



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 2007

No. 12

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. DAVIS of California).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 22, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SUSAN A. DAVIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

HEALTH CARE INSURANCE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, the President has discovered that we have a problem with health insurance in the United States of America, and that is good news. Approximately 1 million more Americans have become uninsured for health care every year that the President has been in office, a record 46.1 million have no health insurance, 8.3 million of them are children, 609,000 people of them in my State of Oregon, alone.

The President goes on to say, having discovered this problem, that we must

address the rising costs so that more Americans can afford basic health insurance. I think there is a lot of room for agreement there. Unfortunately, the solutions the President is offering are straight out of the neoconservative and right-wing think tanks.

The same people who told us we would be greeted as liberators in Iraq are now giving the President the solutions for the uninsured in America. They are saying the problem is those who are insured have too much insurance. We should tax middle-class Americans, particularly union members, who have good health plans, those that actually provide for some dental and vision coverage, in order to provide health insurance to those who don't.

Now, what the President is ignoring here are a few problems with the wildly profitable insurance industry. First off, it is exempt from the antitrust law. There are only two industries exempt from the antitrust law, baseball and insurance. Now, I don't care that much about the baseball exemption, but insurance should not be exempt from antitrust. They should not be allowed to meet together and collude to jack up prices, collude to determine who they will cover and who they won't cover. Now those are big problems. If we dealt with those problems, that would dramatically drop the cost of health care.

The President is a free market forces guy; well, let's have free market forces in health care. We don't today; it is a cartel. They collude to set the prices; they collude to decide who won't get coverage. Those are big problems. They want to cherry-pick. They only want to insure people who aren't going to file claims. We all know about that with our homeowners insurance now; you file a claim? Whoops, sorry; we don't want to insure you anymore even though you have been paying us a premium for 20 years. This is an industry that must be reined in. But no, that is not what the President is going to do.

He is going to tax middle-class people. He is going to tax union members, people who have decent health care so that some money could then be provided as tax deductions for those who don't have health care. Well, there is another problem with that; of the 46.1 million people, remember, 8.3 million are children, no earnings there. And many of them come from families that earn less than \$50,000 a year. What is a Federal tax deduction worth to those families? Zero, nada, zip. Of course, the President doesn't understand that.

Actually, this will provide tremendous benefits to young, healthy people like, say, people who are millionaires at Google who have chosen not to buy health insurance, they will get a nice \$15,000 a year tax break. But for the family that earns \$50,000 a year, they will not get a tax break because they are not paying Federal income taxes. So the President's plan is worthless for those who most need it. It penalizes those who are getting by.

And who is the President to talk about gold-plated health care plans? He has socialized medicine. He doesn't pay a penny. He gets a \$20,000 physical exam for free every year, in addition to any other health care he might need. And he is talking about Americans, families with gold-plated plans who can actually take their kids to the dentist and get partial payment? Seniors who can actually get some new eyeglasses so they can see again? That is gold-plated in the President's world. Those people should pay taxes so that we can give a phony benefit to the uninsured. This is not the way to solve the problem.

If the President had any guts he would take on the insurance industry. He would join me in proposing to take away the antitrust exemption from the insurance industry, stop them from redlining people and cherry-picking, and that would make health insurance

□ 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.

H791

cheaper for all Americans, not the posterous proposal he is putting forward.

WATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, today, all over Capitol Hill people are preparing for the State of the Union speech. Iraq, global warming, health care are all at the top of everyone's list. One that, unfortunately, will be suspiciously absent is the topic of a conference that is taking place just across the Potomac River, the third National Dialogue on Water Resources. Yet there is nothing that is more important than the discussion about water. Indeed, if you are talking about war and peace, climate change and health care, they are all directly related.

Water is not just a potential source of conflict, but of conflict resolution. You can actually measure water flows in quality. If the Israelis and the Palestinians can solve their water issues, who knows where it could lead.

Health. One-half the people in the world today who are sick are sick due to water-borne disease, almost all of which is preventable.

Global warming. We are concerned about global warming because of the impacts that are directly water-related: rising ocean levels, coastal erosion, storm surges, disappearing snow pack and polar ice, flooding, rainstorms; too much water too little water in the wrong places at the wrong time. Global warming is all about water.

It is my hope that regardless of what is discussed in the State of the Union and thereafter, that we can add this subject to the top of the list of the 110th Congress, to work with the administration and people on both sides of the aisle to build on one of the few areas of bipartisan progress that we have seen in the recent toxic atmosphere on the House floor.

In the 108th Congress, we were able to work to reform the flood insurance programs, before Katrina. In the 109th Congress, we had the landmark Water For the Poor Act that I was able to work on with Republicans Henry Hyde and Senator Bill Frist.

There are some simple steps that we can take now. I hope that Chair LOWEY and Ranking Member WOLF will fund our international water and sanitation commitments. I hope that out of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee we will update the hopelessly outmoded Corps of Engineers water principles and guidelines that are over a quarter century old and lead to bad decisions. I hope that we can continue Chair FRANK's commitment to further flood insurance reform.

Others are going to take more of a lift, but we can use water supply and

quality in the farm bill to pay farmers to do the right thing and make a profound difference on water around the country. We can shift our frame of reference to deal with basin-wide water management; and we can use the huge value implicit in water resources to fund our crying needs.

At core, Madam Speaker, it is time for us to match our policies on where the water comes from, which date back to the beginning of our country and were basically frozen in place by 1950, to overlap with our water quality and environmental and health protections which have been developed largely since that time.

Money is actually less of a problem because, while water is priceless, we are doing silly things with it; for example, subsidizing people to grow cotton in the desert. When we have an era where for bottled water, some people are paying up to \$8 a gallon or more, we are paying more than gasoline or cheap wine, there are ways that we can tap into that value. We spend too much on uncoordinated infrastructure investments with inappropriate pricing, poor planning and incremental fragmented management.

We have the possibility to refine those partnerships, both public and private, to bring together the Federal agencies, even Congress itself, to limit our stovepipe mentality with fewer subcommittees and more policy management. It is not really that hard. College students, farmers, local government officials, Girl Scouts and church youth groups understand these basic principles after the most basic of study. It is time for the rest of the players to catch up with them, and I hope starting with the 110th Congress.

GLOBAL WARMING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about global warming and our energy future, the epic challenges of our time.

First, I want to applaud our leader, Speaker NANCY PELOSI, for recognizing the importance of this issue to our children and our grandchildren. And I think she is right to put a deadline for the House to act.

Energy independence and global warming are of paramount concern to the American people. Most polls show the American people, by 70 to 80 percent, think these are very serious problems.

Today, a significant development occurred on this front. In the Capitol this morning, the U.S. Climate Action Partnership issued its call for action. This group is composed of environmental groups, World Resources Institute, NRDC, Environmental Defense, the Pew Center on Global Climate Change;

industrial giants like Alcoa, BP, Caterpillar, Duke Energy and Dupont; and many others, including our power company in New Mexico, PNM Resources.

Listen to what they say in their report: "We know enough to act on climate change."

"The challenge is significant, but the United States can grow and prosper in a greenhouse gas constrained world."

"In our view, the climate change challenge will create more economic opportunities than risks for the U.S. economy."

"We need a mandatory flexible climate program."

This report is significant, because major U.S. companies have stepped up to the plate and called for action now. They are optimistic. They believe we can get this done. In the 109th Congress, the Udall-Petri legislation, H.R. 5042, had most of the components called for by this partnership. We will reintroduce it in the 110th and try and capture these up-to-date recommendations.

Udall-Petri stands for immediate action. Our bill is a mandatory cap-and-trade system that uses the marketplace. It puts a price on carbon dioxide emissions. Our bill has a safety valve which balances economic losses with emissions reduction achievements. And our bill provides the flexibility to unleash American business ingenuity.

I told the partnership their first agenda item should be to meet with President Bush. Their message needs to be heard in the White House. The President has called for a voluntary program. While his voluntary program has been in place, we have seen no reduction in carbon dioxide emissions. In fact, we have seen every year in the 6 years a 2 percent increase every year. President Bush should take note of these business leaders and let's join together to leave the planet a better place for our children and grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, this morning myself and several Senators and Representatives including the Senate Majority Leader REID and House Majority Whip HOYER had the honor of participating in an unprecedented meeting with the CEOs of DuPont, GE, Duke Energy, Lehman Brothers, PG&E, FPL Company, Caterpillar, Alcoa, BP America, and PNM Energy from my home state of New Mexico, and the heads of the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Pew Center on Global Climate Change, Environmental Defense, and the World Resources Institute. The United States Climate Action Partnership, as this organization of CEOs is named, has coalesced around the urgent need to enact a federal global warming policy, and to enact it now. I am humbled both by the commitment expressed by these leading global corporations and by the enormity and importance of the task we here in Congress have before us to craft policies to address perhaps the most pressing issue of our generation. I applaud them for their leadership and courage on this issue, and I look forward to working with them.

The time for debate about whether or not global warming is real and whether or not it is

attributable to human activity on this planet, has passed. America must lead the global effort with a national global warming policy. We can no longer sit and reap the benefits of fossil fuels without mitigating the negative effects they are having on our planet and our way of life. We cannot, we must not, leave this one up to our children.

It is now the moment in time when we must create a policy to address global warming. To that end, my good friend and colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. TOM PETRI, who was also present at the meeting this morning, have developed a comprehensive greenhouse gas emissions control bill. We introduced the Keep America Competitive Global Warming Act during the 109th Congress and are currently making minor changes to the legislation for reintroduction in the coming weeks. Our legislation will put our country on the path to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, while not jeopardizing American competitiveness, American jobs, and the American economy.

The bill is an economy-wide, upstream, cap-and-trade policy that covers all greenhouse gas emissions. However, to provide some certainty to the economy, the bill provides for an unlimited number of additional "safety valve" allowances. This safety valve provision provides cost-certainty to industry and will help ensure that this policy will not result in economic harm. We believe it is better to have a policy that works slowly yet surely rather than one that might prove economically unworkable. Many companies, including some who were present at this morning's meeting, have expressed the need for a safety valve in any mandatory greenhouse emissions control legislation.

Some of the other key provisions of this legislation include the creation of an Advanced Research Projects Agency at the Department of Energy to explore the truly out-of-the-box, high-risk, high-payoff research that will be necessary if we are to get to a low or no carbon dioxide and greenhouse gas world. Technological advancement hold the key to the long-term solution of global warming. Our bill also includes resources for workers, entities and localities who may be negatively impacted by this policy. Also, Madam Speaker, to address concerns about American competitiveness, our legislation ensures that the United States will not be put at a competitive disadvantage relative to developing countries or countries not taking actions comparable to ours to stem greenhouse gas emissions.

Madam Speaker, the message we hear from scientists is clear, we must act immediately to stop global warming. We must do so, however, in a responsible manner that does not cost American competitiveness and American jobs. Mr. PETRI will soon be reintroducing our reasonable, certain, and efficient global warming legislation. Please join us in combating one of the most pressing issues facing our country today.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SARBANES) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God Almighty, the floor of this Chamber, the courts of our land and the tribunals of peace, as well as the everyday decisions of corporate America, cannot live on megabytes, lest the hunger for true justice and holiness become a famine covering the whole Earth.

Help Your people to turn their attention to the deeper truths that will guide nations and unite peoples in compassion and respect for fully living in the present moment.

Do not allow us to argue against the truth, rather, give us a proper sense of our own ignorance; never be ashamed to admit our mistakes, nor swim against the wide current of common sense.

Never let us be the doormat for a fool or seek favor with the powerful. Instead, strengthen us to fight to the death for truth. For then You, Lord God, will fight on our side 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 gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. DAVIS of California 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.

MAKING ADOPTION TAX RELIEF PERMANENT

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week, I introduced a bill that will make permanent the \$10,000 adoption tax credit which is set to expire in 2010.

As the father of an adopted son, as a former attorney handling adoptions, and as a member of the Congressional Coalition on Adoption, I know firsthand the challenges and rewards adoption brings.

The adoption process can be mentally and procedurally exhausting. Families should not be overwhelmed with financial burdens as well. We should offer incentives, not penalties, to those making this commitment.

I am proud to sponsor this bill and pleased that 46 of our colleagues, including Ways and Means Committee Chairman CHARLES RANGEL, have joined me as co-sponsors. This legislation is necessary to promote adoption and foster the creation of happy homes.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

PENSION-KILLING BILL 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 the House will consider legislation to kill the pensions of Members of Congress convicted of a felony.

Amazingly, lawmakers who broke the law collect taxpayer-funded pensions after conviction. Rostenkowski collects after mail fraud; Traficant collects after corruption; Cunningham collects after bribery; and Ney collects after conspiracy.

Today's bill is a step forward, but blocks pensions for only four felonies: bribery, being a foreign agent, conspiracy to defraud, and perjury. The key story is what is missing.

Our House leadership presented a bill, but banned an amendment that would add 17 public corruption felonies to the list. Under today's unamended bill, Congressmen would still get a pension if convicted of income tax invasion, wire fraud, intimidation to secure contributions, and racketeering. Speaker PELOSI voted for these tougher reforms in 1996, but appears to have changed her mind.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the bill before the House because it is the result of reform-minded Members like me who brought it to the floor, but it does fall 17 felonies short of the reforms needed to fully clean up this House.

SHRINKING MILITARY IS GETTING BIGGER

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, disturbing news: the U.S. military is smaller in size than any time in the last 50 years and continues to shrink, according to USA Today. But those who apply are larger than ever.

Only 1.4 million people wear the military uniform; 95 percent of those are Reservists and National Guard troops. So the number of full-time military troops is small considering 300 million people live in the U.S. So why the shrinking military? One reason, more Americans do not qualify. To be in the best military in the world one must be

in good medical shape, but two-thirds of the 17- to 24-year-olds that volunteer are disqualified. The number one reason? They are overweight. We have too many young people who are too big to join up.

This Nation as a whole cannot continue to travel the ever-widening path of obesity because large people don't fit into the military. As the size of the military unfortunately trims down, the waistline of those who apply continues to grow.

Mr. Speaker, overweight kids have become a national security issue.

And that's just the way it is.

PENSION-KILLING BILL FALLS SHORT

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

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today that we are going to take up a bill to deny a Member who has been convicted of bribery their pension.

Over a year ago, I introduced the first bill to deny a Member a pension when they have been convicted of a felony such as bribery. Two of my other Republican colleagues stood with me at that press conference and also submitted their own bills. It was actually brought up for a vote last May, and amazingly the Democratic leadership in total voted against denying pensions to Members of the House of Representatives convicted of bribery, but yet we stand here today with a new Member introducing a bill that falls substantially short.

And, by the way, I am happy that this bill is coming to the floor. I really believe it has been the unified pressure of MARK STEVEN KIRK, JOHN SHADEGG, and myself for the last year, including the first day of the session this year, in coming to the House floor and saying we need this bill. That is the reason that it is here today, even though we are being denied our participation in that process.

RECALL DESIGNEE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 22, 2007.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives, H-154,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CLERK: Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 1, and also for purposes of such concurrent resolutions of the current Congress as may contemplate my designation of Members to act in similar circumstances, I hereby designate Representative Steny Hoyer of Maryland to act jointly with the Majority Leader of the Senate or his designee, in the event of my death or inability, to notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, of any reassembly under any such concurrent resolution. In the event of the death or inability of that designee, the alternate Members of the House listed in the letter bearing this date

that I have placed with the Clerk are designated, in turn, for the same purposes.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH 2007

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 29) supporting the goals and ideals of National Mentoring Month 2007.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 29

Whereas mentoring is a longstanding concept in which a dependable adult provides guidance, support, and encouragement to facilitate a young person's social, emotional, and cognitive development;

Whereas high-quality mentoring promotes positive outcomes for young people, including an increased sense of industry and competency, a boost in academic performance and self-esteem, and improved social and communications skills;

Whereas research on mentoring shows that participation in a high-quality mentoring relationship successfully reduces the incidence of risky behavior, delinquency, absenteeism, and academic failure in young people;

Whereas mentoring, in addition to being beneficial for those being mentored, is also extremely rewarding for those serving as mentors;

Whereas quality programs that encourage young people to learn about mentoring and to become mentors, such as programs that recruit high school students to mentor younger children, are important and have the potential to create high-quality mentors at an early age;

Whereas mentoring relationships have grown dramatically in the past 15 years, now reaching 3 million young Americans, because of the remarkable creativity, vigor, and resourcefulness of the thousands of mentoring programs and millions of volunteer mentors in communities throughout the Nation;

Whereas, in spite of the progress made to increase mentoring, our Nation has a serious "mentoring gap," with nearly 15 million young people currently in need of mentors;

Whereas a recent study confirmed that one of the most critical challenges that mentoring programs face is recruiting enough mentors to help close the mentoring gap;

Whereas in December 2006, the President designated January 2007 as National Mentoring Month to call attention to the critical role mentors play in helping young people realize their potential;

Whereas the month-long celebration of mentoring will encourage more individuals and organizations, including schools, businesses, nonprofit organizations, faith institutions, and foundations, to become engaged in mentoring across our Nation; and

Whereas National Mentoring Month will build awareness of mentoring and recruit more individuals to become mentors, thus helping close our Nation's mentoring gap: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Mentoring Month;

(2) acknowledges the diligent efforts of individuals and groups who promote mentoring and who are observing National Mentoring Month with appropriate ceremonies and activities to further promote awareness of and volunteer involvement with youth mentoring;

(3) recognizes with gratitude the contributions of the millions of caring adults and students who are already volunteering as mentors; and

(4) encourages more adults and students to volunteer as mentors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert material relevant to House Resolution 29 into the RECORD and to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to honor those who make a difference in the lives of our young people across the United States. This January marks the National Mentoring Month 2007, a month-long event honoring those who are mentors. This event also draws attention to the great need for additional volunteer mentors.

As we know, Mr. Speaker, many of our children can become lost at an early age without a responsible adult to show them the way. Our children need to know that somebody older cares, and that is what mentoring is all about, showing our kids that we care. Unfortunately, many of our children do not have such an adult in their lives, and without a solid role model, the consequences for our children can be detrimental.

Mr. Speaker, a third of those entering high school do not graduate and will face limited job prospects, according to the Government Accountability Office. This alarming statistic I think would be lower if each one of these kids had a solid mentor to stress the importance of education.

There is no substitute for a healthy relationship with an adult. A caring adult is one of the most important aspects of adolescent development. When a responsible and reliable adult becomes a mentor, the benefits to the mentee last a lifetime.

Another aspect of mentoring sometimes that we overlook are the vast

benefits to the mentors themselves. Helping a younger person find their way can be extremely fulfilling, and often those who become a mentor continue to volunteer throughout their lives.

Chris Warren became a mentor to Joshua Becerra in my hometown of San Diego through the Big Brothers/Big Sisters program in 1999. As a mentor, Chris taught Joshua the value of education and encouraged him to study hard in school. Joshua is now a student at High Tech High School and has already visited UCLA, San Diego State University and other campuses trying to decide where to attend college.

As a role model, the relationship has given Chris a healthier perspective on what is important in life, that is, helping others.

The relationship between Joshua and Chris shows what a mentor can do for a young person, and it also shows the joy it can bring to the mentor.

Millions of adults nationwide have similar relationships with children who face problems at home or struggle at school. Unfortunately, research shows that about 15 million children across the United States are in need of a good role model.

This resolution calls on more adults to make a difference in the lives of our young people, and we in Congress also need to heed this call. Federal programs that encourage mentoring need our support. The Mentoring Children of Prisoners program began in 2001 to provide guidance and friendship to children with at least one incarcerated parent. Funding for the program was targeted for a 20 percent reduction for the current fiscal year. Funding for a number of mentoring programs through the Department of Education was targeted for considerable reductions as well. I urge my colleagues to increase our support for these programs and to put a priority on mentoring.

We must also encourage programs that recruit young people to become mentors to those who are younger. It is these programs that will help create a cycle of mentoring between the generations.

The bottom line: our children need strong, responsible mentors.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the millions of adults, and there are millions of them out there, who are mentoring our children, and call on more adults to become role models to those who are in need.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to bring this resolution to the House floor to call attention to this worthy cause on the occasion of National Mentoring Month 2007. I urge its passage today.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 29, which cele-

brates mentors who are positively impacting the lives of young people and highlights the need for additional mentors to make themselves available to America's youth.

I applaud Representative SUSAN DAVIS' continued efforts to draw attention and support to this very important issue, and I appreciate her dedicated leadership in this area.

Mentors give their time and energy to improve the lives of American young people who increasingly spend less time with concerned adult role models. According to the National Mentoring Institute, young people with mentors are roughly half as likely as those without mentors to begin using illegal drugs, 27 percent less likely to begin using alcohol, and 50 percent less prone to absenteeism from school. The positive effects of mentoring also include the improvement of academic achievement, a reduction in violent behavior, and a higher self-esteem.

In December 2006, President Bush proclaimed January 2007 as National Mentoring Month, giving public recognition to mentors who serve as role models and provide quality involvement and interaction in the lives of America's youth.

□ 1415

As the President said, "Through friendship and encouragement, mentors can help prepare young Americans for a hopeful future."

By honoring mentors and mentoring programs, we recognize the importance of mentoring programs implemented in our local schools and communities. We also draw attention to the components of a quality program, including appropriate screening of potential mentors and careful matching of youth with adults who have a genuine interest in providing guidance and being exemplary role models.

Mentoring programs are varied and unique. They can be school-based or faith-based, and they may be established through community organizations or corporate initiatives. I encourage people across the country to take the time to discover what mentoring programs exist in their communities and see what they can do to help. Many volunteers are needed to meet the growing demand for mentors.

Again, I am pleased to recognize the important work of mentors and the quality mentoring programs, and I urge Members to support this resolution.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have any other speakers on that side of the aisle?

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there are no further speakers.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I really am pleased to be here on behalf of this resolution today. I urge and thank those who have continued to volunteer as mentors in our communities to continue on with those efforts, and I

urge that those adults who have not embarked on mentoring think about it and join with some organizations that could help them move forward and help many of our young people who are in the community today and who need their help, their support and certainly the caring that they bring.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 29, to support the goals and ideals of National Mentoring Month. As Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California, Mrs. DAVIS, for introducing this bill to highlight the importance of mentoring our youth.

Mr. Speaker, today many youth face temptations that often lead them down destructive paths and it is vitally important that we provide guidance that helps them make good decisions.

Mentors have been an integral part of society for many years, dating back to Ancient Greece. The Greek poet Homer wrote in the *Odyssey*, that when Odysseus left to fight in the Trojan War, he charged Mentor, his wise old friend, with the task of caring for his son, Telemachus, and teaching him wisdom. Since then, the word mentor has come to mean a wise and responsible tutor or an experienced person who advises, guides, teaches, challenges, corrects, and serves as a model.

In our society today, mentors exist in many different environments. There are mentors in professional settings who guide apprentices by teaching them how to effectively perform in the workplace. There are mentors in academic settings who guide students, teaching them how to reach and maintain high scholastic achievement. There are mentors in community groups who guide their protégés through life issues, teaching them how to be productive citizens. There are mentors in spiritual and church groups who advise others through their spiritual growth. In all cases, they are very important and essential to the success of the youth that they mentor.

Who needs mentors?

There are 35.2 million young people ages 10–18 in the U.S. today; of those young people: 1 out of 4 lives with only one parent; 1 out of 10 was born to teen parents; 1 out of 5 lives in poverty; 1 out of 10 will not finish high school.

About half of young Americans—17.6 million young people—want or need caring adult mentors to help them succeed in life. Of those 17.6 million young people, only 2.5 million are currently in formal mentoring relationships.

That leaves 15.1 million youth still in need of formal mentoring relationships. We call this our nation's "mentoring gap."

Mr. Speaker, imagine if every child had a mentor—just one person whom they could look up to and go to for advice and guidance. Imagine how many young lives could be positively impacted. We could create the avenues and encouragement to ensure that all of our children receive the proper education. Too many of our youth are not being properly advised and guided on the importance of getting an education.

Mentors can help give those youth living in poverty to strive towards a brighter future for themselves. Every child could benefit from having someone in his or her life to turn to for advice and help in the time of need.

National research has shown that children who have mentors are more confident in their

academic performance, able to get along better with their families, 46 percent less likely to begin using illegal drugs, 27 percent less likely to begin using alcohol and 52 percent less likely to skip school. The positive relationships and reinforcement that mentors provide is clearly effective.

I applaud the efforts of the mentors in our nation who encourage and motivate our youth to realize their worth and become productive citizens. I urge my colleagues to join me in thanking and supporting them by passing this resolution, H. Res. 29.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 29, which has been introduced in recognition of the goals and ideals of National Mentoring Month for 2007. Young people today are confronted with many challenges in life. They can find the confidence to overcome many of these challenges through a mentor.

The benefits of a mentor are immeasurable. We take this opportunity today through consideration of this resolution to honor those mentors who unselfishly give of their time to encourage and support students across our country. Mentors provide important guidance and friendship to students and they serve as positive role models in our community. Mentors listen and above all, they care.

Mentors leave an indelible imprint on our minds and hearts. I, as well as many of my colleagues, had mentors that helped us shape our aspirations and achieve our goals. The confidence and support that they provide is something that every young person deserves.

