and master's degrees in Hebrew Letters as well as a Doctor of Divinity Honoris Causa from the Hebrew Union College in 1957.

Shortly after his ordination as a rabbi from the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, Rabbi Greenebaum enlisted in the U.S. Air Force and served as Jewish Chaplain for two years in San Antonio, Texas. After his military service, he served in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, as Assistant Rabbi, led Congregation Beth Torah in their efforts to build a synagogue in Prairie Village/Overland Park, Kansas, served as Rabbi in Flint, Michigan, and also in Fremont, California, where he met Nancy, his wonderful wife of 35 years.

In 1972, Rabbi Greenebaum enlisted in the active duty U.S. Army and served as Chaplain in Columbia, South Carolina, Heidelberg, Germany, and Monterey, California. After his retirement in 1990, he continued to serve as a civilian chaplain to the Jewish military community in the Monterey Bay region until 2001.

Since his retirement in 1990, Rabbi Greenebaum has continued to serve the Monterey Bay Area full time; as a member of the Board of Directors and substitute rabbi for Congregation Beth Israel in Carmel Valley; interim rabbi for Temple Beth El in Salinas, California; as Assistant District Commissioner for the Boy Scouts of America; as a Monterey County Civil Grand Juror; and as a member of the distinguished Allocations Panel for the Monterey County chapter of the United Way. Rabbi Greenebaum also spends many hours visiting the sick, elderly, and others in his community who are in need of spiritual comfort.

In the 1960's, Rabbi Greenebaum met Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. when they both addressed the National Bar Association Convention in Milwaukee. In 1969, he was appointed Chairman of the Flint, Michigan, Human Relations Commission and served as President of the Flint Ministerial Association. He served as volunteer Jewish Chaplain at the Kansas State Prison and at the Federal Penitentiary in Leavenworth. In 1962, the mayor of Kansas City appointed Rabbi Greenebaum to the Cuban Refugee Committee where he helped the city prepare for and welcome more than one hundred Cuban refugees to Missouri.

The principle of Tikkun Olam, "world repair" through social action and justice, has guided the actions of Rabbi Greenebaum throughout his life. As a prominent community leader, human rights activist, and helping friend, he has given countless hours, tears, and moments of laughter to many who would otherwise have suffered alone, while building religious and civil institutions to support spiritual values and integrity in every sphere of our community lives.

Madam Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in honoring Rabbi William A. Greenebaum for more than fifty years of outstanding dedication and public service. His deeds are a strong example and inspiration to us all.

# Daily Digest

## Senate

### Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. It will next meet at 1:00 p.m., on Monday, January 22, 2007.

### Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

#### STEM CELL RESEARCH

*Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:* Committee concluded joint hearings with the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor,

Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Services to examine stem cell research, focusing on ongoing Federal support of both embryonic and non-embryonic stem cell research and scientific progress, including recent findings on amniotic fluid stem cells, after receiving testimony from Story C. Landis, Director, National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services; George Q. Daley, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts; John E. Wagner, University of Minnesota Stem Cell Institute, Minneapolis, Minnesota; and Lauren Stanford, Plymouth, Massachusetts.

---

## House of Representatives

### Chamber Action

**Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced:** 23 public bills, H.R. 576–598; and 10 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 38–39; and H. Res. 73–75, 78–82 were introduced. **Pages H788–89**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Pages H789–90**

**Reports Filed:** There were no reports filed today.

**Speaker:** Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Ross to act as Speaker Pro Tempore for today. **Page H761**

**Director of the Congressional Budget Office—Appointment:** The Chair announced the joint appointment by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate of Dr. Peter R. Orszag as Director of the Congressional Budget Office, effective January 18, 2007, for the term expiring January 3, 2011. **Page H764**

**Revising the composition of the House of Representatives Page Board:** The House passed H.R. 475, to revise the composition of the House of Representatives Page Board to equalize the number of members representing the majority and minority

parties and to include a member representing the parents of pages and a member representing former pages, by a yea-and-nay vote of 416 yeas with none voting “nay,” Roll No. 42. **Pages H764–68**

The measure was considered under a unanimous consent agreement reached on Thursday, January 18.

**Meeting Hour:** Agreed that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday, January 22 for Morning Hour debate. **Page H773**

**Calendar Wednesday:** Agreed by unanimous consent to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business of Wednesday, January 24. **Page H773**

**State of the Union message:** The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 38, providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President on the State of the Union on Tuesday, January 23, 2007 at 9 p.m. **Page H773**

**Quorum Calls—Votes:** One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of today and appears on page 768. There were no quorum calls.