Unfortunately, there are not enough mentors for the millions of children who want or need them. Currently, as this resolution notes, approximately 15 million young people are in need of mentors across our country. As we celebrate National Mentoring Month, let us commit ourselves to raising awareness and to promoting the rewards of mentoring for mentors, our children, our communities and our country.

I also take this opportunity today to commend the young people who participate in mentoring programs. Their involvement in mentoring partnerships demonstrates their personal commitment to improve the lives of others. Let us continue to encourage them by providing additional opportunities and resources to enhance and reinforce their mentoring work. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 29.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the

Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 51) honoring the contributions of Catholic schools.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 51

Whereas America's Catholic schools are internationally acclaimed for their academic excellence, but provide students more than a superior scholastic education;

Whereas Catholic schools ensure a broad, values-added education emphasizing the life-long development of moral, intellectual, physical, and social values in America's young people;

Whereas the total Catholic school student enrollment for the 2005–2006 academic year was about 2,400,000 and the student-teacher ratio was 15 to 1;

Whereas Catholic schools teach a diverse group of students;

Whereas more than 27 percent of school children enrolled in Catholic schools are from minority backgrounds, and nearly 14 percent are non-Catholics;

Whereas Catholic schools produce students strongly dedicated to their faith, values, families, and communities by providing an intellectually stimulating environment rich in spiritual, character, and moral development;

Whereas in the 1972 pastoral message concerning Catholic education, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops stated: "Education is one of the most important ways by which the Church fulfills its commitment to the dignity of the person and building of community. Community is central to education ministry, both as a necessary condition and an ardently desired goal. The educational efforts of the Church, therefore, must be directed to forming persons-in-community; for the education of the individual Christian is important not only to his solitary destiny, but also the destinies of the many communities in which he lives."; and

Whereas January 28 to February 3, 2007, has been designated as Catholic Schools Week by the National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals of Catholic Schools Week, an event co-sponsored by the National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops and established to recognize the vital contributions of America's thousands of Catholic elementary and secondary schools; and

(2) congratulates Catholic schools, students, parents, and teachers across the Nation for their ongoing contributions to education, and for the key role they play in promoting and ensuring a brighter, stronger future for this Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert material relevant to H. Res. 51 into the RECORD and to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Without objection, Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and request that he control the balance of my time.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 51 honoring National Catholic Schools Week and the tremendous contributions that Catholic schools make to our country. Since 1974, Catholic Schools Week has celebrated the important role that these institutions play in America and their excellent reputation for providing a strong academic and moral education, as well as teaching community responsibility and outreach.

I am proud to sponsor this resolution as my first resolution of this new Congress, and I would also like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) for his work on this resolution. Unfortunately Mr. FOSSELLA today has been unable to make it. He is stuck in New York today. But he would like to be here also to speak of his support for this resolution on Catholic Schools Week.

This year's theme of Catholic Schools Week is "Catholic Schools: The Good News in Education." This theme has multiple meanings for Catholic schools. At the center of Catholic education is the "Good News" or Gospel of Jesus and salvation. Jesus taught love and service. And the history of Catholic schools reveals an ongoing emphasis on the Gospel values of reaching out and serving others.

But the "good news" in Catholic education is also the news of success in shaping the lives of so many young men and women. Nationally about 2.4 million young people are enrolled in nearly 8,000 Catholic schools. These schools have more than 160,000 full-time professional staff, boasting a student/teacher ratio of 15:1. On average, Catholic school students surpass other students in math, science and reading in the three grade levels of the NAEP test. The graduation rate for all Catholic high school students is 95 percent, and 83 percent of Catholic high school graduates go on to college. These are amazing statistics in America today.

Catholic schools are also highly effective in educating minority students and disadvantaged youth. The percentage of minority students in Catholic schools has more than doubled in the

past 30 years, today representing more than one-quarter of all those enrolled. And almost one in seven students in Catholic schools is not Catholic. The success of Catholic schools does not just come from selectivity. On average, Catholic schools accept about nine out of every 10 students who apply.

One of the reasons for the “good news” of Catholic schools is that in addition to learning reading, writing and arithmetic, students also learn responsibility and how to become persons of character and integrity.

Community service is a priority in Catholic schools; 94 percent of schools have a service program, with the average student completing 79 hours of service.

I was born, raised and lived in the Chicago Archdiocese, which has one of the most successful school systems in the country. Today more than 106,000 students attend 276 schools. In my district alone there are five Catholic high schools and 34 grammar schools, including one of the best in my home parish of St. John of the Cross.

The success of students in archdiocesan schools is phenomenal, with the high schools having an amazing graduation rate of over 99 percent, and 95 percent of graduates from Catholic schools go on to college. This is certainly a record to be proud of.

My wife and I are each products of 12 years of Catholic education. My wife in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, at St. Patrick's Grade School and Bishop McCourt High School; myself in Chicago at St. Symphorosa Grammar School and St. Ignatius College Prep. Like so many others, I understand how important Catholic schools are in providing a spiritual, moral and intellectual foundation. My 12 years of Catholic education provide me with the knowledge, discipline, desire to serve, and a love of learning that enabled me to go on to earn my Ph.D. and become a teacher before I was elected to Congress.

As we recognize Catholic Schools Week, we must pay special tribute to the dedicated teachers and administrators who sacrifice so much, usually getting paid much less than they could to dedicate their lives to teaching at Catholic schools. I have fond memories of my teachers, who taught me not only the value of a good education, but also the values of faith and service. Although it was 35 years ago that I started school, I can still fondly remember all my teachers, from first grade, Sister Mildred; second grade, Miss Ivers; and on and on. And I will never forget Sister Diane, my coach on the Student Congress in high school. And to this day, when I speak to a crowd, I always remember her sitting there nodding her approval as I gave my speeches, as I was a nervous young kid in high school. Millions of other Americans have similar memories of teachers who gave their heart and soul and made such a big difference in the lives of their students.

Mr. Speaker, as an important complement to public schools and other private institutions, Catholic schools contribute a great deal to America. They have made a big difference in my life and in the lives of countless others. As Father William Davis, Interim Secretary for the Conference of U.S. Catholic Bishops, said, “High achievement rates, high retention rates, high moral values, and high student and parent satisfaction are the distinctive marks of a Catholic school. That's the good news and we want to share it.”

For this good news, America's Catholic schools deserve our praise and our support, and to share our praise and support, I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 51, offered by the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. DAN LIPINSKI. This resolution increases the awareness of Catholic education while honoring the contributions of America's Catholic schools. They are dedicated to not only educating their students academically, but to developing their moral, intellectual, physical and social values.

January 28 through February 3, 2007, is Catholic Schools Week, an annual tradition in its 33rd year and jointly sponsored by the National Catholic Education Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. The purpose of this resolution and Catholic Schools Week is to celebrate the vital role Catholic elementary and secondary schools play in providing a values-added education with high standards of quality and excellence to millions of children in America.

As President George W. Bush has noted, Catholic educators share the basic conviction that every child can learn, which is the grounding principle behind the No Child Left Behind Act.

Catholic schools have also played a vital role in the gulf coast's path to recovery after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. They worked as quickly as possible to reenroll their students, while also opening their doors to thousands of public school students displaced by the storm.

Catholic schools continue to demonstrate their faith in every student and commitment to excellence with overwhelming results. According to the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, Catholic schools have a greater than 99 percent graduation rate, and about 97 percent of Catholic high school graduates go on to postsecondary training at 4-year colleges, community colleges, or technical schools.

I know firsthand of the significance of Catholic schools in that my new daughter-in-law, Jennifer Miskewicz Wilson of Fairfield, New Jersey, was influenced by a Catholic education.

I appreciate the great work being done by Catholic schools, their admin-

istrators and teachers, as well as their parents and volunteers. Catholic schools carry out their servant mission by building the academic achievement, character and values of their students. I commend my colleague from Illinois for introducing this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I would like to congratulate and thank Mrs. DAVIS and Mr. LIPINSKI for their leadership on the past two resolutions.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say in closing that I thank the gentleman from South Carolina, that I thank Mr. LIPINSKI, the gentleman from Illinois as well, for speaking out so eloquently on the critical role that Catholic schools play in our society today.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 51 to honor the contributions of Catholic Schools to our nation's educational system. Too many children in our country are not getting the education they need and deserve. Catholic schools provide many students with a wonderful education and, in many cases, a quality alternative to overburdened public schools.

I am grateful for the work of the 39 Catholic schools that are run by the Diocese of Bridgeport which is based in Connecticut's Fourth Congressional District, and serves 10,988 students from diverse backgrounds. These schools offer elementary and secondary education, as well as after-school programs. They present students with an alternative to public schools, and provide a strong sense of faith and discipline.

I commend the teachers, administrators, students and parents for their role in Catholic education, and the key role they play in creating a brighter, better educated nation.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 657, which has been offered by Mr. LIPINSKI from Illinois. I thank my colleague for introducing this resolution honoring Catholic Schools Week, 2007.

Catholic Schools Week is an annual national celebration of the important role that Catholic elementary and secondary schools across the country play in providing quality education for American youth. The mission of these institutions—to build solid foundations for lives of confidence, faith, and service—has had a tremendous impact in shaping family values and community life across the country, and particularly in my community in Western New York.

Beginning the last Sunday in January, the nation's nearly 8,000 Catholic schools will celebrate Catholic Schools Week, Jan. 28 through Feb. 3. This year's theme is “Catholic Schools: the Good News in Education” and focuses on the role Catholic Schools play both in educating students and teaching them the value of virtues such as integrity and dignity. Through education and community service, Catholic schools produce students strongly dedicated to their faith, values, families and communities by providing an intellectually stimulating environment rich in spiritual, character, and moral development.

Together, more 160,000 Catholic school teachers nationwide teach 2.4 million students,

of which more than 27 percent are from minority backgrounds and nearly 14 percent are non-Catholics. An astounding 99 percent of these students will graduate, and 97 percent of those graduates go on to college. As these students become adults, their intelligence and character will benefit communities in Western New York and throughout the nation.

In my hometown of Buffalo, neighborhoods are often known by the names of their Catholic Schools and Parishes, and the many families that are active in Catholic schools are enriched by the values they espouse. Indeed, I have spent my life as a first-hand witness to the beneficial work of Catholic schools. My mother was a teacher at Our Lady of Perpetual Help, and my two children, John and Maeve, attend Catholic School in South Buffalo. My family and I are personally grateful for the contributions that America's Catholic schools have been making to families like ours, and American society at large, for more than four centuries.

I thank the National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops for cosponsoring this week-long event.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in supporting this resolution, and I thank my colleague Mr. LIPINSKI for his leadership on this issue.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 51, which honors the contributions of Catholic schools. Catholic schools not only ensure that their students are equipped with a superior scholastic education, but also emphasizes the moral, physical, intellectual and social development of America's youth. This bill honors and supports the goals of Catholic Schools Week, an event co-sponsored by the National Catholic Education Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

Education is a very important value that should be emphasized to American young people. This bill congratulates Catholic schools, students, parents, and teachers for their role in ensuring that American students remain competitive in a global marketplace while emphasizing their character development.

I commend Congressman LIPINSKI for sponsoring this bill which promotes and encourages education. Education is the pathway to a better future and an American ideal is for students of every background and race to have the opportunity to access equal education. Catholic schools have strived to maintain diversity with more than 27 percent of school children enrolled in Catholic schools from minority backgrounds.

Supporting this bill sends a message that we care about the education of American students. Not only do Catholic schools educate Catholic youth, but 14 percent of those children who attend Catholic schools are non-Catholic. We must keep in mind that Catholic schools educate America's young people and ensure that they have a brighter future. Catholic schools have ensured that they are well equipped to face the rigorous challenges after graduation while contributing to their character development and helping to raise responsible citizens who give back to our communities and the world.

Thus I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting and honoring the contributions of Catholic schools.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I stand here in support of H. Res 51, a resolution that honors the contributions of Catholic schools.

As we get ready to celebrate Catholic Schools week, it's important to highlight and celebrate the contributions of the nearly 8,000 Catholic schools that exist in our Nation.

Catholic education has long been characterized by a commitment to high and appropriate standards in all aspects of its educational mission.

The history of Catholic schooling embodies a constant effort to promote academic excellence for a diverse group of students in an environment permeated by religious values and beliefs.

Aside from America's Catholic schools being internationally acclaimed for their academic excellence, catholic school students also learn responsibility, and how to become persons of character and integrity.

Father William Davis of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops said, "High achievement rates, high retention rates, high moral values and high student and parent satisfaction are the distinctive marks of a Catholic school."

In my district and the surrounding areas, Catholic education is rather prevalent. The San Bernardino diocese contains at least 32 Elementary schools and 2 High schools. A new Preparatory high school is also in the works for the Coachella Valley area.

Catholic schools foster a sense of community. They encourage their students to be loving family members; and to be responsible adults within the workplace, as leaders of the world and as inhibitors of their communities.

I commend Catholic schools for holding high educational standards, instilling good moral values, and community sentiments.

Let us recognize and honor the valuable traits Catholic schools possess.

I urge the rest of Congress to stand with me, and support H. Res. 51.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as an original co-sponsor and in strong support of House Resolution 51, "Honoring the Contributions of Catholic Schools."

As a product of Saint Anselm and Archbishop Ryan, I know the vital role that Catholic schools, students, parents, and teachers play towards building a stronger nation. I know that I would not be here today without the guidance of Sister McFadden, the assistance of Ms. Erwin, or the countless other teachers, priests and nuns who helped shaped me into the man I am today.

Our Catholic schools instill a strong sense of community and service in their students: service to our God, to our families, to our towns and cities. And it is this spirit of service that leads so many to strengthen our communities: in our hospitals, schools, businesses and even in these halls of Congress.

President John F. Kennedy, the first and only Catholic President—and one of my political heroes—said: "With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

Mr. Speaker, though I have not been in this Chamber long, I have relied on the lessons I learned in the classrooms of St. Anselm and Archbishop Ryan to do what I believe is right.

And I am honored that in the first 100 hours of the 110th Congress we have passed bills to lift millions out of poverty by raising the minimum wage and to protect our environment by investing in alternative energy.

But Mr. Speaker, the commitment to justice, peace and service taught in Catholic schools resonates far outside this chamber and is felt in countless, yet tangible ways in every corner of the nation. And it is only through everyday men and women simply trying, as President Kennedy so eloquently stated, to make God's work their own, is America the nation it is today.

That is why Mr. Speaker, as a proud former student of Catholic schools, I urge my fellow representatives to support this resolution honoring the contributions of these fine institutions to our communities and Nation.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my sincere gratitude to Catholic Schools not only in my Home Congressional District of Staten Island and Brooklyn, but also the entire nation as we honored Catholic Schools Week from January 28–February 3, 2007.

America's Catholic schools educate nearly 2.5 million students a year, providing the nation's young men and women with a broad academic background emphasizing the lifelong development of moral, intellectual physical and social values.

Catholic school initiatives that reach out to disadvantaged young people have touched a diverse group of students who sometimes find themselves trapped in underachieving schools. It is not surprising to me that more than 27 percent of Catholic school students are from minority groups and nearly 14 percent are non-Catholics. Parents recognize the importance of a quality education and are willing to sacrifice to ensure their children have every opportunity to succeed in the world.

Catholic Schools Week pays tribute to the dedication, character, compassion, and values that embody Catholic education in this country. I believe it is important to recognize the outstanding contributions Catholic Schools make in our country today. Their commitment to the educational standards and values ensure our children will have the right moral framework to help lead our great Nation in the future.

I would like to recognize all Catholic Schools in the 13th Congressional District of New York: Academy of St. Dorothy, Blessed Sacrament, Holy Rosary, Immaculate Conception, Notre Dame Academy, Monsignor Farrell High School, Moore Catholic School, Mother Franciscana, Notre Dame Academy Elementary, Our Lady of Good Counsel, Our Lady Help of Christians, OL Mount Carmel/St. Benedicta, Our Lady Queen of Peace, Our Lady Star of the Sea, Sacred Heart, St. Adalbert, St. Ann, St. Charles, St. Christopher, St. Clare, St. John Villa Academy, St. Joseph, St. Joseph by the Sea High School, St. Joseph Hill Academy, St. Joseph-St. Thomas, St. Margaret Mary, St. Mary, St. Patrick, St. Paul, St. Peter's Boys, St. Peter's Girls, St. Peter's Elementary, St. Rita, St. Roch, St. Sylvester, Seton Foundation For Learning, St. Teresa, Most Precious Blood, Fontbonne Hall Academy, Our Lady of Angels, Our Lady of Grace, Our Lady of Guadalupe, St. Anselm, St. Bernadette, St. Ephrem, St. Finbar, St. Frances Cabrini, St. Patrick School, Sts. Simon & Jude, Visitation Academy, Xavarian High School, Xavarian Genesis Program.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 51, a resolution to recognize our Nation's Catholic schools and honor their important contributions to our students and our communities. I thank the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, for offering this important measure.

Roughly 2.3 million students attend more than 7,500 U.S. Catholic schools—more than one-fourth of them minority students. Year in and year out, these schools have made remarkable contributions to our Nation's intellectual growth. For example, on average, ninety-five percent of Catholic school students graduate, with eight out of every ten of Catholic high school graduates going on to pursue a higher education.

While these schools are widely-known for their academic excellence, their contributions go far behind grade point average and graduation rates. Rather, Catholic schools also emphasize the moral, physical, and social values of our Nation's young people. And for that, their contributions simply cannot be quantified.

Next week, our nation's Catholic schools, their students, and their families will be marking Catholic Schools Week for the 33rd year. Catholic Schools Week celebrates the quality of the education available to all students in Catholic grade schools and high schools across the U.S., and we wish them all the best during their celebration.

As we prepare to reauthorize the No Child Left Behind Act and continue to work to close the achievement gap between disadvantaged students and their more fortunate peers, we also should recognize that if it weren't for our nation's Catholic schools and the dedicated teachers who serve them, the achievement gap today would be even wider.

With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this resolution to honor Catholic schools, students, parents, and teachers for their ongoing contributions to education, as well as for the key role they play in promoting and ensuring a brighter, stronger future for our Nation.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I express my strong support for House Resolution 51 offered by Mr. LIPINSKI of Illinois. As both a Catholic and product of Catholic schools, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this resolution which recognizes January 28th to February 3rd, 2007, as Catholic Schools Week.

Connecticut's Second Congressional District is home to nearly 30 Catholic elementary and secondary schools. From the southeastern corner of the district in Pawcatuck and Saint Michael's School, to the district's northwestern corner and the Enfield Montessori School, Catholic schools are an important part of the fabric of education in eastern Connecticut. The Archdiocese of Hartford and Diocese of Norwich deserve credit for making its schools accessible throughout the State.

As a graduate of Northwest Catholic High School in West Hartford, Connecticut, I know firsthand the academic rigor and discipline that Catholic schools demand. They provide their students with strong scholastic backgrounds and prepare them for life's many moral challenges.

Catholic schools deserve recognition for their contributions to our country. Today more than 2.4 million students are enrolled in Catholic schools, and 27 percent of those students are from minority backgrounds. Further-

more, Catholic schools emphasize strong community development and service. In my hometown of Vernon, Connecticut, students at St. Joseph School and St. Bernard school are active in the community visiting nursing homes and collecting money and clothes for the less fortunate.

I thank the National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops for designating January 28th to February 3rd, 2007 as Catholic Schools Week. And I thank Mr. LIPINSKI for offering this important resolution. The country's Catholic schools are certainly meritorious of such recognition.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 51, a resolution to honor the contributions of Catholic schools. This timely resolution comes before us during the annual commemoration of Catholic Schools Week, and just days before the National Appreciation Day for Catholic Schools on Wednesday, January 24, 2007. This year's theme, "Catholic Schools: The Good News in Education" accurately describes the positive contribution Catholic schools have made to providing children with quality education within the United States and throughout the world.

The work of the National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops toward coordinating Catholic Schools Week and toward raising general awareness of the contributions Catholic schools have made to our communities is commendable. Together, their efforts have ensured that Catholic Schools Week has remained a success since its inception in 1974.

Catholic schools have fulfilled an important role in this country. The advent of Catholic schools in this country can be traced back as far as 1606, when the priests from the Franciscan order opened a school in Florida. Today, Catholic schools offer comprehensive programs and educational, spiritual, and moral guidance to approximately 2,400,000 students at nearly 8,000 schools across the United States.

The number of racial and ethnic minority students enrolled in Catholic schools in the United States has more than doubled in the past 30 years. Racial and ethnic minority students now comprise 27 percent of the student population at Catholic schools. These statistics are evidence of the commitment to diversity fostered by Catholic schools in the United States. Catholic schools are also known for their academic excellence. Catholic secondary schools in the United States graduate 99 percent of their students, 97 percent of which go on to attend college.

I represent Guam. The Roman Catholic Church has long been an intrinsic part of Guam's culture. In fact, Padre Diego Luis de San Vitores, a Spanish Jesuit missionary, established a mission in the village of Agaña in 1665. Guam's population is approximately 85 percent Roman Catholic. The positive influence of the Roman Catholic Church on Guam is evidenced as a result its service to the needy, its dedication to the community, and its education of our youth.

In 1946, Bishop Appollinaris Baumgartner, recognizing the need for quality education on Guam, invited the Sisters of Mercy from North Carolina to Guam. The Sisters of Mercy established The Academy of Our Lady. The Academy of Our Lady became the first all girls'

Catholic high school on Guam and continues to educate young women today. Three years later, Bishop Baumgartner invited the School Sisters of Notre Dame to Guam. The School Sisters of Notre Dame founded Notre Dame High School, which continues today to provide high-quality Catholic education to young men and women on Guam. Father Dueñas Memorial High School is named in honor of the courageous Father Jesus Baza Dueñas, who was executed by the Imperial Japanese forces occupying Guam during the Second World War for refusing to betray the location of an American sailor hiding on our island. Father Dueñas Memorial High School continues his legacy of courage and integrity. All three of these Catholic high schools offer rigorous curricula to prepare students for college while instilling strong moral values and an understanding of the Catholic faith.

Archbishop Felixberto Camacho Flores, Guam's first Chamorro Bishop, continued Bishop Baumgartner's legacy of shaping the character of Guam's faithful by promoting Catholic education opportunities on our island. Under Archbishop Flores's leadership, the number of Catholic schools serving the people of Guam increased, education programs expanded, and school facilities were modernized. In addition to these three Catholic high schools, Guam is home to four nursery schools, six elementary schools, and six middle schools that teach the Catholic faith in addition to other academic curriculum. Our community knows well the contributions that Catholic schools make toward providing a quality educating to our children.

Catholic schools on Guam and around the country excel in their mission of providing quality and character education to children. Their influence has helped form socially responsible and morally upright graduates who possess the skills, character traits and compassion that help produce good citizens and effective community leaders. On this occasion of the 33rd annual Catholic Schools Week, I recognize and commend the Catholic schools on Guam and throughout the country for their commitment to instilling the principles of academic excellence, strong moral values, and a dedication to and fulfillment of Catholic ideals in our children's daily lives. In particular I recognize in a very special way all of the administrators, the faculty, the staff, the students, the parents, and their families of the greater Catholic School community on Guam. Their work is a testament to the strength of Catholic education on Guam. I also recognize the unfailing leadership of Archbishop Anthony Sablan Apuron, OFM Cap., D.D., the Metropolitan Archbishop of the Archdiocese of Agaña, and Ms. Cynthia S. Agbulos, the Superintendent of Catholic Schools for the Archdiocese of Agaña.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 51.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1430

CONGRATULATING ILLINOIS
STATE UNIVERSITY

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 57) congratulating Illinois State University as it celebrates its sesquicentennial.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 57

Whereas Illinois State University marks its sesquicentennial with a year-long celebration, beginning with Founder's Day on February 15, 2007;

Whereas Illinois State Normal University was founded by Jesse W. Fell in 1857 as Illinois' first public university and was established as a teacher education institution;

Whereas Abraham Lincoln, then an attorney, drafted the bond that guaranteed that the citizens of Bloomington, Illinois, would fulfill pledges to finance the University;

Whereas more than 2,000 staff members provide outstanding support to the educational mission of Illinois State University; and

Whereas Illinois State University has more than 165,000 alumni living around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives congratulate Illinois State University as it celebrates its sesquicentennial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert material relevant to House Resolution 57 into the RECORD and to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of House Resolution 57, a resolution congratulating Illinois State University on 150 years of educating students.

Illinois State Normal University was founded in 1857 as Illinois' first public university and opened with an enrollment of just 43 students. The university's very beginnings were touched by history. Four years prior to his election as President, Abraham Lincoln himself drafted the original bond guaranteeing that the citizens of Bloomington, Illinois, would finance Illinois State.

Originally established as a teachers' college, Illinois State University now

offers undergraduate degrees in more than 160 fields of study and 39 graduate programs.

In 2005, the university enrolled more than 20,000 students, and 83 percent of its new freshmen students were in the top half of their high school graduating class.

Public colleges, as we know, provide a great service by offering affordable options of higher education and encouraging access for minority and low-income students. This role is increasingly important as the cost of attending college continues to increase.

Illinois State University has embodied this spirit of access to higher education in public service. It is not more clear than in its mission statement. And that mission statement reads: "We devote all of our resources and energy to creating the most supportive and productive community possible to serve the citizens of Illinois and beyond."

Illinois State University has graduated many notable alumni who have given back to the university, the State of Illinois, and this country in so many ways. There are an estimated 155,000 Illinois State University alumni living around the world, and many of these students have gone on to great accomplishments, including Thomas Edison's State College president George Pruitt; two-time Academy Award nominee John Malkovich; and former U.N. Ambassador for the U.S., Donald McHenry.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Illinois State University on 150 years of service to their students and alumni, the State of Illinois, and the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to resoundingly pass this resolution.

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 57, a resolution congratulating Illinois State, as it celebrates on February 15 its 150th anniversary of its founding. I would like to thank my good friend, Mr. WELLER of Illinois, for introducing this resolution and recognizing the important role Illinois State University plays in educating the citizens of Illinois and many other States in the Nation.

With more than 20,000 students, Illinois State University is a large-scale university with a small-college feel. Of the 20,000 students, there are 3,000 students enrolled in graduate degree programs. In addition to a number of graduate certificates, Illinois State offers 63 undergraduate programs and over 47 master's degrees, specialist and doctoral degree programs.

Illinois State University has been ranked as one of the 100 best values in public education by Kiplinger's Personal Finance magazine. ISU actually jumped four spots, from 83 to 79, in Kiplinger's newest edition and was only one of two State schools to make the list.

Sixty-six percent of Illinois State University students receive financial

aid, and the school has a low default rate of 2 percent, well under the national default rate of 4.5 percent.

Illinois State also recognizes the importance of educating students to become good teachers. Founded by Jesse Fell in 1847, Illinois State was the first public university in Illinois and was quickly established as a teachers' education institution.

Now, 150 years later, the university is the second largest producer of teacher education degrees in the country. In fact one in seven Illinois teachers holds a degree from Illinois State. Mr. Speaker, Illinois State University is a remarkable institution, and I would like to congratulate all of those students, the alumni and past and present employees on all that they have accomplished over the past 150 years.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution honoring Illinois State University on its 150th anniversary. I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) for sponsoring this resolution.

I want to add my voice as a Representative who has many hundreds of students and alumni from Illinois State University. I want to congratulate all of those associated with the university through those 150 years.

With all of the years of success that they have had, it is a great value, a great part of our public university system in the State of Illinois. As a former college professor, I understand the importance of an education. I know how difficult it is today, especially, to pay for education. Schools like Illinois State give the opportunity for students in Illinois to get a great education at a great value and allow them to pursue so many things as they move forward.

So today I just want to congratulate the students, the alumni, the teachers, the administrators, everyone at Illinois State University on their 150th anniversary.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), the author of this resolution.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 57, a resolution honoring and congratulating Illinois State University on its upcoming 150th-year anniversary. I introduced this resolution with my good friend and colleague, Congressman TIM JOHNSON, with the support of the Illinois delegation.

I am proud to note that the Illinois State University campus is located in the 11th Congressional District which I have the privilege of representing.

On February 15, Illinois State University will start a year-long celebration marking the day that the founder, Jesse W. Fell, took up the campaign of creating the first public institution of

higher education in Illinois and having it housed in the Bloomington-Normal area.

In February of 1857, then-Governor William Bissell signed a bill, legislation creating Normal University, and established the board of education for the State of Illinois as its governing body. After Jesse Fell secured financial backing totaling \$141,000, future President Abraham Lincoln, then acting as attorney for the board, drew up the bond guaranteeing that Bloomington's citizens would fulfill their financial commitments.

Established originally as a teacher education institution, then known as Illinois State Normal University, it has developed into a multipurpose university, recognized around the world with degree programs in the bachelor's, master's and doctoral levels.

Currently, approximately 20,000 undergraduates and post-graduate students attend the university, supported by an outstanding university staff of 3,200 employees.

I would also note that ISU today benefits from the support of over 65,000 alumni living and working around the world.

My colleagues today have shared much about Illinois State University, but here is a few little-known facts. The model for student teaching that today is used nationwide was invented by Illinois State Normal University teacher Cecilla Lauby, who today is 94 years old and still lives in the town of Normal.

One of every eight teachers in Illinois graduated from Illinois State University. Illinois State University's insurance program is so popular and respected that Lloyd's of London sends it executives each year for management training. And as others have noted, Illinois State University has made the Kiplinger list for the 100 top universities in public education three straight times.

Illinois State's physic's program is ranked as one of the top in the country. Illinois State's first president, Charles Hovey, recruited a regimen of teachers to fight in the Civil War.

Illinois State is also the home of the Gamma Phi Circus, the oldest collegiate circus in the United States, which was founded in 1929. That circus today is one of two collegiate circuses in the United States.

Finally, I would note that Watterson Towers dormitory on Illinois State University, is considered one of the tallest college dormitories in the world and is the tallest structure between the cities of Chicago and the City of St. Louis.

Illinois State University has been a model for higher education institutions around this country over the last 150 years. I would like to note a very good friend of mine, Illinois State University's current president, Dr. Al Bowman, and congratulate him, his great staff and all of those affiliated with Illinois State University as they mark this great achievement.

Illinois State University has been a model for higher education institutions around this Nation for the last 150 years. I wish them all the best in their year-long celebration. I also want to thank the chairman of the committee, Chairman MILLER, and Ranking Member MCKEON for allowing this bill to make it to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in wishing Illinois State University congratulations as it marks its 150th anniversary.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers and would close with just urging all my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues from the great State of Illinois representing this resolution, celebrating 150 years of Illinois State University, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 57.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO REVEREND WAITSTILL SHARP AND MARTHA SHARP FOR THEIR HEROIC EFFORTS TO SAVE JEWS DURING THE HOLOCAUST

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 52) paying tribute to Reverend Waitstill Sharp and Martha Sharp for their recognition by the Yad Vashem Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Authority as Righteous Among the Nations for their heroic efforts to save Jews during the Holocaust.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 52

Whereas, on June 13, 2006, the Yad Vashem Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Authority in Israel, an organization dedicated to preserving the memory of Holocaust victims, honored the Reverend Waitstill Sharp, and his wife, Martha Sharp, posthumously as "Righteous Among the Nations" for risking their lives to save Jews during the Holocaust;

Whereas the Sharps had to leave their 2-year-old daughter and 6-year-old son in the care of family and congregants in Wellesley, Massachusetts, to answer a call from leaders of the American Unitarian Association to go to Czechoslovakia in February 1939 to provide humanitarian assistance for the tens of thousands of refugees crowding into Prague;

Whereas Martha Sharp was a social worker trained at the Jane Addams Hull House, a community service organization in Chicago, Illinois, and the Reverend Waitstill Sharp was a Harvard-educated lawyer and a Sunday school teacher who was inspired to become a Unitarian minister;

Whereas, after their arrival in Czechoslovakia, the Sharps immediately grasped that they needed not only to help feed refugees, but also to assist Jews and opponents of the Nazi regime escape to safety elsewhere in Europe;

Whereas the Sharps refused to leave Prague when, in March 1939, a month after the Sharps' arrival, the Nazis occupied Czechoslovakia, making the Sharps' work more urgent, more complicated, and more dangerous;

Whereas the Sharps insisted on continuing their life-saving mission by working out of private residences even after April 1939, when the Nazis ransacked the office of the Unitarian mission in Prague and threw the furniture into the street;

Whereas the Sharps repeatedly risked their own safety to exit and re-enter Nazi-occupied Czechoslovakia, crisscrossed Europe to obtain the travel documents necessary to help Jews and opponents of the Nazi regime escape Czechoslovakia, and even escorted some refugees by train through Germany to the United Kingdom;

Whereas the Sharps were determined to complete their 6-month mission, even after warnings that the Gestapo was searching for them;

Whereas the Sharps stayed in Czechoslovakia until August 30, 1939, 1 day before Gestapo agents came to arrest Martha Sharp, who had become known for her boldness at evading Nazi rules restricting travel;

Whereas, upon the Sharps' return in 1940 to their family and the Wellesley Hills Unitarian Church in Massachusetts, their report to the American Unitarian Association about the imminent danger posed by the Nazis to refugees across Europe led to the Sharps being asked to establish a similar operation in France under the newly founded Unitarian Service Committee;

Whereas the Sharps returned to Europe in 1940 fully aware of the Nazi terror they would face;

Whereas the Sharps had a special interest in saving refugee children, as well as artists, intellectuals, and political dissidents, and the Sharps and the Unitarian colleagues who followed in their footsteps set up systems and escape routes that functioned throughout World War II to assist approximately 2,000 men, women, and children to gain freedom;

Whereas the famous Jewish novelist, Lion Feuchtwanger, who was one of the first Germans to have his citizenship revoked after Hitler came to power and whose name topped the Gestapo's "Surrender on Demand" list, was one of the first people the Sharps helped in a dramatic and dangerous escape from France;

Whereas Eva Rosemarie Feigl, who was 14 in December 1940 when Martha Sharp helped her and 28 other children reach safety in the United States, provided eye-witness testimony that enabled the Yad Vashem Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Authority in Jerusalem, Israel, to honor the Sharps as "Righteous Among the Nations";

Whereas, when the Sharps' plans to set up the first office of the newly formed Unitarian Service Committee in Paris, France, failed as a result of the Nazi occupation of France, the Sharps instead established an operation in neutral Portugal, where throughout World War II Lisbon remained the last hope for refugees seeking safe passage out of Nazi-occupied territory;

Whereas the Sharps recognized that they were dependent upon a much larger circle of friends and colleagues who made their heroism possible, such as the people who cared for the Sharps' children, the members of the congregation in Wellesley, Massachusetts, who maintained the Wellesley Hills Unitarian Church in the Sharps' absence, ordinary Unitarians who financed their cause, ministers across the United States who urged their congregations to become sponsors for refugees, and secretaries who volunteered in Europe and the United States to maintain thousands of case files for refugees;

Whereas the Sharps' efforts resulted not only in the rescue of thousands of people, but in the creation of what is now known as the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee, an institution that multiplied the number of rescues a thousand-fold in the years that followed;

Whereas, at the Yad Vashem ceremony that honored the Sharps as "Righteous Among the Nations" on June 13, 2006, in Israel, officials specifically recognized the Sharps' courage in going into the heart of Europe when World War II was unfolding and many people were fleeing;

Whereas Martha Sharp was the first American woman to be named "Righteous Among the Nations", and the Reverend Waitstill Sharp and Martha Sharp were only the second and third individuals named "Righteous Among the Nations" who were United States citizens at the time they performed the deeds for which they were honored;

Whereas the Sharps' daughter, Martha Sharp Joukowsky, accepted the Yad Vashem honor on behalf of her parents and remarked that they were "modest and ordinary people, who responded to the suffering and needs around them . . . as they would have expected everyone to do in a similar situation";

Whereas Martha Sharp Joukowsky added that the honor given to her parents is also about "the unseen efforts of a much wider circle of people who made their work possible" and that it "is the kind of network that is needed again today to stop the slow genocide in Darfur";

Whereas Martha Sharp Joukowsky concluded her remarks by saying, "Let this celebration about my parents stand as a call to action";

Whereas September 9, 2006, marks the second anniversary of the United States Government declaring the violence in Darfur, Sudan, to be genocide; and

Whereas the Sharps deserve honor for their example and for helping to found an institution, the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee, that today carries on their work in distant corners of the world and asks for the "Righteous Among the Nations" to help save Darfur now: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the Reverend Waitstill Sharp and Martha Sharp as genuine American heroes;

(2) pays tribute to the Reverend Waitstill Sharp and Martha Sharp for having their names added to the Wall of Rescuers in the permanent exhibition of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum on September 14, 2006;

(3) commends the organization founded to support the Sharps' work, the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee, for its efforts to rescue Jews and opponents of the Nazi regime in Europe from 1939 to 1945 and for carrying on the Sharps' legacy by working to save the lives of the people of Darfur, Sudan, and to protect human rights worldwide; and

(4) requests the Clerk of the House of Representatives to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the Joukowsky family of Providence, Rhode Island, the direct de-

scendants of the Reverend Waitstill Sharp and Martha Sharp, and to the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee of Cambridge, Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like first to recognize the outstanding efforts of the sponsor of this important measure, Congressman JAMES MCGOVERN, my good friend from Massachusetts, the distinguished member of the Rules Committee, who represents the area where the Reverend Waitstill Sharp, and his wife, Martha Sharp, who are honored in this resolution, lived.

Recently, the Holocaust Remembrance Authority in Jerusalem honored the Reverend Waitstill Sharp and his wife, Martha, posthumously, as Righteous Among the Nations, for risking their lives to save Jews during the Holocaust.

□ 1445

They are only the second and third Americans to be so honored. Varian Fry, a distinguished American diplomat with whom the Sharps worked, was the first to be so honored.

Mr. Speaker, the Sharps' story is one of courage and caring at vast personal sacrifice. They answered the call from the American Unitarian Association and left their two young children behind to travel to Europe twice to save the lives of Jews who were being persecuted and eventually killed. They spent many months in Czechoslovakia in 1939, returned to the United States for a brief period, and then in 1940 again went back to Europe under the auspices of the newly founded Unitarian Universalist Service Committee to aid more people in escaping the horror of the Nazi regime.

In all, as a result of the efforts of the Reverend and Mrs. Sharp and their Unitarian colleagues, over 2,000 men, women and children were saved from the Nazi death machine.

Mr. Speaker, it is particularly appropriate that this House acknowledge the selfless and courageous actions of the Sharps at this time. In just a few days, on January 27, men and women around the globe will commemorate the Second International Holocaust Remembrance Day.

On November 1, 2005, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution and designated January 27 as an annual International Day of Commemoration in Memory of the Victims of the Holocaust. This action was strongly endorsed and supported by my good friend, Kofi Annan, the recently retired Secretary General of the United Nations.

January 27 was chosen as the day for this commemoration each year because January 27 was the date on which the Nazi death camp at Auschwitz was liberated by Allied troops in 1945 in the closing days of the Second World War. Two years ago on the 50th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, along with the chronicler of the Holocaust Elie Wiesel and his wife, my wife Annette and I had the honor to be members of the United States delegation at Auschwitz representing our Nation at the solemn ceremonies marking that historic event with heads of state, diplomats, world leaders, and, most importantly, survivors of the Nazi atrocities.

Mr. Speaker, the U.N. General Assembly resolution adopted 14 months ago urges every country to honor the memory of the victims of the Holocaust and encourages the development of educational programs on Holocaust history as part of our firm resolve to prevent genocides in the future.

When this resolution was adopted, Secretary General Kofi Annan said, and I quote, "There can be no reversing the unique tragedy of the Holocaust. It must be remembered with shame and horror for as long as human memory continues. Only by remembering can we pay fitting tribute to the victims. Millions of innocent Jews and members of other minorities were murdered in the most barbarous ways imaginable. We must never forget those men, women and children or their agony."

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we remember the horror and the reality of the Holocaust. A recent poll taken in the United Kingdom, one of the most advanced countries on the face of this planet, revealed the shocking ignorance of the Holocaust among young children in Britain. The poll reported that 28 percent of 18-to-29-year-olds were not certain that the Holocaust took place. This is both incredible and deeply disturbing. And I fear that the United Kingdom is not the only country where such results could be found.

Even more disturbing are political phenomena like Iranian President Ahmadinejad who claim that the murder of 6 million Jews and others targeted by the Nazis and their collaborators during World War II was fabricated. This same Iranian leader recently convened a so-called "conference" in Tehran to bring together other Holocaust deniers.

As the only survivor of the Holocaust ever elected to Congress, I am outraged at attempts to deny what I experienced and witnessed firsthand. The Holocaust, Mr. Speaker, did take place, and

6 million innocent men, women and children were massacred in this horrific genocide.

International Holocaust Remembrance Day is a time for all of us to remember and to honor the victims, but it is also a time to remember those like the Reverend Waitstill and Martha Sharp, recognized as Righteous Among the Nations, who heroically stood up in the face of unspeakable evil and said “no” to the horrors of the Nazi genocide. They and the decent people who helped them deserve our gratitude, recognition, and admiration.

The Sharps’ remarkable story is a powerful reminder that all of us have a moral obligation to take action to end violence and to prevent and stop genocide, genocide which today is taking place in Darfur. We must educate our young people who do not know the significance of the Holocaust, and we must fight against the revisionist historians and phony leaders like Ahmadinejad. The world must be reminded that the Holocaust in fact did occur, that millions suffered untold agony and died.

Mr. Speaker, recent atrocities like Rwanda and Darfur in Sudan remind us that our pledge “Never Again” has not been fulfilled. Let us learn from the Reverend Sharp and his courageous wife to have the fortitude and foresight to act against such evil.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to be on this floor following the words of our chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee Mr. LANTOS, the loan survivor in Congress of the Holocaust, and I echo all of his sentiments.

I also wish to commend my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), for offering this resolution.

Although we come to the floor and pass resolutions, and sometimes we don’t take the time to read them, I hope that all of my colleagues do read this inspirational story of the Sharp family and the way that they helped so many flee the Nazi atrocities, and I rise today in strong support of Mr. MCGOVERN’s resolution.

It recognizes Reverend Waitstill Sharp and his wife Martha Sharp as genuine American heroes. Further, it pays tribute to the Reverend Sharp and his wife Martha for having their names added to the Wall of Rescuers in the permanent exhibit of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum on September 14 of this year.

It further commends the organization founded to support the Sharps’ work, the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee, for its role in rescuing Jews and opponents of the Nazi regime in Europe from the years 1939 to 1945, as well as carrying on to this day the legacy of the Sharps by working to save the lives of people in places like

Darfur, Sudan, and to protect human rights worldwide.

Furthermore, it requests that a copy of this resolution be provided to the direct descendants of these courageous individuals in remembrance of their valiant efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the Sharp family is an example for all to emulate. They demonstrated unparalleled courage in the face of Nazi aggression by providing relief and humanitarian assistance to Jewish refugees, particularly children, and to establish escape routes that were the difference between life and death for many Jews during the Holocaust. They deserve to be honored and they deserve to be remembered today and always.

Elie Wiesel has said that he decided to devote his life to telling the story of the Holocaust because, in his words, “Having survived, I owe something to the dead, and anyone who does not remember betrays them again.”

We would be betraying the victims as well as the survivors if we did not also remember and honor those who risked their own lives to save the lives of others. For this reason, I ask my colleagues to render their full support to the resolution before us.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I commend my good friend from Florida for her eloquent and powerful statement.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield such time as he may consume to my dear friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the author of this resolution, senior member of our Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee for bringing to the floor today H. Res. 52, legislation that pays tribute to the Reverend Waitstill Sharp and his wife Martha, the couple who fought genocide. I also want to express my gratitude to both of my colleagues for their eloquent words in support of this legislation.

Last year on September 14, I was privileged to join the wife of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Annette Lantos, at a ceremony held at the U.S. Holocaust Museum in Washington, D.C., honoring the Reverend Waitstill and Martha Sharp as they became the second and third Americans to be added to the honor roll of 21,000 Righteous Gentiles and non-Jews whose efforts saved countless lives during the Holocaust. At that ceremony we were joined by family members of the Sharps in honoring the memory of this distinguished husband and wife team.

Mr. Speaker, on that same day The Washington Post wrote an article about the Sharps, calling them “The Couple Who Fought Genocide” and I would like to share with my colleagues excerpts from that article:

“As the Nazis marched across Europe in 1939 and 1940, a Unitarian minister from Massachusetts and his wife rushed into the coming Holocaust to save Jews and other refugees, including scores of children. When they set out for Europe in January 1939, Germany had seized the Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia and refugees were flowing across the continent. The American Unitarian Association asked numerous ministers to go to Europe before Waitstill, 37, and his social worker wife, Martha, 33, agreed.

“Prague, Czechoslovakia, was home to one of the world’s largest Unitarian congregations, which was helping refugees of all stripes—Jews, trade unionists, political dissenters, and others. The Sharps arrived to lend a hand in February 1939, and 1 month later, the city was occupied by the Nazis.

“On March 15, 1939, the day the Germans took Prague, Martha Sharp guided an anti-Nazi leader to asylum at the British Embassy. A few days later, the Reverend Waitstill Sharp arranged for a member of the Czech Parliament to be smuggled out of a hospital morgue in a body bag. The Nazis soon closed the Sharps’ office and threw their furniture into the street, but the couple stayed another 5 months and got out just ahead of the Gestapo.

“On their second foray to Europe, they worked in Marseilles, France, and helped smuggle across the Pyrenees into neutral Portugal. One of their close collaborators was Varian Fry, a 32-year-old New York editor who devoted himself to saving European intellectuals and who was the first U.S. citizen placed by Yad Vashem on its ‘Righteous Among the Nations’ honor roll, which includes Oskar Schindler and Raoul Wallenberg.

“Since the Sharps burned most of their records to keep them out of Nazi hands, no one knows how many lives they actually saved. Their grandson, Artemis Joukowsky, III, of Boston, estimates they helped 3,500 refugees in Prague, though it is unclear how many survived. In Marseilles, they pioneered routes that hundreds used to escape.

“Marianne Scheckler-Feder of Laguna Hills, California, has a fuzzy but enduring memory of Martha Sharp, reinforced by a fading black-and-white photograph taken on a sun-dappled street in the French port of Marseilles.

□ 1500

“‘I remember a figure. She was a very, very elegant lady. Kind of serious and very concerned. You looked up to her. She demanded respect,’ Scheckler-Feder said, who is now 79 years old.

“Thousands of refugees from across Europe had flocked to Marseilles in hopes of gaining passage abroad, only to be interned in work camps when France surrendered to Germany in 1940 and the Nazis set up a collaborationist government in Vichy. Scheckler-Feder was 12. She was one of three Jewish sisters, nearly identical triplets, who had fled with their parents from Vienna, a bare step ahead of the Nazis.

“Marseilles was the end of the road, the end of hope, until they met Martha Sharp. She pestered Vichy officials to issue exit visas for 29 children, including nine Jews. With almost as much difficulty, she persuaded our State Department, which was rife with anti-Semitism at that time, to let the children and 10 adults into the United States.

“Sheckler-Feder and her sisters traveled by train to Lisbon and sailed in December 1940 aboard the *Excambion*, a ship stripped of all furnishings except sleeping bags, blankets, and pillows to accommodate as many passengers as possible. Their parents eventually followed.

“Sheckler-Feder has no doubt that were it not for Martha Sharp, her family would have perished: ‘What she did for us is outstanding. It will never be forgotten.’”

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to have introduced this bill with the esteemed chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Congressman TOM LANTOS, along with House Members of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, Representatives CANTOR, LATOURETTE, and WAXMAN, the Members of the House congressional delegations representing Rhode Island and Massachusetts, and other bipartisan co-sponsors.

I want to thank Speaker NANCY PELOSI and the majority leader and the minority leader, JOHN BOEHNER, for supporting this consideration on the Suspension Calendar.

It is my hope that all of us in this House will not only pay tribute to the memory and legacy of Reverend Waitstill and Martha Sharp but will recognize the example they set. There are many urgent situations confronting our world today where people's lives are in grave danger. Many people in communities even face the threat of genocide, as is the case in Darfur. I hope that we can learn from the Sharps' example that each of us can make a difference, can save the lives of others, and all we have to do is step up and answer the call. It is my hope that the inspiration of the Sharps will compel our government and other civilized governments across this world into taking more proactive and more effective steps to stop the genocide that is now going on in the Sudan.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to pass this resolution. Again, I want to thank my friend Mr. LANTOS and my friend Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN for their eloquent words of support.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, again I congratulate Mr. MCGOVERN for authoring this important resolution. And that selfless and giving nature of the American spirit as exemplified by this tremendous family is alive and well with so many people trying to stop the genocide in Darfur and in other dark places of the globe.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 52, which honors Rev. Waitstill Sharp and Martha Sharp for their outstanding heroism during the Holo-

caust. Although the couple lived safely with their two children in Massachusetts in 1939, both felt a calling to provide aid to those in need overseas. They traveled to Czechoslovakia and began providing food for the refugees fleeing the Nazi regime. However, when they arrived, the Nazis invaded Czechoslovakia and the situation grew more dangerous.

Instead of returning home, they found that they could better serve those in harm's way by helping them escape from the region. Despite the numerous life-risking situations and constant pursuit by the Gestapo, the couple stayed and succeeded in helping over 2,000 people escape danger throughout World War II.

I am pleased that they received official recognition as “Righteous Among Nations” last June, in the Yad Vashem ceremony in Israel, for truly their righteous actions are unparalleled, and we are incredibly honored to call them our fellow citizens. The Sharps were some of the first Americans to receive the award, setting an incredible example of righteousness and good will for all who follow them.