**Adjournment:** The House met at 10:00 a.m. and adjourned at 1:59 p.m.

## Committee Meetings

### MILITARY MEDICAL READINESS

*Committee on Appropriations:* Held a hearing on Military Medical Readiness and Related Issues. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: William Winkenwerder, Jr., M.D., Assistant Secretary, Health Affairs; LTG Kevin C. Kiley, M.D., U.S. Army Surgeon General, Commander, U.S. Army Medical Command; LTG James G. Roudebush, M.D., Surgeon General, Air Force; and VADM Donald C. Arthur, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy Surgeon General, Chief, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery; Charles Marmar, M.D., Associate Chief of Staff, Mental Health, San Francisco VA Medical Center; and a public witness.

### BAKER-HAMILTON COMMISSION REPORT

*Committee on Foreign Affairs:* Held a briefing on the Baker-Hamilton Commission Report. The Committee was briefed by Lee Hamilton, Co-Chair, Iraq Study Group (Baker-Hamilton Commission).

### CLEAN WATER INFRASTRUCTURE—NEED FOR RENEWED INVESTMENT

*Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:* Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing on the Need for Renewed Investment in Clean Water Infrastructure. Testimony was heard from Benjamin H. Grumbles, Assistant Administrator, Office of Water, EPA; and public witnesses.

---

## CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of January 22 through January 26, 2007

### Senate Chamber

On Monday, at 2:00 p.m., Senate will begin consideration of H.R. 2, Fair Minimum Wage.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

### Senate Committees

*(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)*

*Committee on Armed Services:* January 23, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Lieutenant General David H. Petraeus, USA, to be General and Commander, Multi-National Forces-Iraq, 9:30 a.m., SR-325.

January 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the current situation in Iraq and on the Administration's recently announced strategy for continued United States assistance to the Iraqi government and for an increased United States military presence in Iraq, 9:30 a.m., SD-106.

*Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:* January 25, to hold hearings to examine the billing, mar-

keting, and disclosure practices of the credit card industry, and their impact on consumers, 9:30 a.m., SD-538.

*Committee on the Budget:* January 23, to hold hearings to examine the growing tax gap and strategies for reducing it, 10 a.m., SD-608.

January 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the Congressional Budget Office budget and economic outlook, 10 a.m., SD-608.

*Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:* January 24, organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures for committee operations, committee's rules of procedure for the 110th Congress, and subcommittee assignments; to be followed by a hearing to examine the potential impact of airline mergers and industry consolidation relating to the state of the airline industry, 10 a.m., SR-253.

*Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:* January 24, organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures for committee operations, committee's rules of procedure for the 110th Congress, and subcommittee assignments; to be followed by a hearing to examine an analysis completed by the Energy Information Administration entitled "Energy Market and Economic Impacts of a Proposal To Reduce Greenhouse Gas Intensity With a Cap and Trade System", 9:45 a.m., SD-366.

January 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine oil and gas resources on the Outer Continental Shelf and areas available for leasing in the Gulf of Mexico, 9:30 a.m., SD-366.

*Committee on Finance:* January 24, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Michael J. Astrue, of Massachusetts, to be Commissioner of Social Security, 10 a.m., SD-215.

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* January 24, business meeting to consider S. Con. Res. 2, expressing the bipartisan resolution on Iraq, 9 a.m., SH-216.

*Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:* January 24, organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures for committee operations, committee's rules of procedure for the 110th Congress, and subcommittee assignments; committee will also consider the Genetic Information Non-discrimination Act, 10 a.m., SD-430.

*Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:* January 24, organizational business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures for committee operations, committee's rules of procedure for the 110th Congress, and subcommittee assignments, 10 a.m., SD-342.

January 25, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia, to hold hearings to examine the Federal government's efforts to develop a foreign language strategy, focusing on the government's efforts to increase foreign language education to meet the Federal workforce, national security, and economic competitiveness needs, 2:30 p.m., SD-342.

*Committee on Indian Affairs*: January 25, business meeting to consider an original resolution authorizing expenditures for committee operations, and committee's rules of procedure for the 110th Congress, 9:30 a.m., SR-485.

*Committee on the Judiciary*: January 23, to hold hearings to examine challenges and strategies for securing the U.S. border, 9:30 a.m., SD-226.

*Committee on Veterans' Affairs*: January 23, to hold oversight hearings to examine Department of Defense and Veterans Affairs collaboration and cooperation to meet the needs of returning military service members, 9:30 a.m., SR-418.

*Select Committee on Intelligence*: January 23, to hold hearings to examine intelligence reform, 2:30 p.m., SH-216.