In addition, I would like to note the powerful words of their daughter, Martha Sharp Joukowsky, who accepted the award on their behalf. She reminded us that her parents' actions represent “the unseen efforts of a much wider circle of people who made their work possible” and that this “is the kind of network that is needed again today to stop the slow genocide in Darfur.” Sadly, we must recognize that suffering and oppression does not end with one war or one crisis in our past but continues into our present day. In order to truly pay tribute to the Sharps, we must acknowledge our present condition. So I urge my colleagues, as they remember the Sharps today, to also remember the urgency of the devastating situation in Darfur. I am sure if they were alive today, they would devote all their efforts to save the people there from this modern-day Holocaust.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 52, to honor Reverend and Mrs. Sharp for their heroic rescue efforts during World War II.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 52, legislation paying tribute to Reverend Waitstill and Martha Sharp, an American couple who left the comfort and safety of their home in Massachusetts to save the lives of Jews in danger of being killed during the Holocaust.

Waitstill Sharp was a Unitarian minister and his wife Martha was a social worker.

In the late 1930s, amid the horrors of the Holocaust and a refugee crisis in Europe, the American Unitarian Association asked numerous ministers to cross the Atlantic and offer assistance. The Sharps agreed, despite the dangers and despite having young children at home whom they would have to leave behind in the care of friends and neighbors and members of their congregation.

In February 1939, the Sharps arrived in Prague, Czechoslovakia, where one of the world's largest Unitarian congregations was assisting Jewish refugees and others who opposed the Nazis, including trade unionists and political dissenters. A month later, the Germans occupied Prague, increasing the urgency of the Sharps' mission but also the risk. They remained in Prague almost six months.

Through their courage, creativity and persistence they were able to lead hundreds of people, likely thousands, to safety.

They again heeded the call to action, returning to Europe in 1940, this time based in Marseilles, France, where they helped smuggle people across the Pyrenees into neutral Portugal. The escape routes that they established enabled hundreds of refugees to survive.

Among those whom the Sharps saved from persecution and slaughter at the hands of the Nazis were many children, including Jewish children who are now elderly, living freely in America, and remember with gratitude the couple who saved their lives almost 70 years ago.

I should note that the Sharps and others who worked to save Jews not only had to worry about the Nazis and the Gestapo, Vichy officials, collaborators and informers but also had to overcome bureaucracy and anti-Semitism even among the U.S. State Department. Historians have documented that inaction, indifference, failures and even outright hostility by American officials resulted in the tragic death of Jews during the Holocaust.

But today we do not dwell on this; instead we honor the Sharps for persevering despite such obstacles and adversity.

Some of the Sharps' surviving relatives and admirers claim they were merely ordinary people who did what anyone would have done in the face of suffering. While I would like to believe that all people of compassion would come to the aid of people in need, especially when lives are at stake, sadly I know that is not the case. It was not true during the Holocaust, and it is not true today as millions of people in America and around the world suffer poverty, hunger, disease and even genocide and yet still not enough is being done to help them.

The special and extraordinary nature of the Sharps' actions is clear by the rare and high honors they have deservedly received.

In June 2006, the Yad Vashem Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Authority in Israel honored Reverend Waitstill Sharp and Martha Sharp posthumously as “Righteous Among the Nations” for risking their lives to save Jews during the Holocaust.

And in September 2006, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C. honored the Sharps.

There were definitely other brave, compassionate people who were inspired by their faith, values or their sense of right and wrong and therefore took steps, both small and large, to help Jews during the Holocaust. Some provided food and shelter, some refused to inform on their neighbors or cooperate with authorities enforcing murderous policies, some actively resisted against the Nazis, and some helped transport Jews to safety. But this was not the norm in Europe during the Holocaust. And we know the tragic, horrific results: over 6 million Jewish men, women and children perished.

So today we acknowledge the Sharps as American heroes, and I would add as heroes of humanity. Martha Sharp is the first American woman—and she and Waitstill are only the second and third Americans—to be added to the honor roll of 21,000 “righteous” gentiles, or non-Jews, whose efforts saved countless lives during the Holocaust.

We also commend the Unitarian Universality Service Committee. UUSC was founded to

support the Sharps' work and helped rescue Jews and other refugees from Nazi persecution. The organization has continued to do good work in support of human rights all over the world and is actively engaged in efforts to stop the genocide in Darfur, Sudan.

As we honor the Sharps, let us be inspired by their heroic example and let us all commit ourselves to doing what we can—and what we must—to bring an end to human suffering.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 52.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PRESERVATION OF RECORDS OF SERVITUDE, EMANCIPATION, AND POST-CIVIL WAR RECONSTRUCTION ACT

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 390) to require the establishment of a national database in the National Archives to preserve records of servitude, emancipation, and post-Civil War reconstruction and to provide grants to State and local entities to establish similar local databases.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 390

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 "Preservation of Records of Servitude, Emancipation, and Post-Civil War Reconstruction Act".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL DATABASE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Archivist of the United States shall preserve relevant records and establish, as part of the National Archives, an electronically searchable national database consisting of historic records of servitude, emancipation, and post-Civil War reconstruction, including the Southern Claims Commission Records, Records of the Freedmen's Bank, Slave Impressments Records, Slave Payroll Records, Slave Manifest, and others, contained within the agencies and departments of the Federal Government to assist African Americans and others in conducting genealogical and historical research.

(b) MAINTENANCE.—The database established under this section shall be maintained by the National Archives or an entity within the National Archives designated by the Archivist.

SEC. 3. GRANTS FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF STATE AND LOCAL DATABASES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Historical Publications and Records Commission of the

National Archives shall provide grants to States, colleges and universities, and genealogical associations to preserve records and establish electronically searchable databases consisting of local records of servitude, emancipation, and post-Civil War reconstruction.

(b) MAINTENANCE.—The databases established using grants provided under this section shall be maintained by appropriate agencies or institutions designated by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated—

- (1) \$5,000,000 to implement section 2; and
- (2) \$5,000,000 to provide grants under section 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 390.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 390, which authorizes the National Archives to preserve historical documents relating to servitude, emancipation, and post-Civil War reconstruction. Introduced by my friend, Representative LANTOS of California, the bill calls on the Archives to place these documents in a searchable electronic database for use in historical and genealogical research.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 390 and chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee on Information Policy, Census, and National Archives, I am pleased to see the measure presented for consideration by the House today. Under this legislation, grants will be made available to States, colleges and universities, and genealogical associations to preserve similar records in their possession and make them available electronically. The bill will for the first time make a wide range of historical documents relating to servitude, emancipation, and post-Civil War reconstruction easily accessible and searchable. This will vastly improve the ability of African Americans to research their lineage. It will also facilitate the efforts of historians performing research into this period of American history.

An identical version of this bill was approved unanimously by the Committee on Government Reform last year. And as someone with a deep appreciation of African American and American history, I am honored to support its passage today.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 390, the Preservation of Records of Servitude, Emancipation, and Post-Civil War Reconstruction Act, legislation which would establish a grant program, as outlined just a moment ago by Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 390 would authorize the creation of a national database within the National Archives to include records of servitude, emancipation, and post-Civil War reconstruction held by Federal agencies. These records include: the Southern Claims Commission Records, Records of the Freedmen's Bank, Slave Impressment Records, Slave Payroll Records, and Slave Manifests.

Many of these records are not organized, catalogued, or well protected from the elements. H.R. 390 will not only make these documents more accessible to the public but will preserve them as well. H.R. 390 continues the important preservation efforts begun under the Freedmen's Bureau Records Preservation Act of 2000. The creation of a searchable database will help African Americans conduct genealogical research and learn more about their families' history.

In addition, the national database will help historians and others interested in the Civil War and post-Civil War eras to conduct research that promises to reveal more about the history and culture of the South and the African American experience. Similar records of servitude, emancipation, and post-Civil War reconstruction are held by local and State entities.

H.R. 390 authorizes the National Archives to provide grants to States, universities, and genealogical associations to digitally preserve their records through the creation of searchable databases. The digital preservation of these important historical documents and improved accessibility to them will ensure that they are available to future generations of Americans.

I think this is legislation that all my colleagues can support, and I urge support for H.R. 390.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of this legislation, Representative LANTOS.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank my dear friend, the distinguished chairman of the committee, for yielding me time and for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, last week our Nation paused to remember and to recognize the extraordinary life and achievements of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Today I rise in strong support of H.R. 390, the Preservation of Records of Servitude, Emancipation, and Post-Civil War Reconstruction Act, which will help eliminate a little-known and rarely recognized vestige of slavery. This important legislation, which passed the Government Reform Committee last

year by a unanimous vote, will open the way for African Americans to trace their ancestry from the critical period immediately following the end of slavery in this country.

Mr. Speaker, for most Americans, researching their genealogical history involves searching through various historical records, almost all of which have been properly archived as public historical documents. Unfortunately, African Americans face a unique challenge due to our Nation's history of discrimination and slavery. Instead of simply looking up wills, birth and death certificates, or other traditional genealogical research documents, African Americans are forced to identify the names of former slave owners and then hope that these owners kept accurate records of pertinent property tax and probate information.

Compounding the difficulty of this problem, Mr. Speaker, is that many of these records of servitude and emancipation are frequently inaccessible, stored in farmhouses and schools throughout the South. Even when researchers are able to locate the records, they find them poorly catalogued and inadequately preserved from deterioration and decay.

While some States and some localities have undertaken efforts to collect these documents, and they need to be commended for their endeavors, a national effort to preserve these important pieces of public and personal history is necessary to ensure that they are readily and easily accessible to all Americans.

H.R. 390, my legislation, builds on the success of the Freedmen's Bureau Records Preservation Act, which Congress passed and the President signed into law 6 years ago. That law required the archivists of the United States to catalogue the genealogical and historical records into a searchable indexing system and was the first step toward ensuring easy access. Passing H.R. 390 is the next step necessary to complete this preservation project for our entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, my bill tackles the problems of poorly catalogued and inadequately preserved records in two ways. First, it will make sure that the records of servitude, emancipation, and post-Civil War reconstruction currently being stored within the various agencies of the Federal Government will be properly preserved and accessible in a single electronic site. Second, the searchable index will allow individuals to access information in seconds rather than months or years to build their own personal histories.

□ 1515

Since many of these records are held in non-Federal public and private collections around the country, my legislation authorizes the National Archives to distribute grants to the States, academic institutions, and genealogical associations to locate, preserve, and establish on-line data-

bases of these important records. These grants will ensure that families doing research in my home State of California or anywhere in the country will be able to find post-Civil War reconstruction items easily accessible in a single electronic site. The searchable index will allow individuals to access information in mere seconds.

The Federal and local records covered by my legislation are not only of personal importance to the families involved, Mr. Speaker, they are historically significant to all of us. They document the reuniting of our Nation and the historic moment of transition for slaves from the status of property to citizens, a time when our country finally began to right a horrible moral wrong. We need to take the process another step now by ensuring that those records and the lessons they hold are preserved for all eternity.

I want to thank Chairman WAXMAN and Ranking Member TOM DAVIS, both cosponsors of my legislation, for their continued support of this measure. I also want to thank my friend and colleague ELLIJAH CUMMINGS for all his efforts on this important measure. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense recognition that justice at long last must be made.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) for their work on this very important legislation. It has been an honor for me to manage this for the minority.

Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers. I urge support of H.R. 390, and yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to thank my good friend from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for his leadership on this issue. We appreciate it. I want to commend my good friend from California (Mr. LANTOS) for sponsoring this bill that will catalog and preserve these records from a time long ago.

Being a history enthusiast, I believe the adage that a people who don't know their history are doomed to repeat it, and I urge the House to pass the bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 390, the Preservation of Records of Servitude, Emancipation, and Post-Civil War Reconstruction Act. I support H.R. 390 because it will protect a vast amount of genealogical information from this period in our Nation's history. This bill authorizes the National Archives to do two things: (1) to use necessary resources to preserve, maintain and electronically catalogue these important records, and (2) to distribute grants to the States, academic institutions, and genealogical associations in order to preserve and establish online databases of their own important local records.

While most Americans can learn about their genealogy through already well-archived documents like certificates of birth, death, or marriage, African-Americans have more difficulty with this, due to our Nation's history of slavery and discrimination. African-Americans seeking information about their ancestors must instead

turn to less well-archived records such as documents written by former slave owners. These records are often not very accessible, disorganized, or in poor condition, and so it is important that we make every effort to adequately archive the familial records of so many of our Nations' citizens.

This bill would be the first national effort to preserve and protect this important part of our nation's history, and I thank Mr. LANTOS, the gentleman from California, for introducing it.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill, and I look forward to seeing it passed.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Preservation of Records of Servitude, Emancipation, and Post-Civil War Reconstruction Act.

The House of Representatives is truly a body of history. Each day we walk through the Capitol and stand where our Nation's first Members of Congress debated hundreds of years ago. Statues, plaques and paintings remind us of the past and inspire our future. In fact, every day history is recorded on the House floor through the records of our statements.

We must not underestimate the importance of our Nation's past and our individual history. For many African Americans identifying their history and researching genealogy becomes challenging due to a lack of organized records. Many African Americans are left with piecing together records of their ancestors left from former slave owners or searching for information from the post-Civil War reconstruction. Many of these records are unorganized, inaccessible and quickly decaying. We need a national effort to preserve these pieces of public and personal history or to make them readily and easily accessible to all Americans.

Under this bill the Federal Government will maintain an organized system for preserving the records of servitude, emancipation, and the post-Civil War. These records will include Southern Claims Commission Records, Records of the Freedmen's Bank, Slave Impressments Records, Slave Payroll Records, and Slave Manifests. This will go a long way towards preserving our past, and helping individuals discover their history as well.

I urge my colleagues who everyday participate in this Nation's history to extend that dedication to preserving our past to vote for this important piece of legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SARBANES). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 390.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1753

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN) at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1820

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN) at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

CONGRESSIONAL PENSION
ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 476) to amend title 5, United States Code, to make noncreditable for Federal retirement purposes any Member service performed by an individual who is convicted of any of certain offenses committed by that individual while serving as a Member of Congress, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 476

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

SECTION 1. LOSS OF PENSIONS ACCRUED DURING SERVICE AS A MEMBER OF CONGRESS FOR ABUSING THE PUBLIC TRUST.

(a) CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—Section 8332 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(o)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subchapter, the service of an individual finally convicted of an offense described in paragraph (2) shall not be taken into account for purposes of this subchapter, except that this sentence applies only to service rendered as a Member (irrespective of when rendered). Any such individual (or other person determined under section 8342(c), if applicable) shall be entitled to be paid so much of such individual's lump-sum credit as is attributable to service to which the preceding sentence applies.

“(2)(A) An offense described in this paragraph is any offense described in subparagraph (B) for which the following apply:

“(i) Every act or omission of the individual (referred to in paragraph (1)) that is needed

to satisfy the elements of the offense occurs while the individual is a Member.

“(ii) Every act or omission of the individual that is needed to satisfy the elements of the offense directly relates to the performance of the individual's official duties as a Member.

“(iii) The offense is committed after the date of enactment of this subsection.

“(B) An offense described in this subparagraph is only the following, and only to the extent that the offense is a felony under title 18:

“(i) An offense under section 201 of title 18 (bribery of public officials and witnesses).

“(ii) An offense under section 219 of title 18 (officers and employees acting as agents of foreign principals).

“(iii) An offense under section 371 of title 18 (conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States), to the extent of any conspiracy to commit an act which constitutes—

“(I) an offense under clause (i) or (ii); or

“(II) an offense under section 207 of title 18 (restrictions on former officers, employees, and elected officials of the executive and legislative branches).

“(iv) Perjury committed under section 1621 of title 18 in falsely denying the commission of an act which constitutes—

“(I) an offense under clause (i) or (ii); or

“(II) an offense under clause (iii), to the extent provided in such clause.

“(v) Subornation of perjury committed under section 1622 of title 18 in connection with the false denial or false testimony of another individual as specified in clause (iv).

“(3) An individual convicted of an offense described in paragraph (2) shall not, after the date of the final conviction, be eligible to participate in the retirement system under this subchapter or chapter 84 while serving as a Member.

“(4) The Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe any regulations necessary to carry out this subsection. Such regulations shall include—

“(A) provisions under which interest on any lump-sum payment under the second sentence of paragraph (1) shall be limited in a manner similar to that specified in the last sentence of section 8316(b); and

“(B) provisions under which the Office may provide for—

“(i) the payment, to the spouse or children of any individual referred to in the first sentence of paragraph (1), of any amounts which (but for this clause) would otherwise have been nonpayable by reason of such first sentence, but only to the extent that the application of this clause is considered necessary given the totality of the circumstances; and

“(ii) an appropriate adjustment in the amount of any lump-sum payment under the second sentence of paragraph (1) to reflect the application of clause (i).

“(5) For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘Member’ has the meaning given such term by section 2106, notwithstanding section 8331(2); and

“(B) the term ‘child’ has the meaning given such term by section 8341.”

(b) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—Section 8411 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, the service of an individual finally convicted of an offense described in paragraph (2) shall not be taken into account for purposes of this chapter, except that this sentence applies only to service rendered as a Member (irrespective of when rendered). Any such individual (or other person determined under section 8424(d), if applicable) shall be entitled to be paid so much of such individual's lump-sum

credit as is attributable to service to which the preceding sentence applies.

“(2) An offense described in this paragraph is any offense described in section 8332(o)(2)(B) for which the following apply:

“(A) Every act or omission of the individual (referred to in paragraph (1)) that is needed to satisfy the elements of the offense occurs while the individual is a Member.

“(B) Every act or omission of the individual that is needed to satisfy the elements of the offense directly relates to the performance of the individual's official duties as a Member.

“(C) The offense is committed after the date of enactment of this subsection.

“(3) An individual convicted of an offense described in paragraph (2) shall not, after the date of the final conviction, be eligible to participate in the retirement system under this chapter while serving as a Member.

“(4) The Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe any regulations necessary to carry out this subsection. Such regulations shall include—

“(A) provisions under which interest on any lump-sum payment under the second sentence of paragraph (1) shall be limited in a manner similar to that specified in the last sentence of section 8316(b); and

“(B) provisions under which the Office may provide for—

“(i) the payment, to the spouse or children of any individual referred to in the first sentence of paragraph (1), of any amounts which (but for this clause) would otherwise have been nonpayable by reason of such first sentence, but only to the extent that the application of this clause is considered necessary given the totality of the circumstances; and

“(ii) an appropriate adjustment in the amount of any lump-sum payment under the second sentence of paragraph (1) to reflect the application of clause (i).

“(5) For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘Member’ has the meaning given such term by section 2106, notwithstanding section 8401(20); and

“(B) the term ‘child’ has the meaning given such term by section 8341.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today was introduced by my distinguished colleague, Representative NANCY BOYDA from Kansas. It represents part of a continuing effort by the Democratic leadership to clean up the ethics outrage left over by the Abramoff scandal.

The fundamental concept of this bill is simple. If Members of Congress are convicted of engaging in illegal behavior during the performance of official duties, then in addition to going to jail, their public pension will be eliminated. The language was included in the Republican lobby reform bill last year. The only difference is one enhancement responsive to Senate concerns. We have added language to deny pension benefits to Members who ask others to lie for them, or help them cover up their crime.

Applying this penalty to those convicted of corruption is another step toward comprehensive ethics reform and restoring the public trust in Congress.

It goes without saying that no one should ever violate their oath of office. No one in this body should ever engage in criminal conduct. Such conduct distorts the people's business and leads to the formulation of bad public policy. It breaks the social contract that Americans have with one another, and with their elected leaders. Such conduct demoralizes the Nation, and it damages the reputation of this great institution.

The bill before us represents one step toward discouraging illegal and unethical abuses of our office. As a consequence of enacting this bill, Members hopefully will think twice before stepping over the line.

The Boyda pension forfeiture bill denies a congressional pension to any Member of Congress who is convicted of certain felonies and who has exhausted all appeals. It does not apply to a Member's own contributions to the retirement system.

The covered felonies include: Bribery of public officials and witnesses; acting as foreign agent; conspiracy to commit the above offenses, or conspiracy to violate the postemployment restrictions; perjury by falsely denying any of the above-listed crimes; and subornation of perjury by getting someone else to lie or cover up for you.

Every act constituting any of the above felonies: Must have occurred while the Member is in office; must directly relate to a Member's official duties; and must take place after the date of enactment.

Any element of a crime leading to a final conviction can occur at any time after enactment. So passage of this initiative, Mr. Speaker, puts every current and future Member on notice that there will be an additional price to pay for criminal behavior while holding an office of public trust.

Now does this bill go too far or not far enough? I have heard it argued both ways. Some say that more crimes should be included. Others ask: "Why should a criminal's spouse or child be eligible for the criminal's forgone pension?" Some argue that prosecutors should be empowered to use pension forfeiture as a negotiating tool. Others argue that judges should be able to adjust pension forfeiture to fit the crime, and there are many more such questions and thoughts.

I will tell you now that this policy is an important step, but it is only a first step. It is a way to lay down the law. It is a way to tell the public that we reject criminal behavior while in office. It is a way to tell the American people that we are serious about addressing illegal and unethical behavior by our colleagues. And it is a way to get this pension forfeiture penalty enacted. No, it is not perfect, but it moves us in the right direction.

You will hear arguments that it doesn't go far enough, that previously convicted Members should not presently be allowed pensions. And while I am not unsympathetic with the under-

lying sentiment, we are prohibited, as legislators, from passing *ex post facto* laws, which criminalize or penalize past behavior, which is again a violation of the Constitution.

You will hear arguments that more types of criminal behavior should be covered. One of my colleagues indicated last Friday that more types of criminal behavior should be covered. Up until this point, pension forfeiture has only applied to treason and espionage and related offenses. So this is a big step. We are extending pension forfeiture to cover those offenses that lie at the heart of violations of the public trust and relate to the performance of official congressional duties. We are not applying this to others in the executive branch, so this is without precedent.

You will hear arguments that an innocent spouse or child should be punished along with the criminal. On balance, I don't think that is good policy. It may satisfy one's desire for revenge, but if you believe in individual responsibility, then you don't punish an innocent person for another's bad behavior just because they are related by marriage or parentage. I think we need to take a look at this principle in other situations as well, but today we are looking at it in the context of criminal behavior by Members of Congress.

The American people are rightly outraged by elected officials' criminal acts, but the American people are also humane and understanding. Although the first response to this outrage is likely to be "throw the bum in jail," most Americans will not countenance throwing the child of a criminal into the street, or anyone's child.

Assuming family members are innocent of any wrongdoing, this bill gives the Office of Personnel Management the discretion to respond to hardships placed on the family and caused by the Member's criminal wrongdoing. If OPM decides to do so, it will come out of any amounts contributed directly by the Member, and to which he or she is still entitled. That is fair and just, in my opinion. OPM could still impose full pension forfeiture, or something less if the totality of the circumstances warrants a different outcome.

There are lots of other arguments we can have about the merits of this initiative and whether it goes too far or not far enough. Some may even question whether it even goes in the right direction. All of these are legitimate policy concerns, which can be pursued by the interested Members with the committees of jurisdiction through future legislation. But the bill before us today, however imperfect you may judge it, is an immediate response to the American people's demand that we change the way we do business here in Washington.

There are many other initiatives we will be taking to reverse the last decade of criminal and ethical decline. We will do them, and we will be a better and more responsive government for

having done so. But this is step one. The American people are sending an unequivocal message to all Representatives and Senators: If you lie, cheat or collude with others to cover up your criminal abuse of public office, you will not only go to jail, but you will sacrifice something that the American people provided you, and that is trust, which the American people can take away from you if you violate that trust. Dishonor that trust, and you break your contract with the American people, and the consequences are clear.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SHADEGG. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHADEGG. Can the Chair tell me if this bill was reported out of committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill before us has not been reported by the committees to which it was referred.

Mr. SHADEGG. So it has not been reported out of committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

□ 1830

Mr. SHADEGG. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHADEGG. Can the chairman tell me if this bill was subject to amendment in committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The phrase "as amended" in the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California signifies that the text proposed for passage differs in some respect from the text of the introduced bill.

Mr. SHADEGG. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHADEGG. Can the gentleman tell me where and when this bill was amended?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is amended in the motion that is placed at the desk.

Mr. SHADEGG. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Has the majority been provided the text of the bill at this time, or can you tell me when it was amended?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the Chair's understanding that the bill is available to Members in the Chamber and copies have been provided.

Mr. SHADEGG. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. We just asked for a copy of the bill, a Member just did, and was not able to get it. Do we have more than one copy?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The official copy is at the desk and the Chair understands that there are other copies that have been distributed throughout the Chamber.

Mr. SHADEGG. One further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his further parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, it has been widely reported today that this bill has a delayed effective clause which would not make it effective until January of 2009. That is different than the introduced bill, which had an immediate effective date.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Is that a parliamentary inquiry that he is just suggesting here?

Mr. SHADEGG. Can the Chair clarify whether or not it has been amended in that respect?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The content of the bill is a subject for Members to discuss during the debate. It is not for the Chair to state.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KIRK. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois will please state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the amendment in the final form of this bill, my understanding is we are now dealing with a handwritten piece of paper on a napkin?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, is at the desk.

Mr. KIRK. Is anything typed and shared with the minority?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The engrossing Clerk has the official paper at the desk.

Mr. KIRK. Which is handwritten.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may examine the copy at the desk for himself.

Mr. KIRK. I will take that as a "yes."

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. TERRY. Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, this suspension rule was just amended or written and changed in the last 45 minutes. It is my understanding from the votes that we took on the first day of the House that the rules were amended. A civility section was added to the rules that said that we would be provided 48 hours' notice.

It is my thought that this last-minute change violates the rules that were adopted in the House our first day in session for the 110th Congress, and I object to the bill's going forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair appreciates the gentleman's comments. Unfortunately, the gentleman has not stated a point of order.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WHITFIELD. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, of course this subject matter is very im-

portant, the Congressional Pension Accountability Act; and I just went up to the desk and asked for a copy of the bill that we will be debating. And I was told that they did not have a copy. The Speaker has said that there are copies available for Members, and I would like to know where the copies are and how many copies are available for the Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is an engrossing copy at the desk and further copies will be made available to Members throughout the Chamber.

Mr. WHITFIELD. When will copies be made available for us?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Currently, The Chair observes their being passed out as we speak.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, the ruling from the Chair, in respect to my objection, was based on the rules that were adopted by the House, the civility section, where we were supposed to be provided 48 hours of notice of any legislation brought to the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is unaware of a rule that the gentleman describes. A motion to suspend the rules obviates any point of order in any event.

Mr. TERRY. Are you stating that there is no rule saying that the majority has to supply 48 hours' notice?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct, and a motion to suspend the rules obviates any point of order in any event.

Mr. TERRY. I thank the gentleman.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, although the rules package contained a provision that said the majority would provide legislative text to the minority 48 hours before a vote, that is not, in fact, a rule; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A motion to suspend the rules, as the gentleman knows, obviates any point of order to that effect.

Mr. SHADEGG. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, is there a means by which I can appeal the ruling of the Chair in order to allow the Members of the minority the time in the civility clause that is 48 hours to see the language of this bill which was apparently amended within the last 45 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman suspend for one moment.

Mr. SHADEGG. I would very much appreciate an answer to my question,

Mr. Speaker. I don't think that is asking too much.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the points of order being made are debate and comment, not points of order. And I am going to object to the continuation of a process that theoretically raises points of order which is debate and not a point of order.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I believe I stated a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would say to the gentleman from Arizona that the motion to suspend the rules is simply being given its ordinary meaning in this process.

Mr. SHADEGG. So the answer to my question is that there is no procedure by which I may object to this bill going forward without the 48 hours promised in the civility provision of the House rules?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman.

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

But to begin with, I would like to yield a moment to the chairwoman of the committee and ask, just to try to clarify this, what is the effective date of the amendment we are considering?

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EHLERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the question raised by the gentleman from Michigan, the effective date is upon enactment of the bill.

Mr. EHLERS. Thank you for clarifying that.

Mr. Speaker, part of the reason for the question was an honest inquiry simply because there has been a lot of confusion about the last-minute changes, which is certainly not customary for a bill taken up under suspension.

This bill would deprive Members of Congress from their pensions if they are convicted of certain crimes. Similar language was included in the ethics and lobbying reform bill passed by the Senate last week.

This is not a new issue. This is not the first time the House has considered the question of whether convicted Members should lose their pensions. In 1996, following the conviction of Congressman Dan Rostenkowski, a public outcry followed published reports that he would be receiving a generous pension even while serving his prison term. In response, the House scheduled and voted on H.R. 4011, to take away the pensions of Members convicted of offenses listed in the bill. It passed 390-32 in the House, but was not taken up in the Senate and did not become law; and Mr. Rostenkowski received his full pension.

Incidentally, mail fraud, the crime for which Mr. Rostenkowski was convicted, was a listed offense in that bill, H.R. 4011, but is not listed in the bill pending before us today. So if there were another Rostenkowski event, today this would not affect that behavior.

The recent convictions of some of our former colleagues, and published reports implicating a current Member in bribery schemes, have caused this issue to surface again.

Then, as now, these legislative efforts amount to an attempt to close the barn door after the horse has gone. Even if H.R. 4011 had passed in 1996, it would not have affected anyone engaged in criminal activity prior to its passage. In other words, Mr. Rostenkowski still would not have been affected by that bill. Whatever we do today will not deprive any of our convicted former colleagues of their pensions and won't threaten the pension of a Member who might have already engaged in criminal activity but has yet to be charged or convicted. The Supreme Court has ruled you simply cannot change the criminal penalty for a crime after it has been committed and apply it retroactively. This is called *ex post facto* punishment and is clearly prohibited by the Constitution, and that is why it is so extremely important to draft this bill properly.

The Congress had originally attempted to do this when it passed the Hiss Act in 1954 in response to the perjury conviction of Alger Hiss. The law applied to a number of offenses. But this law, though passed after his conviction, was written to take away Hiss's pension but was struck down by a Federal court, and later the Congress scaled the law back because it was unmanageable. This illustrates again the importance of careful work on bills of this nature.

Conviction of an offense listed in the Hiss Act, which is still in effect and applies to all government employees, results in total loss of the pension. The Hiss Act, as amended in 1961, is now limited to crimes against the State that threaten national security: treason, espionage, sedition, et cetera.

Of course, had the Congress enacted the House-passed legislation on the subject in 1996, those who have been convicted of listed criminal offenses in the interim would not be able to receive pensions and today's action would not be necessary.

In view of all this, I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think it is most unfortunate that we are considering this bill under suspension with last-minute changes, with limited time for debate, and no opportunity to consider alternatives. I believe that it is important to look at some alternatives. The courts have raised the issue of proportionality, that the punishment must be proportional to the crime. This bill does not contain anything relating to that. And it should, because under this bill a person who commits a heinous

crime and has 5 years of pension credit suffers a minor penalty compared to a person who might commit a minor crime but has 20 years of pension to lose. This is not taken care of in this bill, and it should be.

The issue of spouse pensions, as the Chair of the committee mentioned, is dealt with in this bill; but I don't think it is dealt with satisfactorily. I think we should give some guidelines to the Office of Personnel Management in dealing with that.

My point on all this, Mr. Speaker, is that this is an important bill. It is going to potentially affect each and every Member of the Congress. I think it should be done with due deliberation and carefulness, and I think it is most unfortunate that this bill has become clouded by the hasty effort to get this taken up on suspension with last-minute changes not approved previously by the minority.

I hope this is not an example of what we can expect in the future. The issue is certainly more important than naming a post office, which is what we normally do on suspension; and I hope that this bill, when it does pass, will come back in conference so that we will be able to fine tune it in conference with the Senate and produce a good bill that is worthy of final passage.

Mr. Speaker I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just take about 30 seconds to correct a misrepresentation of the ranking member. He spoke of mail fraud, of which Mr. Rostenkowski was convicted, was not one of the crimes contained in the House bill that was passed out of this House by the Republicans last year. So that is a mischaracterization.

□ 1845

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS. The bill was passed in 1996.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Irrespective of, it was not one of those that were, as you had suggested in your opening statement.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield such time as she may consume to the author of this bill, the outstanding new Member who introduced this bill, the gentlewoman from Kansas (Mrs. BOYDA).

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill that will help rebuild the American people's faith in our Congress.

Last year a Member of this House, Congressman Bob Ney, praised legislation that would have stripped the pensions of Members of Congress who are convicted of trading votes for bribes. Congressman Ney claimed that the bill would hold, and I quote, "Members of Congress and those they work with to the highest standards in order to en-

sure that those who abuse the public trust will be dealt with accordingly." But that bill never passed, for which Congressman Ney is probably grateful. On Friday he was sentenced to serve 30 months in Federal prison. His crime: Accepting tens of thousands of dollars in luxury vacations, sporting tickets, and meals from Big Money lobbyist Jack Abramoff.

Despite his conviction, Congressman Ney remains eligible to draw a congressional pension. And he isn't alone. Over the last 25 years, as many as 20 politicians convicted of serious offenses have received their congressional pensions. The exact amount of their payments vary, but the typical payment is about \$47,000 a year. That is greater than the average American's total household income, and four times the annual earnings of the minimum-wage worker.

Why should taxpayers fund a comfortable retirement for a crooked Congressman? The answer, of course, is that we shouldn't. Corrupt politicians deserve prison sentences, not taxpayer-funded pensions.

Mr. Speaker, this House has already taken an important first step toward ending congressional corruption. On our very first day of Congress in session, we passed an aggressive ethics package that banned Members from accepting meals and gifts from lobbyists, and we enacted real earmark reform. But our work isn't done.

During my campaign I promised my constituents that I would help end Big Money's control of Congress, and that promise won't be fulfilled until Members who accept Big Money bribes cannot still retire at taxpayer expense.

Today I am proud to introduce H.R. 476, the Pensions Forfeiture Act, which would strip the pensions of Members of Congress convicted of bribery, conspiracy, espionage, or perjury. I am honored that my three fellow Representatives from Kansas, Representative TODD TIAHRT, JERRY MORAN, and DENNIS MOORE, are cosponsoring this legislation with me. All of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, are answering Kansas's demands to sever the link between money and politicians.

My father told me when I told him about this legislation, he said, "Sweetheart, it's about time. Let's get on with it."

Unfortunately, we cannot now revoke Congressman Ney's pension. Believe me, I wish we could, but the Constitution prohibits us from passing such laws after the fact. But we can and we must prevent this from happening again.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Pensions Forfeiture Act. I hope that this bill will further deter corruption. Perhaps when Congressmen know that their retirement benefits are on the line, they will think long and hard before committing a Federal crime. But if some future Representative does follow in the footsteps of Congressman Ney, at least

Kansas taxpayers and the rest of American taxpayers won't have to foot the bill for his retirement home.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to the time left for both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN). The gentlewoman from California has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to Mr. KIRK of Illinois.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the author of this legislation, Mrs. BOYDA, a question. She has added an amendment to this legislation within the last half hour. What was it, and what did you intend to do with that amendment?

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. I don't believe that it has been amended in the last half hour, but we did add subornation of perjury.

Mr. KIRK. Reclaiming my time. The gentlewoman actually has amended the legislation within the last half hour to add a fifth charge of subornation of perjury. But this bill falls far short of its potential.

In 1996, the Congress is on record with the vote of Congresswoman PELOSI and Congressman HASTERT of supporting legislation with 21 public integrity felonies, not the 5 under the legislation before us.

We are missing a key element in this legislation which falls far short of our potential for reform. We know under current law that Rostenkowski collects after mail fraud, Traficant collects after corruption, Cunningham collects after bribery, and Ney collects after conspiracy. But the key story tonight is what is missing in this legislation.

Our House leadership presented a bill which until an hour ago would have exempted the 110th Congress from any of these reforms. Now they are going to go back with the original intention of the bill with the new amendment that the Congresswoman added. But this list of felonies fails to include income tax evasion.

I would ask her, why didn't you add income tax evasion to the list of felonies under this bill?

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. I believe that the bill is intended as the voters have said we need to get something done. The crimes that are included in this bill will go right at the heart of the corruption that is affecting the Congress.

Mr. KIRK. Reclaiming my time. I would say that we should not provide taxpayer-funded pensions for someone who is convicted of income tax evasion.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, just a couple of seconds, and I would like to speak to the speaker who has just spoken. He spoke about the amendment to this bill, the subornation of perjury. This is in the gentleman's bill that he has introduced, so I don't know why his objection to that. The Democrats have added two addi-

tional crimes to this bill, and one is that; the other is a conspiracy to violate postemployment restrictions. We have tried to put in this bill to strengthen this bill two additional crimes, and so I am concerned that his argument is one that is in his bill that he has introduced.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, Mrs. SUSAN DAVIS.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 476, the Pension Forfeiture Act sponsored by my new colleague and good friend NANCY BOYDA.

Usually, Mr. Speaker, I pride myself on seeing two sides of an issue, but honestly, I have looked, and I can't find another side on this one.

I like this bill, because any Member of Congress who has been convicted of a criminal offense doesn't deserve to get his or her pension. And I like this bill for another reason, too. No matter how small the amount, each dollar that now goes to criminal ex-Members can be used to fund vital programs at a time when we are challenged with record debt.

Mr. Speaker, I love this institution, and it makes me angry that the bad behavior of a few has disgraced Congress and harmed our Nation, and, in fact, this is a very important first step. Perhaps in the future we can go beyond this. And it frustrates me deeply when members of the media and the public say that we are incapable or unwilling to reform ourselves. So, let's prove them wrong. Let's prove them wrong today. Let's pass H.R. 476.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to grant 2 minutes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I will help answer the gentlewoman from California; in the sense that this is a decent bill, but it could be much better if it was brought through a regular order where we were allowed to participate and offer improvements by way of amendments. But the process has been shut down to us, and that is why we are upset. We can make a decent bill better if given the chance. It was brought up on suspension with the intended purpose of forbidding us from offering any amendments to make it better.

And I just want to say that MARK STEVEN KIRK, JOHN SHADEGG, and myself, we have been very concerned about people who have violated the people's trust, accepted bribes, broken the law, and getting their pension. That is why all three of us joined together over a year ago and offered bills; but yet the bill that has been brought up today isn't one of the Republican bills. Is that civility? I doubt it.

Now, the interesting part is, after working with the Speaker a year ago, it was brought up for a vote, and almost all of the Democrat leadership and 173 other Members of the Democrat Party voted against the bill that they are now saying, well, geez, it is your bill that you brought up a long time ago.

But there is one area I have amendments prepared, because I thought when we were going to get here that we would go through regular order. And one of them was solicitation of a bribe, which is not part of this.

Mr. Speaker, can I enter into a colloquy with the author of the bill, the gentlewoman from Kansas? My inquiry to her would be, why did you not offer solicitation of the bribe when you authored this piece of legislation? Solicitation is not in there.

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Let me just say that I have offered a bill that I think is historic. I think it is going to make a difference. And I would suggest that you can vote for it, or you can vote against it. It is a good first step.

Mr. TERRY. So if you want to solicit bribes, this is not a part. And there is a glaring gap here that needs to be filled, and we have not been allowed to fill it.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that my colleague has said that the bill could be stronger. That is an argument that we could make on every bill that comes to this floor, it can be stronger.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now yield to our majority leader 1 minute, the Honorable STENY HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. It is tough to be in the minority, isn't it? I feel your pain. I want you to know that.

Of course, that perfect bill of which all of you speak could have been passed in 1995 or 1996 or even 1997 or 1998 or 1999 or 2000, or even 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and, yes, 2006 when you were in charge, and we had no say as to what you passed or what you didn't pass. But you didn't pass this bill. You passed this bill through the House; it is not law. It is not law. And you had the President, you had the Senate, and you had the House.

There is now a claim that we have heard now for 2 weeks: The energy bill could have been better. Yes, but many of you voted for it. You indicated, many of you, that the minimum wage bill could have been perhaps better by adding some things on, but 82 of you voted for it.

This bill could be better, but it is timely. It is timely to do the right thing.

Mr. KIRK has a number of suggestions. I think they are pretty good suggestions. I don't mind them. He asked about income tax. Now, we all pay income taxes. All Americans pay income taxes, or some have preference items they avoid, assuming they are doing it legally. But that is not part of our duties as a Member of Congress; it is part of our duties as a citizen.

What this bill seeks to say is when you raise your right hand and swear that you will serve your constituents faithfully and honestly, that you do that; that you don't do it for some outside lobbyist or interest group. And that if you do, we are not going to pay your pension. That is all this bill says.

It is late in coming, but it is never too late to do the right thing, and I

would hope that every Member of this House when the roll is called on this bill will say to their constituents that I am going to take pensions away from those who abuse their power and responsibility given to them by the American people as Members of this House and undermine the faith and trust that the American people have in Members and in this House.

□ 1900

I agree with Mr. TERRY, it could be better. We could add things to it. Perhaps we will. As a matter of fact, we just added something, as you have pointed out, because we thought that not only is lying bad, but asking people to lie is bad. It is called a fancy word, subornation of perjury. But what it is, is asking your staffer to say, don't tell the grand jury I did that. That is essentially what that says. So you can't tell your staff to go to the grand jury, when the grand jury says, does Member A, B or C take money or lie or do something or take money to vote on something, if you ask them to do that, and, after all, they work for you, you have control of their salary, you are also going to be subject to loss of pension.

So I agree with those that say this bill is not perfect. They are right, but a lot of the bills that we have passed, as a matter of fact probably no bill that we have passed has been perfect, but this is a good bill. As my friend, the former Congressman from Kentucky would say, "And I tell you that frankly."

My expectation is we are going to have almost every Member, I would hope 100 percent of the House say to the American people we will not allow Members who misuse and fail your trust to get your taxpayers' dollars paid to them in pensions. Vote for this bill. It is a good bill.

I want to congratulate NANCY BOYDA for her leadership in bringing this bill to the floor, and I urge Members on both sides of the aisle, in a bipartisan way, vote to say to the American people, we won't take your pensions if we do wrong by you, and we won't let others do as well.

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

I would just like to make a brief response to the majority leader before recognizing my next speaker. The issue is not just the quality of the bill. The main issue is the process, and I recall many times over the past few years, when we were in the majority, I asked our leadership to take up a bill on suspension. They said we can't do it unless the minority agrees to it, and I had to wait weeks several times for that.

Now, suddenly, we get a bill tossed out in just a few hours' notice. That is not proper procedure.

Mr. Speaker, I next yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, we just heard how serious this bill is; and, indeed, I think it is serious and important.

Over a year ago, I introduced a similar bill, so did my colleague Mr. KIRK, and so did my colleague Mr. TERRY. The majority leader has just told us that we ought to all vote for this bill because it is so important; but once again, we are here in a procedural abuse of mind-boggling consequences.

For my colleagues who have not been here, you need to know that in the last hour this bill has been amended by the majority. Indeed, in the last 24 hours, it has been amended not once but twice. It was introduced in one form. This morning they announced two different amendments to it, changing both its effective date and the crimes to which it applies, and your offices were all told when you arrived here today that it had a new effective date and had a new series of crimes to which it applies. But guess what, do not rely on your staff because this bill is so important the majority has amended it within the last few minutes. Now they have added a crime, but changed the effective date again.

This is not the way that serious Congresses legislate. If you believe this bill is important, don't ask these Members to vote on it with less than an hour's notice. If you would like to look at a copy of the bill, many of our Members on the majority asked for a copy moments before debate started, and they could not get a copy. Indeed, the amendments appear to have either been handwritten or typed within the last few minutes.

This is not the way to legislate. Procedure matters. We have not been allowed to see this bill go through committee and to be marked up. It did not go to Rules where we could offer amendments, where we could offer the effective date we think is right or the list of crimes that we believe is right.

No, the majority has decided that the minority does not matter. Well, let's talk about fundamental fairness. In the Contract with America, we allowed that side, when they were in the minority, to offer to our Contract bills 154 floor amendments. That is on top of taking all of those bills to committee, and 48 of those amendments passed.

This is a procedural outrage, and they ought to be ashamed.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the speaker who just spoke stated that we changed the date. We changed the date of the bill to comply with the leadership on the Republican side. So he was disingenuous.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader.

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

First of all, let me say that I do not think this is the best procedure that we could have followed.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry, did she not just call me disingenuous? I would like the words taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HOYER. No. I thought I was recognized. I was speaking.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SHADEGG. Point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SHADEGG. You may not besmirch the motives of a Member of the body. I believe the lady said that my comments were disingenuous. I would like to hear the comments. If she called me disingenuous, I take that as an offense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a point of order.

Mr. SHADEGG. I want her words taken down. Mr. Speaker, I would like the lady's words taken down.

Mr. HOYER. I think we are beyond that point, but let me say I don't believe the gentleman is disingenuous. As a matter of fact—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the majority leader suspend.

The gentleman's request for the words to be taken down has not been requested in a timely and an appropriate manner.

The gentleman from Maryland is now recognized.

Mr. TIAHRT. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has the time.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair. Just because the Chair wasn't listening to the gentleman doesn't mean he wasn't making it in a timely manner.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. HOYER

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to table.

Mr. TERRY. In all due respect, the Speaker's microphone was not on, and we could not hear your ruling.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Parliamentary inquiry. Did you recognize the appeal of the ruling of the Chair?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

The question is on the motion to table.

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

Mr. HOYER. 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 223, nays 190, answered "present" 1, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

YEAS—223

Abercrombie	Bean	Boucher
Ackerman	Becerra	Boyd (FL)
Allen	Berkley	Boyd (KS)
Altmire	Berman	Brady (PA)
Andrews	Berry	Braley (IA)
Arcuri	Bishop (GA)	Brown, Corrine
Baca	Bishop (NY)	Butterfield
Baird	Blumenauer	Capps
Baldwin	Boren	Capuano
Barrow	Boswell	Cardoza

Carnahan	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Carney	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Castor	(TX)	Pelosi
Chandler	Jefferson	Perlmutter
Clarke	Johnson (GA)	Peterson (MN)
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Jones (OH)	Rahall
Clyburn	Kagen	Rangel
Cohen	Kanjorski	Reyes
Conyers	Kaptur	Rodriguez
Cooper	Kennedy	Ross
Costa	Kildee	Rothman
Courtney	Kilpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Cramer	Kind	Ruppersberger
Crowley	Klein (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	Kucinich	Ruppersberger
Cummings	Lampson	Ryan (OH)
Davis (AL)	Langevin	Salazar
Davis (CA)	Lantos	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (IL)	Larsen (WA)	T.
Davis, Lincoln	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
DeFazio	Lee	Sarbanes
DeGette	Levin	Schakowsky
Delahunt	Lewis (GA)	Schiff
DeLauro	Lipinski	Schwartz
Dicks	Loeb sack	Scott (GA)
Dingell	Lofgren, Zoe	Scott (VA)
Doggett	Lowey	Serrano
Donnelly	Lynch	Sestak
Doyle	Mahoney (FL)	Shea-Porter
Edwards	Maloney (NY)	Sherman
Ellison	Markey	Shuler
Ellsworth	Marshall	Sires
Emanuel	Matheson	Skelton
Engel	Matsui	Slaughter
Eshoo	McCarthy (NY)	Snyder
Etheridge	McCollum (MN)	Solis
Farr	McGovern	Space
Fattah	McIntyre	Spratt
Filner	McNerney	Stark
Frank (MA)	McNulty	Stupak
Giffords	Meehan	Sutton
Gillibrand	Meek (FL)	Tanner
Gonzalez	Meeks (NY)	Tauscher
Gordon	Melancon	Taylor
Green, Al	Michaud	Thompson (CA)
Green, Gene	Millender-	Thompson (MS)
Grijalva	McDonald	Tierney
Hall (NY)	Miller (NC)	Towns
Hare	Miller, George	Udall (CO)
Harman	Mitchell	Udall (NM)
Hastings (FL)	Mollohan	Van Hollen
Herse th	Moore (KS)	Velázquez
Higgins	Moore (WI)	Visclosky
Hill	Murphy (CT)	Walz (MN)
Hinche y	Murphy, Patrick	Wasserman
Hinojosa	Murtha	Schultz
Hirono	Nadler	Watson
Hodes	Napolitano	Watt
Holden	Neal (MA)	Weiner
Holt	Oberstar	Welch (VT)
Honda	Obey	Wexler
Hooley	Olver	Wilson (OH)
Hoyer	Ortiz	Woolsey
Insl ee	Pallone	Wu
Israel	Pascrell	Wynn
		Yarmuth

NAYS—190

Aderholt	Carter	Foxx
Akin	Castle	Franks (AZ)
Alexander	Chabot	Frelinghuysen
Bachmann	Coble	Galle gly
Bachus	Cole (OK)	Garrett (NJ)
Baker	Conaway	Gerlach
Barrett (SC)	Crenshaw	Gilchrest
Bartlett (MD)	Cubin	Gillmor
Barton (TX)	Davis (KY)	Gingrey
Biggert	Davis, David	Gohmert
Bilirakis	Davis, Jo Ann	Good
Blackburn	Davis, Tom	Goodlatte
Blunt	Deal (GA)	Granger
Boehner	Dent	Graves
Bonner	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hall (TX)
Bono	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hastert
Boozman	Doolittle	Hastings (WA)
Boustany	Drake	Hayes
Brady (TX)	Dreier	Heller
Brown (SC)	Duncan	Hensarling
Brown-Waite,	Ehlers	Herger
Ginny	Emerson	Hobson
Buchanan	English (PA)	Hoekstra
Burgess	Everett	Hulshof
Burton (IN)	Fallin	Hunter
Calvert	Feeney	Inglis (SC)
Camp (MI)	Ferguson	Issa
Campbell (CA)	Flake	Jindal
Cannon	Forbes	Johnson (IL)
Cantor	Fortenberry	Johnson, Sam
Capito	Fossella	Jones (NC)

Jordan	Murphy, Tim	Sensenbrenner
Keller	Musgrave	Sessions
King (IA)	Myrick	Shadegg
King (NY)	Neugebauer	Sha ys
Kingston	Nunes	Shimkus
Kirk	Paul	Shuster
Kline (MN)	Pearce	Simpson
Knollenberg	Pence	Smith (NE)
Kuhl (NY)	Peterson (PA)	Smith (NJ)
LaHood	Petri	Smith (TX)
Lamborn	Pitts	Souder
Latham	Platts	Stearns
LaTourette	Poe	Sullivan
Lewis (CA)	Porter	Tancredo
Lewis (KY)	Price (GA)	Terry
LoBiondo	Pryce (OH)	Thornberry
Mack	Putnam	Tiahrt
Manzullo	Radanovich	Tiberi
Marchant	Ramstad	Upton
McCarthy (CA)	Regula	Walberg
McCaul (TX)	Rehberg	Walden (OR)
McCotter	Reichert	Walsh (NY)
McCrery	Renzi	Wamp
McHenry	Reynolds	Weldon (FL)
McHugh	Rogers (AL)	Weller
McKeon	Rogers (KY)	Westmoreland
McMorris	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
Rodgers	Ros-Lehtinen	Wicker
Mica	Roskam	Wilson (NM)
Miller (FL)	Royce	Wilson (SC)
Miller (MI)	Sali	Wolf
Miller, Gary	Saxton	Young (AK)
Moran (KS)	Schmidt	Young (FL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Lungren, Daniel
E.