January 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine intelligence reform, 2:30 p.m., SH-216.

### House Committees

*Committee on Agriculture*, January 23, to meet for organizational purposes, 1 p.m., 1302 Longworth.

*Committee on Appropriations*, January 22, Subcommittee on Defense, executive, on Intelligence Readiness, 1:30 p.m., H-140 Capitol.

*Committee on Armed Services*, January 23, hearing on implications of Iraq policy on total force readiness, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

*Committee on the Budget*, January 23, hearing on Why Deficits Matter, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

*Committee on Education and Labor*, January 24, to meet for organizational purposes, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

*Committee on Foreign Affairs*, January 23, to meet for organizational purposes; followed by a mark up of H. Res. 24, Establishing the House Democracy Assistance Commission for the One Hundred Tenth Congress, 2:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

January 24, hearing on The Escalating Crisis in Darfur, 10:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

*Committee on Homeland Security*, January 23, to meet for organizational purposes, 11 a.m., 311 Cannon.

*Committee on the Judiciary*, January 23, to meet for organizational purposes, 1 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

*Committee on Rules*, January 23, to consider a resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to permit Delegates and the Resident Commissioner to the Congress to cast votes in the committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, 11:30 a.m., H-313 Capitol.

*Committee on Science and Technology*, January 24, to meet for organizational purposes; followed by a mark up of the following: H.R. 365, Methamphetamine Remediation Research Act of 2007; H. Res. 59, Supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week; and H. Con. Res. 34, Honoring the life of Percy Lavon Julian, a pioneer in the field of organic chemistry research and development and the first and only African American chemist to be inducted into the National Academy of Sciences, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

*Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure*, January 23, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, on the State of Economic Development, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

January 24, Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, hearing on Surface Transportation System: Challenges for the Future, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

*Committee on Ways and Means*, January 22, Subcommittee on Health, to meet for organizational purposes, 6 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

January 23, full Committee, hearing on the State of the U.S. Economy, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

January 23, Subcommittee on Oversight, to meet for organizational purposes, 2 p.m., 1105 Longworth.

January 24, full Committee, hearing on Economic and Societal Costs of Poverty, 10 a.m. 1100 Longworth.

*Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence*, January 24, executive, hearing on Intelligence Support to the Policy Maker, 10 a.m., H-405 Capitol.

*Next Meeting of the SENATE*

1:00 p.m., Monday, January 22

*Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*

12:30 p.m., Monday, January 22

## Senate Chamber

**Program for Monday:** After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 1 hour), Senate will begin consideration of H.R. 2, Fair Minimum Wage.

## House Chamber

**Program for Monday:** To be announced.

## Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

## HOUSE

Aderholt, Robert B., Ala., E160  
 Blackburn, Marsha, Tenn., E151, E153, E155  
 Brady, Robert A., Pa., E157  
 Castle, Michael N., Del., E156  
 Cummings, Elijah E., Md., E159  
 Dreier, David, Calif., E163  
 Farr, Sam, Calif., E160  
 Hastert, J. Dennis, Ill., E159  
 Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E160  
 Hensarling, Jeb, Tex., E156

Heger, Wally, Calif., E156  
 Knollenberg, Joe, Mich., E152, E154  
 Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E152, E154  
 Lantos, Tom, Calif., E164  
 McCarthy, Kevin, Calif., E162  
 Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E161  
 Marshall, Jim, Ga., E164  
 Miller, Gary G., Calif., E162  
 Moore, Dennis, Kans., E163  
 Norwood, Charlie, Ga., E161  
 Pastor, Ed, Ariz., E152, E154  
 Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E151

Putnam, Adam H., Fla., E157  
 Rahall, Nick J., II, W.Va., E157  
 Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E151, E153, E155  
 Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E152, E154  
 Sherman, Brad, Calif., E161  
 Tancredo, Thomas G., Colo., E164  
 Tiahrt, Todd, Kans., E151, E153  
 Udall, Mark, Colo., E158  
 Wilson, Heather, N.M., E160  
 Wilson, Joe, S.C., E158  
 Wolf, Frank R., Va., E161  
 Wynn, Albert Russell, Md., E158



# Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at [www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess](http://www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess). Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at [swais.access.gpo.gov](http://swais.access.gpo.gov), or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202-512-1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: [gpoaccess@gpo.gov](mailto:gpoaccess@gpo.gov); Phone 1-888-293-6498 (toll-free), 202-512-1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202-512-1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$252.00 for six months, \$503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, \$10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, \$21.00; greater than 400 pages, \$31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$146.00 per year, or purchased for \$3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://bookstore.gpo.gov). Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

**POSTMASTER:** Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.