NOT VOTING—21

Bilbray	Linder	Rogers (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Lucas	Rush
Buyer	McDermott	Ryan (WI)
Carson	Moran (VA)	Smith (WA)
Costello	Norwood	Turner
Culberson	Pickering	Waters
Gutierrez	Pomeroy	Waxman

□ 1929

Messrs. BURTON of Indiana, JOHN-SON of Illinois and KUHLE of New York changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader, is recognized.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we could dissipate, first of all, any implication that anybody was disingenuous. There are obviously disagreements on issues. I know that the gentle lady, the Chair of the committee, and Mr. SHADEGG have spoken. I think that is a good thing.

I wanted to say to Mr. SHADEGG, I certainly did not believe he was anything but stating his opinion, and I think that is certainly appropriate to do. I want to make that very, very clear, that we do not and I do not nor did the chairwoman intend to put anybody's motivation in question. We should not do that. Hopefully, we will all try not to do that.

Secondly, let me say that in terms of notice, I had the opportunity to talk to Mr. BOEHNER on Friday. This bill was scheduled, as you know, for consideration on Friday.

□ 1930

There was concern that perhaps people hadn't seen it for sufficient time,

although this bill, in substance, has, in fact, been passed by the House before with your leadership. So Mr. BOEHNER and I have discussed it. Mr. BLUNT and I had a colloquy, in which time I said that this would be on suspension tonight.

The bill was amended, the gentleman is correct, within the last few hours. The date was changed at the request of Mr. BOEHNER. I happen to agree with Mr. BOEHNER that the date of 2009, which was in the bill, and I know Mrs. BOYDA, I talked to Mrs. BOYDA about it, she agreed with the change as well. The change was made because it was Mr. BOEHNER's feeling, and I think the minority's feeling, that the bill ought to go into effect immediately.

The reason the date was put in as 2009 because that is what the Senate bill does under the constitutional provision of the 27th amendment, where compensation of a Member may not be changed during the course of their term. So it was made effective at the next term.

But my observation, and I think Mr. BOEHNER's, I don't know whether he is on the floor, were the same; that if that question would be raised, let a defendant who is convicted of falling short of his duties and responsibilities, or hers, to their constituents and to this institution, let them raise that. I agreed with that. So that change was made mutually.

There was an additional subornation of perjury which we think is appropriate. But I want to say to Members on both sides, I am an institutionalist. I believe in this institution, I believe in the Members, and I believe the Members need to have careful and thoughtful consideration.

This bill is straightforward and, as I say, for all intents and purposes has been passed. I want to tell everybody, I think we are going to roll the vote on this bill because we don't want anybody to miss it. There are 11 Members on each side absent because of planes that have not flown on schedule because of weather. And it is an equal number on each side, so we are going to wait.

But I hope when this bill comes to a vote that all of us vote for it, notwithstanding our differences on process, which ought to be better. We are going to strive to make it better.

I want you to know that I feel strongly. When I said I feel your pain, I do. I don't think it is disingenuous pain. I think you are accurate on that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we could conclude the debate on this. I think we are all going to agree on this.

I see my friend Mr. BOEHNER coming to the podium. But I would hope that we could move this bill and give to the American public the understanding that we believe this is a very serious matter, and we are going to address it, and we are going to address it soon.

I will be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for yielding, and

make it clear that when there was a suggestion made about changing the date from the bill that had been introduced on its way to the floor, I, and my staff, believed that it was not in the best interest of the House to change this bill in the hour before it was to come to the floor. And I appreciate my colleague from Maryland, the majority leader's working with us to put the date back to where it was with the introduced bill.

But having said that, I talked last week on the floor about my concern about how the House was proceeding. I understand the Six for '06 and the need to move the Six for '06 agenda right out of the gate. But as I said on the floor last week, I would hope that we would get back to regular order.

Now, we are not on bill number six or bill number seven or, for that matter, bill number eight. I think we are on bill number nine. And as I reiterated on the floor last week, when we took the majority in 1995, there were many of my colleagues on our side of the aisle that said that we ought to treat the other side of the aisle the way they treated us. I stood my ground for months and months and months suggesting to my colleagues that, no, we should treat the minority, the then minority, the way we asked to be treated. And I think the real concern here is that what we have seen today on the floor over this bill is exactly the point we have been trying to make about going back to regular order.

The committee process in this House does work, and I think the gentleman from Maryland clearly understands that, because Members on both sides of the aisle can pinpoint flaws and problems and correct those. And then there is a Rules Committee that has hearings. There is an opportunity for Members to offer amendments, hopefully, to be made in order so that the House can work its will.

And so I would ask my colleague from Maryland, the majority leader, to just treat us the way you have been asked to be treated. My colleagues on this side of the aisle want to participate. We want to work with the majority in the best interest of the American people, and we can do that together. But the only way to do that is to go through regular order. And I think the gentleman from Maryland understands, and I thank him for his time.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. And as we had a good discussion on this particular bill last week, but I understand the gentleman's position. I don't think it is an unreasonable position. I think our perception is that this is a bill that has passed. It is of deep interest to the American public, and we wanted to make a statement as early as possible. We are not going to affect anybody, obviously, in the past, but going forward we wanted the public to be very assured what our position was. And that is the purpose of this.

I know that the fact that it is on suspension means that it is not open to

amendment. We understand that that may cause some consternation, and others will think that that is a procedure under which this kind of a bill probably should be concerned, in any event. But I appreciate the gentleman's view.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the other speakers that I have to yield their time, and I will just yield myself such time as I may consume to quickly wrap it up.

I appreciate the comments made by the majority leader and minority leader. I hope they cleared the air.

But I just want to add a personal note. I served on a county commission some years ago and became the chair of the county commission, and there I learned the importance of proper order in doing things in regular order. I served as president pro tem of the State senate, and that even reinforced it more strongly. Always proceed properly, fairly and in order.

And I think part of the difficulty we have had here today is that the members of the current minority sat here for 2 weeks grinding their teeth while they watched things come to the floor without having gone to committee, without prior debate and discussion. And this was the crowning insult, to bring something to the floor under suspension, and to make not just one change, we have heard discussion of the date, but two changes in the bill between the time it was agreed to and the time that it reached the floor.

We cannot have that. As a minority we will not tolerate that. We deserve proper order. We deserve respect. And I assume the majority will, from this time henceforth, give us that respect and follow proper order, proper procedure, so we can avoid these donnybrooks in the future.

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

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the statement that I made earlier about the gentleman from Arizona, it was not my intent to question his motives. And I look forward to working with him in the coming days and weeks and months ahead. And so I do not intend for him to take that personally, and I am sorry for that.

Mr. Speaker, and all of my colleagues who are listening and have listened to this debate today, please take note. The Democratic leadership of this institution plans to clean up the criminal and ethical morass it inherited. This bill is a down payment on the new ethical climate control system we are building.

The American people deserve to know that criminal and unethical behavior by any of our colleagues will be punished, and that the penalties for violating the sacred trust which has been bestowed upon us by our voters and the States we represent will be substantive and serious and not window dressing.

We have more to do after this bill passes, so we can continue this discus-

sion during the next installment of ethics reform. But I urge my colleagues to take this leap with me today and with the very distinguished gentlewoman from Kansas who introduced the bill, to begin this journey toward a more open and honest government, and toward a more ethical direction in this 110th Congress. The American people deserve it, and it is up to us, you and I, to deliver it.

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 476.

At the start of the 110th Congress, this chamber passed rules governing how we conduct the people's business. We made sure that the interest of our constituents would be placed ahead of the special interests. Today, we must take the next step to restore the public trust in Congress by stripping Congressional pensions from Members who commit federal crimes while in office.

This legislation is a crucial next step. It adds bribery of public officials and witnesses, wrongfully acting as agents of foreign principals, and conspiracy to commit one of these offenses to the list of federal felonies that will call for the forfeiture of a Congressional pension. In keeping with the spirit of the new rules governing this chamber, a Congressional pension can be stripped when a Member violates the new postemployment restriction statutes. Furthermore, any member who commits perjury or subornation of perjury in denying their involvement in any of these offenses can also lose their pension under this legislation.

We must make sure that those who violate the public trust and their office are not allowed to profit at the tax-payers expense. I proudly rise in support of this measure and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 476, the "Congressional Pension Accountability Act," which amends title 5 of the U.S. Code to make non-creditable for Federal retirement purposes any Member service performed by an individual who is convicted of any of certain offenses committed by that individual while serving as a Member of Congress. With the adoption of this legislation, we take another giant step in fulfilling the pledge we made to America last November to "drain the swamp" and end the "culture of corruption" that pervaded the 109th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, today, this House will consider another critical component of ethics reform: congressional pension forfeiture. The bill introduced today is similar to the House bill introduced by my colleague Representative BOYDA on January 17, 2007—with two minor changes in response to Senate concerns.

First, subornation of perjury is added as a disqualifying offense. The second change, which extends the effective date of the legislation until January 2009, is necessary to satisfy the requirements of the 27th Amendment. That amendment requires that any law relating to the compensation of a Representative or Senator may not take effect until there has been an intervening congressional election.

With these specific changes, the bill:

Requires that Members convicted of certain Federal felonies related to the performance of their official duties forfeit their congressional pension rights under the Civil Service Retirement System or the Federal Employees Retirement System if the conduct constituting the

felony takes place after enactment and while the Member is in Congress and a conviction occurs after January 2, 2009; and

Applies to bribery of public officials and witnesses; wrongfully acting as agents of foreign principals; conspiracy to commit one of the offenses listed above; conspiracy to violate the post-employment prohibitions; and perjury and subornation of perjury in falsely denying committing one of these crimes.

While I believe it is important to punish those Members who violate the law, and in turn the public's trust, I am very pleased that this bill, through the Director of Office Personnel Management (OPM), provides protection for family members of those Members whose conduct warrants forfeiture of their pensions.

The intent of the bill is not to harm the family members of Members who are convicted of certain serious crimes. That is why the bill permits the Director of Office of Personnel Management, if it is determined to be necessary under the totality of the circumstances, to provide benefits to the Member's spouse and children, in which case the lump sum payment due the Member based on his or her own contributions would be reduced by an appropriate amount.

While avoiding harm to family members of the convicted Members, this critical measure to deny pension benefits to House Members convicted of corruption is another step towards comprehensive ethics reform. We promised the American people that we would restore a sense of respect and dignity to the House of Representatives. This measure is a meaningful first step towards restoring public trust in Congress and ensuring that taxpayers do not fund the pensions of Members convicted of corruption while serving the American people. While we seek to do the right thing by punishing perpetrators of serious illegal conduct, we also seek to deter Members from such behavior and to assure the American people that we serve at their behest and in their interest, not our own.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 476 is necessary because under current law a Federal elected official found to have betrayed the public trust is eligible to receive taxpayer-funded pensions for their service in Congress—even if they are convicted of serious abuses of power. The American people do not want us to reward those Members who have dishonored and disrespected both the law and the public's trust.

By passing this bill, this Congress is sending a message to the American people that we heard their voices loud and clear in November 2006 that we must win back their trust and act in the best interest of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 476 to clean up the American people's House and win back public trust.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment with the majority's efforts today to attempt to restore the public trust in government.

The Nation's Capital has been hammered by corruption-related political scandals in recent years, and it is imperative that we take action to respond to these scandals. But H.R. 476, the Congressional Pension Accountability Act, is little more than a trophy that the majority can hold up to claim they restored public trust in the Nation's Capital. In a nutshell, the legislation gives Members of Congress who

are convicted of a public corruption related crime an additional slap on the wrist by preventing them from counting their time served as a Member of Congress toward their federal retirement.

This stands in stark contrast to much stronger, bipartisan legislation that the Committee on Government Reform marked up last February to crack down on public officials convicted of betraying the public trust. The Federal Pension Forfeiture Act of 2006, approved by unanimous consent by the Committee last year, would have denied federal retirement benefits to any Member, congressional employee or political appointee in the Executive Branch convicted of a crime related to public corruption punishable by more than one year imprisonment for an act committed while the individual was employed by the federal government.

Unlike H.R. 476, last year's proposal would have permanently denied a pension from an official convicted of a corruption-related crime rather than simply limiting time that counted toward the official's retirement. Additionally and most importantly, last year's proposal covered not only Members of Congress but also political appointees in the Executive Branch. After all, federal officials in both branches of government equally share the blame for the fact that the public no longer trusts public officials.

It's unclear to me why the majority would want to only address half of the issue when we have an opportunity to address the issue in its entirety. Unfortunately this is the first opportunity I have had to raise this concern since the legislation was taken straight to the floor rather than receiving the benefit of committee consideration. Regardless of process, I fear that this legislation will do little if anything to restore any of the public's trust in the federal government.

Therefore, it is with regret that I will vote in favor of this legislation, and I do so only because no other option has been presented to the House.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back whatever time that I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 476, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 52, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 390, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 29, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO REVEREND WAITSTILL SHARP AND MARTHA SHARP FOR THEIR HEROIC EFFORTS TO SAVE JEWS DURING THE HOLOCAUST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 52.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 52, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—413

Abercrombie	Cannon	Duncan
Ackerman	Cantor	Edwards
Aderholt	Capito	Ehlers
Akin	Capps	Ellison
Alexander	Capuano	Ellsworth
Allen	Cardoza	Emanuel
Altmire	Carnahan	Emerson
Andrews	Carney	Engel
Arcuri	Carter	English (PA)
Baca	Castle	Eshoo
Bachmann	Castor	Etheridge
Bachus	Chabot	Everett
Baird	Chandler	Fallin
Baker	Clarke	Farr
Baldwin	Clay	Fattah
Barrett (SC)	Cleaver	Feeney
Barrow	Clyburn	Ferguson
Bartlett (MD)	Coble	Finer
Barton (TX)	Cohen	Flake
Bean	Cole (OK)	Forbes
Becerra	Conaway	Fortenberry
Berkley	Conyers	Fossella
Berman	Cooper	Foxx
Berry	Costa	Frank (MA)
Biggert	Courtney	Franks (AZ)
Billirakis	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Bishop (GA)	Crenshaw	Galleghy
Bishop (NY)	Crowley	Garrett (NJ)
Blackburn	Cubin	Gerlach
Blumenauer	Cuellar	Giffords
Blunt	Cummings	Gilchrest
Boehner	Davis (AL)	Gillibrand
Bonner	Davis (CA)	Gillmor
Bono	Davis (IL)	Gingrey
Boozman	Davis (KY)	Gohmert
Boren	Davis, David	Gonzalez
Boswell	Davis, Jo Ann	Goode
Boucher	Davis, Lincoln	Goodlatte
Boustany	Davis, Tom	Gordon
Boyd (FL)	Deal (GA)	Granger
Boyd (KS)	DeFazio	Graves
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Green, Al
Brady (TX)	Delahunt	Green, Gene
Braley (IA)	DeLauro	Grijalva
Brown (SC)	Dent	Hall (NY)
Brown, Corrine	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hall (TX)
Brown-Waite,	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hare
Ginny	Dicks	Hastert
Buchanan	Dingell	Hastings (FL)
Burgess	Doggett	Hastings (WA)
Burton (IN)	Donnelly	Hayes
Butterfield	Doolittle	Heller
Calvert	Doyle	Hensarling
Camp (MI)	Drake	Hergert
Campbell (CA)	Dreier	Herseth

Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Insole
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter

McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali

Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Berry
Bigert
Billirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito

□ 2000

So (two-thirds of those being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESERVATION OF RECORDS OF SERVITUDE, EMANCIPATION, AND POST-CIVIL WAR RECONSTRUCTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PASCARELL). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 390.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 390, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]
YEAS—414

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bigert
Billirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito

Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel

Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Insole
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—19

Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Buyer
Carson
Costello
Culberson
Gutierrez
Harman

NOT VOTING—21

Lucas
McDermott
McMorris
Rodgers
Moran (VA)
Cannon
Pickering
Pomeroy

Rogers (MI)
Rush
Smith (WA)
Tancredo
Turner
Waters

Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Buyer
Carson
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Gutierrez

Harman
Lucas
McDermott
Norwood
Pickering
Pomeroy
Pryce (OH)

Rogers (MI)
Rush
Smith (WA)
Turner
Waters

2008

So (two-thirds of those being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my home district and unable to record my rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall votes 43-45.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 29.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 29, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]
YEAS—410

Abercrombie	Brown-Waite,	Deal (GA)
Ackerman	Ginny	DeFazio
Aderholt	Buchanan	DeGette
Akin	Burgess	Delahunt
Alexander	Burton (IN)	DeLauro
Allen	Butterfield	Dent
Altmire	Calvert	Diaz-Balart, L.
Andrews	Camp (MI)	Diaz-Balart, M.
Arcuri	Campbell (CA)	Dicks
Baca	Cannon	Dingell
Bachmann	Cantor	Doggett
Bachus	Capito	Donnelly
Baird	Capps	Doolittle
Baker	Capuano	Doyle
Baldwin	Cardoza	Drake
Barrett (SC)	Carnahan	Dreier
Barrow	Carney	Duncan
Bartlett (MD)	Castle	Edwards
Barton (TX)	Castor	Ehlers
Bean	Chabot	Ellison
Becerra	Chandler	Ellsworth
Berkley	Clarke	Emanuel
Berman	Clay	Emerson
Berry	Cleaver	Engel
Biggert	Clyburn	English (PA)
Bilirakis	Cohen	Eshoo
Bishop (GA)	Cole (OK)	Etheridge
Bishop (NY)	Conaway	Everett
Blackburn	Conyers	Fallin
Blumenauer	Cooper	Farr
Blunt	Costa	Fattah
Boehner	Costello	Feeney
Bonner	Courtney	Ferguson
Bono	Cramer	Filner
Boozman	Crenshaw	Flake
Boren	Crowley	Forbes
Boswell	Cubin	Fortenberry
Boucher	Cuellar	Fossella
Boustany	Cummings	Fox
Boyd (FL)	Davis (AL)	Frank (MA)
Boyd (KS)	Davis (CA)	Franks (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Davis (IL)	Frelinghuysen
Brady (TX)	Davis (KY)	Gallely
Braley (IA)	Davis, David	Garrett (NJ)
Brown (SC)	Davis, Lincoln	Gerlach
Brown, Corrine	Davis, Tom	Giffords

Gilchrest	Mack	Rothman
Gillibrand	Mahoney (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Gillmor	Maloney (NY)	Royce
Gingrey	Manzullo	Ruppersberger
Gohmert	Marchant	Ryan (OH)
Gonzalez	Markey	Ryan (WI)
Goode	Marshall	Salazar
Goodlatte	Matheson	Sali
Granger	Matsui	Sánchez, Linda
Graves	McCarthy (CA)	T.
Green, Al	McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta
Green, Gene	McCaul (TX)	Sarbanes
Grijalva	McCollum (MN)	Saxton
Hall (NY)	McCotter	Schakowsky
Hall (TX)	McCrery	Schiff
Hare	McGovern	Schmidt
Hastert	McHenry	Schwartz
Hastings (FL)	McHugh	Scott (GA)
Hastings (WA)	McIntyre	Scott (VA)
Hayes	McKeon	Sensenbrenner
Heller	McMorris	Serrano
Hensarling	Rodgers	Sessions
Herseth	McNerney	Sestak
Higgins	McNulty	Shadegg
Hill	Meehan	Shays
Hinchey	Meek (FL)	Shea-Porter
Hinojosa	Meeks (NY)	Sherman
Hirono	Melancon	Shimkus
Hobson	Mica	Shuler
Hodes	Michaud	Shuster
Hoekstra	Millender-	Simpson
Holden	McDonald	Sires
Holt	Miller (FL)	Skelton
Honda	Miller (MI)	Slaughter
Hooley	Miller (NC)	Smith (NE)
Hoyer	Miller, Gary	Smith (NJ)
Hulshof	Miller, George	Smith (TX)
Hunter	Mitchell	Snyder
Inglis (SC)	Mollohan	Solis
Inslee	Moore (KS)	Souder
Israel	Moore (WI)	Space
Issa	Moran (KS)	Spratt
Jackson (IL)	Moran (VA)	Stark
Jackson-Lee	Murphy (CT)	Stearns
(TX)	Murphy, Patrick	Stupak
Jefferson	Murphy, Tim	Sullivan
Jindal	Murtha	Sutton
Johnson (GA)	Musgrave	Tancredo
Johnson (IL)	Myrick	Tanner
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Tauscher
Johnson, Sam	Napolitano	Taylor
Jones (NC)	Neal (MA)	Terry
Jones (OH)	Neugebauer	Thompson (CA)
Jordan	Nunes	Thompson (MS)
Kagen	Oberstar	Thornberry
Kanjorski	Obey	Tiahrt
Kaptur	Oliver	Tiberi
Keller	Ortiz	Tierney
Kennedy	Pallone	Towns
Kildee	Pascrell	Udall (CO)
Kilpatrick	Pastor	Udall (NM)
Kind	Paul	Upton
King (IA)	Payne	Van Hollen
King (NY)	Pearce	Velázquez
Kingston	Pelosi	Visclosky
Kirk	Pence	Walberg
Klein (FL)	Perlmutter	Walden (OR)
Kline (MN)	Peterson (MN)	Walsh (NY)
Knollenberg	Peterson (PA)	Walz (MN)
Kucinich	Petri	Wamp
Kuhl (NY)	Pitts	Wasserman
LaHood	Platts	Schultz
Lamborn	Poe	Watson
Lampson	Porter	Watt
Langevin	Price (GA)	Waxman
Lantos	Price (NC)	Weiner
Larsen (WA)	Putnam	Welch (VT)
Larson (CT)	Radanovich	Weldon (FL)
Latham	Rahall	Weller
Lee	Ramstad	Westmoreland
Levin	Rangel	Wexler
Lewis (CA)	Regula	Whitfield
Lewis (GA)	Rehberg	Wicker
Lewis (KY)	Reichert	Wilson (NM)
Linder	Renzi	Wilson (OH)
Lipinski	Reyes	Wilson (SC)
LoBiondo	Reynolds	Wolf
Loeb sack	Rodriguez	Wooolsey
Lofgren, Zoe	Rogers (AL)	Wu
Lowe y	Rogers (KY)	Wynn
Lungr en, Daniel	Rohrabacher	Yarmuth
E.	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)
Lynch	Ross	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—25

Bilbray	Carter
Bishop (UT)	Coble
Buyer	Culberson
Carson	Davis, Jo Ann

LaTourette	Pomeroy	Smith (WA)
Lucas	Pryce (OH)	Turner
McDermott	Rogers (MI)	Waters
Norwood	Roskam	
Pickering	Rush	

2015

So (two-thirds of those being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this chamber today. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 43, 44, 45, and 46.

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 material on H.R. 476 considered earlier this evening.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mr. SAXTON, New Jersey.

CUT OFF FUNDING FOR THE IRAQ WAR

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will receive the constitutional address from the executive, and I hope tomorrow that an olive branch will be extended to this Congress, an equal branch of government.

This weekend has seen some 25 U.S. soldiers fall in battle. To their families and their loved ones, I mourn their loss. They are heroes. And so I rise to thank the United States military for heroically and courageously doing their job.

Now it is time for the Congress to be heroic and courageous and cease the funding of this ill-fated war. We are now to reject any suggestion that continued funding protects our soldiers. Unless the President has a political and diplomatic solution, no amount of military force is going to resolve this sectarian fight.

I vote for cutting off the funds. I vote for a courageous and heroic Congress

Gordon
Gutierrez
Harman
Herger

to save the lives of the young men and women of America, and I thank them for their valiant and courageous service.

34TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, anniversaries are commonly recognized as a cause for celebration. Yet today the 34th anniversary of Roe v. Wade is no cause for celebration. While I am inspired by the thousands of citizens who came to Washington to march for life, I am truly disheartened by those who celebrate this "anniversary," a date which marks an overactive judiciary allowing the destruction of human life.

This judicial opinion's 34th anniversary marks the Federal judiciary's usurpation of the Republic's right to set social and moral policy through the electoral process. Moreover, the science behind the opinion is outdated and should, at the very least, be re-evaluated in light of new advancements in science over the last 34 years.

Many legal scholars see the finding in Roe v. Wade as nothing more than judicial activism, a poorly written opinion lacking logic and the strict interpretation of the Constitution in rendering said opinion.

The real legacy of Roe v. Wade is a culture war that will likely continue through many of the opinion's anniversaries yet to come.

Mr. Speaker, today is no cause for celebration. It is yet another example of judges legislating from the bench. Human life is a gift from God, and we all should cherish and protect it.

SMALL BUSINESS HEALTH PLAN

(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, tomorrow we will hear the State of the Union address from the President, and one of the issues that he will highlight in his speech tomorrow night is the need for expanded health care for Americans.

This is something that the Republicans in Congress have focused on for several years, and it is with excitement that we anticipate the President's remarks tomorrow night as he talks about small business health care, talks about small business health plans and how expanding small business health plans to 40 million uninsured Americans, 60 percent of whom work in small businesses, will help more and more families to be able to control their health care and their health care expense, their health care decisions, and preserve their right to access to physicians of their choice.

We know that by giving small businesses the opportunity to band to-

gether, they will have greater options. And we know that this will reduce the number of uninsured Americans.

We look forward to the President's plan for expanding health care through small business health plans.

THE SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the failure of Congress to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act results in a broken promise to over 600 forested counties across this country.

Surely you remember the frantic search last month for James Kim and his family in the Federal forests of southern Oregon. Josephine County relied on critical emergency resources in this heart-breaking effort. Ninety percent of the county's search and rescue budget has been funded by this Federal program, which this Congress has not reauthorized. Likewise, the county utilizes an emergency phone notification system to alert homeowners to disasters and emergencies. They used it during the search for the Kim family.

Sixty-five percent of Josephine County's land base is Federal. When disaster strikes, quick information response is literally a matter of life and death. Failure to reauthorize this program means these county services may not be funded and may not be available.

As Josephine County Commissioner Dave Toler said, the loss of this program "is about more than numbers. Its loss will change our lives for many more years to come."

My colleagues, it is high time for Congress to reauthorize this legislation.

MARCH FOR LIFE

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, more than 20,000 people descended on Washington today as part of the March for Life rally, marking the 34th anniversary of the Supreme Court's ruling on Roe v. Wade.

Over 44 million children, little boys and little girls, their lives have been lost since 1973, at this origination of Roe v. Wade. They were never given the opportunity to enjoy life.

As one March for Life participant pointed out today: "Rain or shine, these unborn children don't have that option. They'll never be able to feel the rain on their heads. They'll never be able to feel the wind on their face. So this is a great opportunity for us to march in their honor." And these participants braved cold weather and lots of rain today to participate and stand up for the most vulnerable in our society.

I hope for a more prosperous day when our country respects the lives of the unborn.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PASCRELL). 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.

TALIBAN RESURGENCE IN PAKISTAN

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. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of President Bush's State of the Union speech, in which he will undoubtedly be searching for support for his plan to send additional troops to Iraq, I fear that the President and his administration are neglecting the real front in the war on terror, and that is Afghanistan. It is because of this neglect that the Taliban has made a resurgence in both Afghanistan and western Pakistan.

In October, President Bush said that "al Qaeda is on the run" and claimed that we are winning the war on terror. The fact is that attacks by jihadists have increased over the last 3 years. In addition to the tragic bombings in Madrid and London, violent incidents linked to al Qaeda have occurred in Iraq, Egypt, Jordan, Indonesia, and elsewhere in the Middle East.

Investigators discovered that the man behind the London bombings, Mohammed Siddique Khan, spent significant time in western Pakistan prior to the bombings. He was in the area of Pakistan that shares the border with Afghanistan, and this area has grown to be one of the most problematic regions in America's war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, the problem stems from late 2001, when American forces pushed al Qaeda out of Afghanistan. The group did not disappear, but rather jumped the border to western Pakistan, where it has set up a network of training camps. A former American intelligence official who worked in Pakistan has claimed that over 2,000 foreign fighters are currently in the region.

The details of insurgent attacks on the ground in Afghanistan are very disconcerting. Suicide attacks have increased from 27 in 2005 to an alarming 139 attacks in 2006. Instances of roadside bombs have more than doubled from 783 in 2005 to 1,677 in 2006. And, Mr. Speaker, we are hardly winning this war.

President Bush and Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice must push Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf to take action against Taliban militants in the western region of his nation. After the attacks of 9/11, President Musharraf offered his support to the United States by vowing to search for

Taliban fighters and Islamic extremists in western Pakistan. However, he has failed to live up to his promise, as reports show that Taliban fighters seem to be flourishing in western Pakistan.

And it appears that Pakistan's agencies, particularly the large and powerful ISI, have been promoting the Islamic insurgency. According to press reports, NATO has captured nearly 200 members of the Taliban, including Pakistanis, who have described in detail the ISI's support of the Taliban.

Last week Director of National Intelligence John Negroponte said that al Qaeda "continues to plot attacks against our homeland from their leaders' secure hideout in Pakistan." President Bush must listen to Negroponte and others who see the realistic side of the war of terror, a war that we are not winning because the President is too focused on the failed war in Iraq.

By sending additional troops to Iraq, in a sense escalating the war, the President will continue to undermine the U.S. mission in Afghanistan. In fact, some reports have stated that a portion of the proposed 22,000 additional troops moving to Iraq will be pulled out of Afghanistan. It is simply unacceptable for the President to continue to risk American lives in Iraq in a war we cannot win while the real terror threat continues to grow in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, if the goal of the war on terror is to prevent future incidents of terrorism in the United States and abroad, President Bush must shift his focus away from Iraq and return it to Afghanistan and Pakistan. He must work with President Musharraf to eliminate extremist training camps in western Pakistan and acknowledge that the real epicenter of the war on terror is Afghanistan and not Iraq.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman 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.)

INDIANAPOLIS COLTS: AFC CHAMPIONS

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. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a great day for the State of Indiana and the city of Indianapolis.

For a long, long time, the Indianapolis Colts, our football team, has been trying to make it to the Super Bowl; but they have come just a little bit short the last 3 or 4 years. As a matter of fact, many people were saying that they didn't have what it takes to make it to the Super Bowl.

Yesterday, the Indianapolis Colts were down 21-3 at the half, and many

Hoosiers who were watching the football game and people across the country were so dismayed because they thought once again we weren't going to make it. But Peyton Manning, the quarterback for the Colts; and Joseph Addai; Tony Dungy, the coach of the team; Bill Polian, who put this thing together as president of the club; and the whole team did an outstanding job and came back and made the greatest comeback in the history of championship playoff games to win the game by 4 points right at the end.

I just have to tell you that it was the most exciting game that I have ever seen, and I want to congratulate the Colts on behalf of the Congress and behalf of the people of the State of Indiana for doing such an outstanding job.

One other thing I would like to comment on is the defense of the Colts has been maligned over the past four, five or six games of the season, and yet when it came to the playoffs, they rose to the occasion and did an outstanding job. Defenses don't usually get the accolades they deserve when they perform well, but I want to say to the Colts' defense, you guys did one heck of a job, and you proved your mettle, and I hope in the next 2 weeks you will get yourselves all up for this big game for the championship in Miami. Everybody in Indiana is rooting for you. You did a great job in the playoffs. Peyton, take them to victory in the Super Bowl. We are rooting for you.

□ 2030

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY 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 North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

(Ms. WATERS 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 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 gen-

tleman from California (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

BLUE DOG COALITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening on behalf of the 44-member fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition. Each week we come to the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to discuss with you and the people of this Congress, Mr. Speaker, about the need to restore fiscal discipline and common sense to our national government.

We speak of the need for accountability. Why? Because today the U.S. national debt is \$8,710,232,192,210; and, we ran out of room on the poster, but if you want to be exact about it, 43 cents. And for every man, woman, and child living in America today, their share of the national debt as of tonight is \$29,061.20. It is what those of us in

the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition refer to as the debt tax, D-E-B-T, which is one tax that will never go away until we get our fiscal house in order.

Mr. Speaker, as you walk the halls of Congress, it is easy to detect when you are walking by an office of a fellow Blue Dog member, because you will see this poster reminding Members of Congress and reminding the American people of the fiscal recklessness that we have witnessed all across this Nation for the past 6 years. The American people have spoken, the American people have given the Democrats an opportunity to lead this Chamber, and we are determined as members of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition to getting our Nation's fiscal house in order and restoring fiscal discipline and common sense to our national government.

The Blue Dog Coalition is about accountability. And, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, on Tuesday, many members of the Blue Dog Coalition will be filing a resolution for the 110th Congress, a resolution providing for Operation Iraqi Freedom cost accountability. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PATRICK MURPHY) for his work on this, a veteran of the Iraqi war who will be joining us later this evening on the floor.

This evening, as members of the Blue Dog Coalition, we plan to talk about providing for Operation Iraqi Freedom cost accountability. You ask people what they think about this postwar Iraq policy, you ask 100 people, you get 100 different ideas about how we ought to do it. One thing is for sure, everybody believes that we need to move in a new direction.

But, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that really makes me proud to be an American is that, unlike Vietnam, and I believe one of the painful lessons to come out of Vietnam is this time, this time at least, we are getting the support for soldier part of this right, because I see us all, not as Democrats and Republicans, but as Americans first. And what I have witnessed this time around has been truly amazing and has made me proud to be an American, and that is that everyone, regardless of how they feel about the war in Iraq, regardless of whether they are a Democrat or a Republican, everyone in America for the most part has stood united in support of our men and women in uniform.

I couldn't help but notice the plane I was on today from Little Rock to Atlanta had about a half dozen soldiers heading to Iraq, and I had the opportunity to shake their hand and thank them for their service to our country. I noticed others doing the same when I was changing planes in Atlanta. There were a lot of soldiers today in Atlanta headed for Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, personally I am opposed to this surge. I think that is not a new direction, I think it is more of the same. But as members of the fiscally

conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, we didn't take a position on that because everyone needs to represent the views of their district, and everyone needs to speak from their heart.

We have approached this, Mr. Speaker, from an accountability standpoint. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to you this resolution so you will know exactly what is in it, and you will know exactly what the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition stands for and what we are talking about, and then a number of Blue Dog fellow members will be joining me in this Special Order to discuss various aspects of this.

But resolution providing for Operation Iraqi Freedom cost accountability says:

Whereas it has been nearly 4 years since Operation Iraqi Freedom began;

Whereas our military personnel have performed with honor and bravery, and deserve the support of all Americans;

Whereas more than 3,000 American military personnel have been killed in Operation Iraqi Freedom and more than 20,000 have been injured;

Whereas the United States has spent nearly \$400 billion in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom;

Whereas the United States has spent tens of billions of dollars paying private contractors for services performed in Operation Iraqi Freedom;

Whereas government investigations and media reports have detailed waste, fraud, and possible war profiteering by some of these contractors;

Whereas American taxpayers deserve a detailed cost accounting for funds spent in Operation Iraqi Freedom;

Whereas instead of the normal budgetary process, the administration has used emergency supplemental appropriation bills to fund Operation Iraqi Freedom;

Whereas the normal appropriations process gives Congress greater oversight concerning both the need for and use of budgeted funds;

Whereas the annual need to budget substantial funding for Operation Iraqi Freedom is not unanticipated within the meaning of section 502 of the fiscal year 2007 budget resolution, and further funding for Operation Iraqi Freedom should be attained through the normal budgeting process;

Whereas since coalition forces removed Saddam Hussein from power, success in Operation Iraqi Freedom has depended upon an active and effective partnership between coalition forces and the Government and people of Iraq, a partnership that provides indispensable leverage to the coalition's financial, military, and political investments;

Whereas Iraqis must assume principal responsibility for internally policing Iraq, failing which past, present, and future coalition investments will not lead to security in Iraq and Iraq will dissolve in chaos.

Let me read that again: Whereas Iraqis must assume principal responsi-

bility for internally policing Iraq, failing which past, present, and future coalition investments will not lead to security in Iraq and Iraq will dissolve in chaos. In other words, we are in this together, and it is time for the Iraqi people to step up to the plate and assume more accountability and responsibility for the internal policing of Iraq.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that; and this is what the Blue Dog Coalition's accountability measure is about: Within 30 days after the adoption of this resolution, and every 90 days thereafter, the Department of Defense Inspector General and the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction shall prepare and transmit to Congress an unclassified report, but with a classified annex if necessary, that would contain:

Number 1. A detailed accounting of how military and reconstruction funds in Iraq have been spent thus far; \$400 billion of tax money from the hard-working people of America has gone to Iraq, and they deserve to know how that money has been spent in support of our men and women in uniform in support of this new Iraqi Government;

Number 2. A detailed accounting of the types and terms of contracts awarded on behalf of the United States, including the methods by which such contracts were awarded and contractors selected;

Our cities and counties all across this Nation are expected to advertise for bids and award bids based on the lowest bid they receive for services rendered for what they are looking for. Our Federal Government should not be any different.

Number 3. A description of the efforts to obtain support and assistance from other countries toward the rehabilitation of Iraq;

And, number 4. An assessment of what additional funding is needed to complete military operations and reconstruction efforts in Iraq, including a plan for security of Iraq, a detailed plan for how any future funds will be spent, and a statement of how those funds will advance the interests of the United States in Iraq.

That is one point.

The second point:

If either Inspector General fails to submit a quarterly report, the Government Accountability Office shall conduct an audit and report to Congress.

Sanctions shall be imposed against contractors who have engaged in fraud or abuse or war profiteering.

Congress should create a Truman Committee to conduct an ongoing study and investigation of the awarding and carrying out of contracts by the United States to conduct activities with regard to Operation Iraqi Freedom, and make such recommendations to the House as the select committee deems appropriate.

Funding requests for Operation Iraqi Freedom in fiscal year 2008 and beyond must come through the regular appropriations process, and not through so-called emergency supplementals.

No more hiding the cost of the war.

In furtherance of the partnership that is critical to success in Operation Iraqi Freedom, the administration should firmly condition further American financial, military, and political resources upon steady improvement in Iraqi assumption of principal responsibility for internally policing Iraq.

□ 2045

That is the resolution that many members of the Blue Dog Coalition will be filing, a resolution endorsed by the 44-member strong, fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition, with the Clerk of the House on Tuesday or Wednesday of this week. I just read it in detail, word by word, so the American people, Mr. Speaker, will know exactly what it is that we are offering up.

It is not complicated. It is not partisan. It is not about whether we should or should not be in Iraq and about whether we should or should not leave tonight or tomorrow, next month or next year. It is about being accountable for the \$400 billion that has already been spent in Iraq, and God knows how much more will be spent in Iraq, and the American people, the hardworking people of this country that get up, go to work, work hard and pay taxes, deserve to know and have a full accounting for how their money is being spent in Iraq.

That is what this resolution is all about. It is what the Blue Dog Coalition is all about. It is about standing for responsibility, transparency and accountability and in getting our Nation's fiscal house in order so we can see this number, Mr. Speaker, the national debt, begin to trend downward, because as long as we are spending a half a billion dollars a day paying interest on the debt we have already got, before we increase it another billion dollars a day, many of America's priorities will continue to go unmet.

We have got to get our fiscal house in order because, you know what, coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan and other parts of the world is a whole new generation of veterans. It is our duty in these United States to be there in support of our veterans, to be there in support of our men and women in uniform, regardless of whether they are serving us in Iraq, Afghanistan or elsewhere across the globe.

We can have differences of opinion with the President on Iraq and his Iraq policy, but what makes me proud to be an American is that we are standing together in support of our men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, we have got a number of folks that have joined me this evening to talk about accountability in this Iraq War, and at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ROSS very much. It is always a pleasure to be on the floor with you and my other colleagues in the Blue Dog Coalition.

I would like to maybe start just responding to what we are doing so that we can set the stage properly for the American people who are watching to understand why we are doing this and the important confirmation that we have for doing it that is embedded deep in the Constitution of the United States.

The question on what role does Congress have in this has been put before pundits and before commentators, news articles once the President made his statement about the surge, and I, too, want to go on record as saying that I oppose this surge, almost exclusively because of the strain that it is placing on our military, which is already overstrained, and taking our young men and women and not only just putting them in harm's way, but placing them in the cross-hairs of a civil war.

But fundamentally, as I mentioned earlier, what this legislation is that we are here to bring some transparency and to bring some understanding of how the taxpayers' money is being spent is embedded, as I said early, deep into the Constitution.

Now, I want everybody to understand that when we put forward this bill, we are not putting it forward based upon what we feel like today. We are putting this forward so that we can be responsive to the job that we were created to do.

In Article I in Section 8 of the Constitution, it states clearly, when that question was put to James Madison and to Alexander Hamilton at the beginning of the formation of the Continental Army, the fight for the freedom of this country at the very beginning, the question was this: Who has the authority to declare war; who has the authority to raise and support our military? Here is what it says in Article I, Section 8, that was written well over 200 years ago.

Article I, Section 8, gives Congress, not the White House, not the executive branch, not the President, it says clearly it gives Congress the power to "raise and support armies." Those words are in there. In other words, it gives Congress the exclusive power to appropriate the funds for war and then to determine the manner in which those funds are handled and used.

That is what undergirds our resolution that we are putting forth as Blue Dogs and as Democrats and as Republicans, because I believe that we will get bipartisan support for standing up and finally allowing this Congress to do what the Founding Fathers put us here to do.

Just for a moment, our war in Iraq has been prosecuted at a tremendous cost to our Nation, a tremendous cost in terms of especially our soldiers' lives, and we cannot thank our soldiers enough for the sacrifice that they have given, but also the strain that it has placed on their families through repeated and increasingly hefty deployments, wear and tear on our equipment and, of course, the taxpayers' money.

That is what the Founding Fathers said when they said raise and support our Army. They just did not say tax the money. It did not say that. It said raise and support, which means put your arms around it and make sure you take care of your Army.

I will tell you, up to this point this Congress has not done so. The strain on our military is extraordinary. Our service members, as we know, are all volunteers. They and their families are more than willing to sacrifice, as they have and as they will continue to do, for the good of our Nation, and the American public at large is also willing to allow its tax dollars to be spent on a worthy cause. However, we in Congress owe it to the whole country to make sure that our service members are not sacrificing needlessly in Iraq and Afghanistan, and that tax money is not being squandered.

The American public and Members of Congress have largely not been aware of exactly where the money is going, where the funding that we are providing has been going, and there is widespread reports of contractor fraud. There is bribery, there is waste, there is theft of reconstruction funds for the war in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the reason it has been is because we have not fulfilled Article I in Section 8 which gives Congress the power to raise and support our armies and determine how this money is being spent, because this Congress, up to now, has rolled over and given this President everything he asked for without asking the questions because they have allowed him to use the emergency supplemental funding process.

For those in America and those on C-SPAN, what that means is that that is a type of funding that prohibits us in Congress from doing exactly what the Founding Fathers said we must do in Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution, and that is to raise and support armies and determine how this money is being spent.

It is because this administration has used the dubious practice of emergency supplementals to fund the operations in Iraq and Afghanistan away from congressional oversight, that is why we have had fraud.

That is why we have had bribery. Emergency supplementals do not go through the normal budgeting and appropriations cycle.

The administration has also not been forthcoming in providing the detail as to what specifically the funds in the supplemental budget request is being used for, and as a result, Members of Congress typically have not had the opportunity to scrutinize the request thoroughly. Supplementals are considered on an expedited basis and basically a sight unseen.

That is why what the Blue Dogs are doing with our resolution is so important. It pulls the covers off and it says let the Congress do the job that the Founding Fathers put us here to do.

One more point I want to make in the Iraq Study Group report that came

out, it recognized this problem, and it mentions briefly the issue of budgeting for Operation Iraqi Freedom, and specifically they recommended that funding be placed back in the regular budget process, away from the supplemental, saying that this should be done to increase transparency and accountability. The Blue Dogs are taking that recommendation and doing with it what was recommended, and for those of you that have that report, you might find that recommendation on page 59 and 60. It is recommendation 72.

So, to correct this problem, we in the Blue Dog Coalition are introducing this bill. As Mr. ROSS said, we will be doing it later this week. This bill will allow the Members of Congress the time and the information required to provide proper oversight of defense spending and contracting, and it will allow us the time to apply the new PAYGO rules recently passed by the House of Representatives, and, most importantly, it will allow the American people, that is what this election was about, it was about this country and this country taking this country back and putting into practice those things that the Founding Fathers gave us to do, and in the process the American people will become more fully educated on the true costs of this war and the sacrifices they are making and make sure that this money goes where it is supposed to go, and will hopefully, prayerfully bring our sons and daughters, our husbands and our wives, our fathers and our mothers back home safe as soon as we possibly can and end this war.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia and would invite him to stay and continue this conversation with me this evening during this Special Order that is being hosted by the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition.

Mr. Speaker, if you have any comments, questions or concerns for us, you can e-mail us at bluedog@mail.house.gov. Again, you can e-mail us at bluedog@mail.house.gov.

One of the new Members of the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition comes to us from the State of Pennsylvania, and that is PATRICK MURPHY, a veteran of the Iraq War who was very involved, as I mentioned at the beginning of the discussion this evening, in helping to carefully craft this resolution to demand accountability for how the tax money of the people of America is being spent in Iraq while continuing to remain steadfast in our support of our soldiers.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PATRICK MURPHY).

Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for this opportunity and for allowing me to serve on that task force that we formed to present this bill this week, this Oper-

ation Iraqi Freedom cost accountability resolution.

As I was seeking to prepare my remarks, I could not help but think about Mr. SCOTT from the great State of Georgia when he talked about that Constitution. That is the Constitution that every soldier, every airman, every marine takes note to support and defend against all enemies, foreign and domestic. I appreciate that.

That is the Constitution I had the great opportunity to talk about and teach about every single day at the United States Military Academy at West Point, and talking about those first three articles of our Constitution that lays out the framework, that separation of powers that we talk about. There is a reason why Article I was the Congress and Article II was the President and Article III was the judiciary.

Those two main goals of the U.S. Congress is to, one, declare war; but two is the purse strings, that budget that you talked so eloquently about. So I appreciate you bringing that up, and I hope we can make this happen this week. I do believe that we will get many of our colleagues, not just on our side of the aisle, but also on the other side of the Chamber as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the war in Iraq, and I want to talk today because the Blue Dogs, the Blue Dog Democrats, the fiscally conservative Democrats, stay focused on two things: one, fiscal responsibility; and, two, a strong national defense. The legislation that we are discussing this week, which I will have the opportunity to introduce, tackles both of these issues.

Mr. Speaker, we have spent over \$360 billion in Iraq over the course of the last 4 years.

□ 2100

Along with the casualty reports and the terrible news on the ground, we are getting reports about money lost and weapons missing.

Last week, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, we heard from Stuart Bowen, the Special Inspector General for Iraqi reconstruction. He told those of us at the hearing that as much as 15 percent of the billions of dollars that we were spending in Iraq has vanished, and as many as 14,000 weapons sent to the Iraqis have gone missing because of mismanagement and fraud. That is enough weaponry to arm an entire division of the al Sadr militia. This isn't just about money; it is about the safety of our troops as well.

Mr. Speaker, it is long past time that we kept track of the money and the weapons that we are giving to the Iraqis and to replace the fraud, waste and abuse with proper oversight, responsibility and accountability.

The legislation that the Blue Dogs are introducing this week addresses the glaring lack of oversight and accountability in Iraq and addresses how our taxpayer dollars are spent on the war.

It puts forward commonsense proposals that ensure fewer resources are wasted and more resources get to the troops in the field.

This bill contains measures everyone can agree on, regardless of their political party. American families are frustrated with the war in Iraq, and this legislation will go a long way toward providing some meaningful solutions.

Another thing that this legislation does is urge the establishment of a Truman Committee-type commission to track and curb the waste, fraud and abuse in Iraq. In the 1940s, then-Senator Harry Truman established a committee that wasn't very popular at the time. Senator Truman's work reportedly saved \$11 billion, and eventually landed him on the cover of Time magazine.

Now, Mr. Speaker, none of us here, none of us Blue Dogs here, are looking to be on the front of a magazine cover; but we are looking for an end to the mismanagement in Iraq and in the war.

As you know, this issue hits very close to home for me. I served in Baghdad, Iraq, in 2003 to 2004 as a member of the 82nd Airborne Division, Second Brigade Combat Team. On our team, we lost 19 men, men that made the ultimate sacrifice. Part of what we did in Iraq was to train the Iraqi National Defense Corps.

At the time that we were training them back in that summer of 2003, they didn't have uniforms, so we took the initiative to give them hats, Chicago White Sox hats, so that we could identify them as a unit. They didn't have uniforms. There was no oversight. There was no thought process. But our soldiers on the ground took the initiative to at least give them something that would distinguish them.

At our hearing, Special Inspector Bowen revealed one example of \$75 million so grossly mismanaged by the Iraqi Police Academy that it had to be knocked down before it was even put to use. That is \$75 million in American taxpayer money that is just thrown to the wayside.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for answers, and it is time for accountability.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a veteran of the Iraq war, a new member of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, for not only joining us for this Special Order this evening on demanding accountability of the American people's tax money and how it is being spent in Iraq, but also playing a very important role in helping draft, carefully craft and write this resolution that the Blue Dog Coalition has endorsed and will be filed as a House resolution on the floor of this House this week. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania again for his work on that and for his service to our country.

At this time I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois, Ms. BEAN, another very active member of the Blue Dog Coalition, someone who comes to

this town and demands fiscal accountability and responsibility like we are doing here on the floor of the House this evening.

Ms. BEAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. It is always a pleasure to join my Blue Dog colleagues on the House floor.

The Blue Dogs were formed with the intention of always demanding accountability and oversight, particularly relative to our national budget. We are out here pretty regularly talking about the \$8 trillion national debt. You have the number right next to you, Mr. ROSS. That has really ballooned out of control.

We talk about PAYGO budget rules, which we were glad to lead our caucus into passing through the House so we can start to bring some fiscal sense back to this Congress in the same way that our taxpayers and constituents have to bring to their home budgets and their business budgets. They deserve the same level of accountability with their tax dollars and the way we spend them here.

That applies to the entire budget. There is no more important priority than ensuring the safety of our troops and our Nation. So it is almost incomprehensible that billions of dollars of the roughly \$400 billion that has been spent on the war in Iraq goes unaccounted for.

Congressman MURPHY just spoke to that. He talked about it is not just dollars unaccounted for, but weapons as well. So there is a serious safety issue for our troops. Therefore, I was proud to join my Blue Dog colleagues as a cosponsor of this Iraq war cost accountability resolution that I believe we are introducing on the floor tomorrow.

Before I talk about the resolution itself, I just wanted to mention another one of our colleagues who is not with us today, Congresswoman JANE HARMAN, who recently had an op-ed piece that she entitled "Stop Conducting the War Off the Books." She talked about how the emergency supplemental that the President has said he will be bringing to this Congress will be the sixth emergency supplemental for this war. She also talks about how our own last year's budget resolution defined "emergency" as only spending that is "sudden, unforeseen or temporary." While certainly supporting our troops is urgent and important, it is not sudden, when we are almost 4 years and \$400 billion into this war.

I think she makes a good case that we all support, who are on this resolution, getting these requests into the budget, and that one of the reasons they have been called emergencies when they haven't been unforeseen or sudden is that doing so exempts the President from spending caps and from counting the hundreds of billions of dollars that have been spent on the war in Iraq in our deficit.

What that really is, it is dishonest accounting. We are not asking all

Americans to join Congress in making the hard decisions about what the cost of this war should mean relative to a shared sacrifice. So by doing it off the books, we are not engaging in the dialogue we really should be having.

This resolution that we are introducing tomorrow will require four things: first, accountability and oversight, not only for our own spending, but also what we are doing to urge other countries and allies to participate and what their spending would be. It will talk about dollars already spent and how they have been spent and whether we have accomplished what we set out to do. Also important is it will include sanctions for contractors that have engaged in fraud, abuse or war profiteering.

The second thing it will do, as Congressman MURPHY alluded to, is create committees akin to the Truman Committee that will, again, look at all contracts awarded and also the method of how those contracts are awarded to ensure we are getting the best return on our tax dollars.

Third, it will require, as I just alluded to, the on-budget accounting of the war. No more emergency supplementals. But it will require that the war in Iraq, starting in fiscal 2008 and beyond, any requests for funding must come through the regular appropriations process, with the oversight and accountability that goes along with that.

The fourth thing that this resolution does is it states how important it is for Iraq to be moving forward in assuming the principal responsibility for their own internal security. It will require that the administration should condition further American financial or military support upon steady improvement in Iraqi progress toward that end.

I am very proud to join my colleagues on this resolution. I think the American public should expect no less from this Congress. I am hopeful that we are going to have bipartisan support on this resolution, as we have on some of the things we have been introducing in the first 100 hours in our new majority.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for letting me join him.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank an active member of the fiscally responsible Blue Dog Democrat Coalition, the gentlewoman from Illinois, MELISSA BEAN, for being a part of this discussion this evening to talk about the Blue Dog Coalition's resolution to demand accountability for how tax money is being spent in Iraq, just as we do here at home through our Blue Dog 12-point plan for budget reform.

This resolution will be filed on the floor of this House this week as the Blue Dog Coalition demands this administration to be accountable for how your tax money, Mr. Speaker, is being spent in Iraq.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from New York, a new member of the Blue Dog Coalition, someone who has

come here and been a very active member of our coalition and has been doing a lot to help us with this resolution, and that is the gentleman from New York, MIKE ARCURI.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Arkansas.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to this administration's call for 21,000 new troops in the surge in Iraq. As one of three New Yorkers in the Blue Dog Coalition, I am very proud of the position that the Blue Dog Coalition takes with respect to identifying issues of fiscal responsibility. They have done that very thing with the war.

There are many, many reasons why we shouldn't be involved in the war in Iraq, and the Blue Dogs have pointed out one additional reason for that in terms of the cost that this war has and the way it has burdened our country.

When I talk to people in my district, they always ask me, why are we spending so much money on the war, when we have such great needs for education or for health care or for housing? Those are all issues that people are very concerned about; yet we continue to spend billions and billions of dollars on a very unpopular war.

My other concern with respect to this war and this operation in Iraq is the fact that our Army is an army that is a volunteer army, which means that in order for us to continue to defend our country and to get the numbers that we need in the Armed Forces, we need to have high numbers of volunteers. Yet with this protracted engagement that we are involved in now in Iraq, it continues to lower morale and makes it more and more difficult to attract troops and to attract recruits to our military.

I am very humbled when I hear my colleague PATRICK MURPHY, a real patriot, a veteran of Iraq, get up here and speak and talk from his heart about the things that he experienced while he was in Iraq. It concerns me, because I believe that this war and this engagement in Iraq is doing more to hurt the morale of our military than any other operation that we have seen in recent history. It concerns me because I hear different anecdotal stories from people in my district. There is one I would like to share with you.

Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine who was a very patriotic young man enlisted in the armed services and actually did three tours of duty. He did one in Afghanistan and two in Iraq. He was wounded and received the Purple Heart and received a Bronze Star.

After his last tour in Iraq, he was ready to leave the military. He talked to his people in his outfit, and they asked him if he would stay and help to train troops in a non-deployment type of position stateside. Being the patriotic person that he is, he agreed to do that.

The problem for him was that because of the buildup and because of the steps that are being taken now, he was

told that he would no longer be able to continue in a nondeployment type of position, but would rather have to go into a third tour of duty in Iraq. It put a huge strain on him. It put a huge strain on his family.

These are the kinds of concerns that we have when it comes to the morale and when it comes to the future of our military.

□ 2115

And speaking from myself, I would just like to say that I believe that this type of action and this type of activity puts a huge strain on our military.

I strongly support the efforts of the Blue Dog Coalition because I believe that they point out the things that we need to do as a country. We are talking about a resolution that will create a Truman type of committee that will help to oversee efforts and oversee different actions which are taking place by different contractors in Iraq. So I am very pleased to be here today to talk on behalf of the Blue Dog Coalition.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI), a new Member of this Congress, a new member of the Blue Dog Coalition, for coming and visiting with us this evening about the need for accountability and responsibility in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Blue Dog Coalition is about fiscal responsibility. It is about restoring common sense and fiscal discipline to our Nation's government, not only here at home, but also in Iraq. And that is why this week the Blue Dog Coalition will file a resolution that its coalition, the Blue Dog members, have endorsed to demand accountability in Iraq.

We read the resolution in its entirety at the beginning of this Special Order. Basically, we want a detailed accounting of how military and reconstruction funds in Iraq have been spent thus far, a detailed accounting of the types and terms of contracts awarded on behalf of the United States, including the methods by which such contracts were awarded and contractors selected; a description of efforts to obtain support and assistance from other countries toward the rehabilitation of Iraq. The U.S. should not be going this alone; an assessment of what additional funding is needed to complete military operations and reconstruction efforts in Iraq, including a plan for security in Iraq; a detailed plan for how any future funds will be spent; and a statement of how those funds will advance the interests of the United States in Iraq. Sanctions shall be imposed against contractors who have engaged in fraud or abuse or, yes, war profiteering.

We are calling for the creation of a Truman-like committee commissioned to conduct an ongoing study and investigation of the awarding and carrying out of contracts by the United States to conduct activities with regard to Operation Iraqi Freedom, and make such recommendations to the House as

the select committee deems appropriate.

Funding requests for Operation Iraqi Freedom in fiscal year 2008 and beyond must come through the regular appropriation process, not through the so-called emergency supplementals; no more of not being accountable; no more hiding the true cost of the war.

And finally, the administration should firmly condition further American financial, military and political resources upon steady improvement in Iraqi assumption of principal responsibility for internally policing Iraq.

Now, why are we filing this resolution? Because our Nation has now spent over \$400 billion, nearly a half a trillion, in Iraq. Total for 2006, \$100.4 billion; for the month, \$8.44 billion; the cost per day, \$275 million. And, Mr. Speaker, yes, each hour we are sending \$11,458,333 of your tax money to Iraq. And we believe it is time for this Congress to fulfill its constitutional duty to provide oversight on how this money is being spent.

I yield to my fellow Blue Dog member from California Mr. COSTA.

Mr. COSTA. Thank you very much, the gentleman from Arkansas. I appreciate having an opportunity to share with my fellow Blue Dog colleagues this evening the challenges that our country is facing as we wage this war on terrorism, and try to bring together some level of stability in Iraq.

The War Funding Accountability Act that the Blue Dog Coalition is sponsoring, that we present to you this evening, is an attempt to bring accountability that has sorely been missing almost 4 years now after we have been engaged in this effort. And we, as Americans, are all engaged in this effort.

This War Accountability Act, if it successfully passes Congress, would require the Department of Defense Inspector General, as well as the Special Inspector General for Iraq on Reconstruction, to report to the Congress every 30 days after any supplemental bill passes, and quarterly thereafter. These reports, unfortunately, have been lacking over the last 4 years.

Now, as we look back, there has been a lot of water that has passed under this bridge, at tremendous costs, beginning first with over 3,000 American lives, men and women that have been lost, and over 20,000 Americans who have suffered injuries as a result of this engagement in Iraq and Afghanistan.

We are talking about the fiscal costs here this evening. But there is no way that we can put a cost or a value on the American lives that have been lost in this effort to try to bring stability and continue to protect Americans on this war on terrorism.

What has been lacking is accountability. The Blue Dogs feel strongly that accountability not only in the fiscal sense, but accountability in how we have engaged in this war effort needs to be seriously focused on. And that is why I am supporting this resolution.

A couple of weeks ago I met with the President, as he solicited our ideas about how we should go forth. I said, "Mr. President, I was in Iraq last year, among the first delegation to meet with Prime Minister Maliki, and I asked Prime Minister Maliki what his goals were. He said they were disband the militias, reduce violence, get reconstruction going and move the economy." It all makes a lot of sense. Eight months later, going on to 9 months, unfortunately, the Prime Minister's actions have been far deficient of his words. And so today we are focusing on this War Funding Accountability Act.

But I said, "Mr. President, militarily we cannot be successful in this effort alone. There needs to be a political agreement in which the major sectarian factions in this sectarian civil war are willing to agree upon on how to share the political power in Iraq and the oil revenues." Let's make no mistake about it. That is what we are fighting in today.

Unfortunately, that is the sectarian civil war that we have gotten ourselves into, and without a political solution, we will not be successful in Iraq.

I have been there. I looked into the eyes of the American men and women in uniform who are fighting valiantly on our behalf, and we need to put the same support for them as we try to put for you. So as we demand accountability on single-source bidding, on sole-source contracting for the efforts in Iraq, let's also hold the Iraqi Government to the same time lines and the same sort of accountability that we should be holding our own government for. And for these reasons, I support the Blue Dog Coalition on the War Funding Accountability Act.

And as I told the President, "Put me in the doubtful column as it relates to the surge unless we have a political agreement among the Shiites, the Kurds and the Sunnis on how they are going to share power forthwith and how they are going to share the oil revenues, because otherwise, in my opinion, we are kidding ourselves, and, more importantly, we are misleading the American public. And sadly, what is at stake are the lives of American men and women in uniform who are in harm's way in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA). And in the 8 minutes or so we have remaining, I have got three other members of the Blue Dog Coalition that have joined us, and we are very pleased that they have. At this time I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA).

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker and Mr. ROSS, tomorrow night, when the President of the United States delivers his State of the Union Address, the Nation will listen carefully as he lays out his agenda for the final 2 years of office. And there is no question our Nation faces many great challenges. The one issue, however, that weighs most heavily on the minds of the American people is, of course, the war in Iraq. The

President is now moving forward with a plan to escalate the war, despite bipartisan opposition. I have grave doubts about the wisdom of this action, as do most of my colleagues.

Regardless of one's views on the right way to move forward in Iraq, we should be able to agree on one thing: Fraud and abuse and flagrant waste of taxpayer dollars that we have seen throughout this war have got to stop. It is bleeding our Treasury dry, and it is further undermining our security in Iraq.

Some estimates suggest the war in Iraq will cost the American people \$2 trillion when all is said and done, and that is truly a staggering figure. That is why the Blue Dogs are putting forward this resolution asking for accountability. We can't afford another \$2 trillion in debt piled on to what Mr. ROSS has already said, \$8.710 and change trillion.

So Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up a lot of time. We have two distinguished colleagues that have waited here to speak to you tonight. But I will say that I applaud the Blue Dogs, and I am proud of being a member of the Blue Dogs. I am proud to be here with you again, Mr. ROSS, and I just believe it is high time that the American people have a full accounting of what this war is costing, and how the contractors have misspent American Treasury in the process.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from California for demanding accountability of how your tax money, Mr. Speaker, is being spent, the tax money of hardworking Americans is being spent, not only here at home, but also abroad in places like Iraq.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, my fellow Blue Dog member, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS.

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. Congressman ROSS, thanks very much. I will be very brief.

During the campaign in November, October and September, obviously leading up to the November 7 election, I heard a great deal from those who would be talking about, do you favor cut and run or stay the course?

I submit to you that neither of those are good alternatives. And the sad thing is that the American public has been told that mission has been accomplished after landing on the battleship. And then shortly after that, the Iraqi insurgents were told, just bring it on. I think it is time that we bring on a little bit of accountability. And this accountability and the resolution that the Blue Dog Democrats have introduced doesn't deal with whether or not we stay, how long we stay. It just talks about the stay that we have already been there, account for it. Account for the almost \$400 billion that has been spent of taxpayer dollars that could be used, quite frankly, maybe to have won the war in a better way, to have brought about a safe Iraq that is not there today.

And my real concern, as I go back and study the Tet Offensive, it is my

concern that, as we send these 20-some thousand extra troops into Iraq, and as we start talking on the Shiia militias, that we may see the results of another Tet Offensive that we saw in 1968 in Vietnam.

I just hope that our President, that the Defense Department and those who are advocating additional troops not only will be accountable for what we have already done there, but at least present to us a better plan than what we have had presented to us in the past.

Stay the course, mission accomplished and bring it on just ain't got it done, and it is time that we look at what is going on in this country. When you look at Iraq and Iran, and you realize that when you hear that there are a billion folks of the faith of Islam, most of those are either in Asia, Central Asia and in Africa, not in the Middle East. Virtually all in the Middle East perhaps are the Islam faith except, obviously, for the nation of Israel. But when you look where most of the Shiias are, only 10 percent of the faith of Islam are Shiias. The other are Sunnis. And when you look at where the bulk of the Shiia population is, it is in Iraq and in Iran.

It is my fear that stay the course, bring it on and mission accomplished has only brought to us two nations in the Middle East, Iraq and Iran, with probably close to 7 percent of the Shiias that will be in control of two nations in the Middle East that will have under their soils around 50 percent of the oil in the Middle East. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that we take a serious look and do what the old crossing at the railroad used to say: Stop, look and listen to what we are doing.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his assessment in support of this Blue Dog resolution to demand accountability in Iraq. And with the remaining 3 or 4 minutes left in this Special Order, Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as the gentleman from Florida, a new member of the Blue Dog Coalition, a new Member of this Congress, Mr. MAHONEY, may so desire.

□ 2130

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from Arkansas for yielding to me tonight. I stand here today representing the great State of Florida's 16th Congressional District, a district that spans from the Atlantic to the Gulf of Mexico and represents the hopes and aspirations of all Floridians.

I stand here as a freshman member of the Blue Dog Coalition supporting our resolution demanding that the administration account for the Iraq war in a manner that lets this Nation see the true costs of the undertaking, and ensuring that our brave men and women who are fighting for our freedom are not being robbed by profiteers and inefficient government bureaucracy.

What got me was that not only was the deficit a tax on my daughter, Bai-

ley's, future, but this administration was not leveling with the American people. This administration was not telling the people the true cost of their programs, telling us that these tax breaks for the wealthiest were driving us to the poor house, cutting revenues when increasing government by over 30 percent.

Now, do not get me wrong. I believe in smaller, more efficient government. I do not believe we need to raise taxes. However, as a businessman, I believe in living within one's means, having to make tough choices so that we can determine what is important, determining what our national priorities are and making those hard choices.

The fact that this administration has calculatingly funded this war with emergency supplemental appropriations so that the American people would not see the true cost is wrong. This Congress and the American people have the right to determine for themselves if the results justify the expenses. Looking at the budget cuts our children had to endure when he cut Head Start, when he unfunded No Child Left Behind, cutting the budget for health services for our veterans, cutting funding for law enforcement programs while violent crime is on the rise, making a decision to leave our ports unsecured by not inspecting the hundreds of thousands of containers that enter this country every year.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to have all of the facts so that they can make their own decision. This resolution calls on the President to budget for the Iraq war like he budgets for everything else. No longer can this country afford the President standing in front of the American people and declaring fiscal victory when he loses less of our money than he projected, declaring victory when we are running record deficits and not adding the cost of the Iraq war.

These are real losses, these are real debts, debts to be repaid with our tax dollars. Further, this resolution calls for the President to be a good steward of our money by asking for accountability in how our hard-earned money is spent. Our resolution specifically calls on Congress to perform this congressional responsibility to provide oversight and make sure that our brave men and women fighting for our liberty get everything they need to come home and make those who would steal from them pay the price.

This is not a new idea. President Truman, as a U.S. Senator, did exactly that during World War II, a Democrat in Congress providing oversight to a Democratic administration. Imagine that. What a novel idea.

Tonight I call upon the American people to let the President know that regardless of whether you support the war in Iraq or not, you expect him to level with the American people.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, let me be clear the Blue Dog Coalition stands for fiscal responsibility and accountability

here at home and in Iraq, and we stand in support of our men and women in uniform, and we demand accountability for them to ensure that these resources are going to them to support them, to keep them safe, and to return them home to their families. May God bless our troops and their families.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPACE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, postponed votes on motions to suspend the rules with respect to House Resolution 51, House Resolution 57, and H.R. 476 will be taken tomorrow.

DEMOCRATS MUST ACT TO AVOID TAX INCREASES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight, as I have for the past couple of weeks, to remind the American people that if this Congress does not act over the next 2, over the next 4 years, in just 1,440 days there will be a tax increase in this country. It is going to happen as I said over the next 4 years if the Democrats do not extend the tax cuts that the Republicans have put in place over the last several years.

It is going to amount to about \$200 billion that the American people will pay more in taxes. And I appreciate my colleagues from the Blue Dog Democrat Coalition coming down to the House floor and talking about fiscal responsibility. They talk about the budget. But I hear very little about taxes and keeping taxes low on the American people.

And one of the Blue Dogs mentioned in his remarks that he believes in smaller and efficient government and that we have to make tough choices. And that is true. We have to make very tough choices. But it is not our money.

We need to make sure that one of the decisions is to not raise the taxes on the American people, because when we were here in the final hours of the Democrats' 100 hours, on that Friday morning, right after they finished the 100 hours, we were in session for all of about 45 minutes, from 10 to 11 a.m. and most Americans did not see that 45 minutes.

So that is why I think it is important that I come to the floor and remind the American people what this Congress is doing and what we have done in the last couple of weeks or the 100 hours that the Democrats ran their six bills. And I have a number, 1,440. That is again January 1, 2011, when our taxes will finally get up to that \$200 billion tax increase if we do not act. All the Democrats have to do is run the clock

out, they do not have to pass legislation, and those tax cuts that we put in place that have benefited this economy so greatly will expire.

There is another number that you can put up, and that is how many days since the Democrats' last tax increase. And it has been just 4 days. Now, little did I know and little did I think that it would take only 14 days of the Democrats being in the majority party in Congress, they worked for 13 years to win back the majority, and in 14 days the first tax increase passed this House and is going to move on to the Senate. I hope the Senate does not pass it.

Because that is a tax increase on the American people. Now, the Democrats say that it is the oil company, the big oil companies that are going to receive this increase in taxes. And that is true. The big oil companies will pay about \$6.5 billion of taxes over the next several years. But the reality is, corporations and businesses do not pay taxes in this country; consumers pay it. The tax increase will be passed along. And it will be passed along in the form of higher energy costs.

We will pay more at the pump when we go to fill our cars up. Oil companies, they will have a competitive disadvantage. They will have to pay more when they go out to explore for oil. It will be the Venezuelan oil company, Citgo, or it will be the Iranian or some other foreign oil company that is going to be in a better position to be able to spend money to find oil, to sell it to the American economy, sell it to America, less expensive than our own domestic energy producers.

Ladies and gentlemen, I just think if you are watching tonight that is not the right thing to do, especially in this time of high energy costs. We have got to make it more cost efficient, give our companies a better footing to compete, not only in energy but in manufacturing. And raising taxes on business is the wrong thing to do.

And as I said, it has only taken the Democrats 14 days until this first tax increase has come down the road and has passed this House of Representatives. And that should not surprise anybody in America, because during the campaign, the new chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the Representative from New York, he told the Bloomberg News that he cannot think of one tax cut passed under President Bush that merits renewal.

There is no question about it, he said, everything has to be on the table. And what we have seen already is a tax increase just 4 days ago. And as I said, I believe that is going to trickle down into the American public, and they will be paying that through higher energy costs, higher fuel costs.

As I said, it is important that I think the American people, if you are watching this evening, are reminded that you are getting exactly what the Democrats said during the election. They said that they would raise your taxes. Once again, I hear the Blue Dogs come

down here night after night talking about fiscal responsibility. I do not hear them, though, talking about taxes, making sure they keep the taxes low on the American people.

I do not hear them talking about the biggest spending programs that our government has, and that is Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid. How are we going to improve and strengthen, reform those important programs important to the American citizens, important to our seniors in this country?

So those are things that I do not hear them talking about. I am very interested to see what the Blue Dog Democrats will propose when it comes to the budget. We will come into budget season here I believe in March. And I know that when the Republicans were in the majority, the Blue Dogs offered a budget every time. There was a Democrat budget, there was a Blue Dog budget, and there was the Republican budget. So I am very, very interested in seeing what the Blue Dogs propose if in fact they are even allowed to propose a budget, because I think it will be different than their elected leadership will put on this floor.

But back to the tax cuts and what it means to the American people. Over the last 4 years we have seen 7.2 million jobs created in this country from those tax cuts. Our economy is creating jobs month after month. Just in December 167,000 jobs were created in this country. The unemployment rate is down to 4.5 percent. It is the lowest average it has been in four decades. That is directly attributable to the tax cuts we have put in place over the last several years.

Now, if we do not extend them, if we do not do the responsible thing, the American taxpayers are going to be penalized for their hard work by us taking money out of their pockets. When you look at a family of four that earns over \$40,000, if we allow the child tax credit and the marriage penalty to expire, they will pay about \$2,000 more that will come out of their pockets.

That is money that they could use to save for college, to pay for health care insurance, to buy a new washer and dryer, or put a down payment on a new car. That is their money. They should be able to spend that money as they see fit. And the way to do that is to keep the tax rates low so that they can continue to determine how to use that money best.

Small business owners, same situation. If we allow some of these tax cuts to increase, our small businesses in this country will be hurt. And I hope the Democrats take a lesson from history. President Kennedy, back in 1960, did just that. He cut taxes. And when he cut taxes, revenues to the Federal Treasury rose as they have today.

Ronald Reagan did it in 1980. He had to fight a Democratic majority, but finally was able to cut taxes. And what happened was the economy grew, one of the greatest expansions of our economy in history, and revenues to the Federal

Government grew as well. That is the same thing we did in 2001 and 2003, cut taxes, the economy rebounded, it was coming out of a recession, coming out of the terrible attack of 9/11, and now our economy is growing very strong. And we do not want to turn that back.

I do not think the Americans, although they did vote in many part of this country for a change, they did not vote to change to slow this economy down. They did not vote to increase taxes. I know that none of my constituents is coming up to me and saying we voted for a change, increase our taxes. That is not what they voted for.

I think it is very important that we in Congress have a very clear voice talking about the need to maintain these tax cuts that as I said we put in place in 2001 and 2003.

I see I am joined tonight by my colleague from Kentucky, a former Army Ranger and a great Kentuckian and also a small business owner who has six kids. So he knows the effects of when you are running a small business how important it is to have a low tax rate so that you can invest back in your business, and also with six children the importance of having money to be able to raise your children and save for their college and make sure that they have a better tomorrow than we have today.

So with that I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS).

□ 2145

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. One of the things I do want to share is I appreciate his leadership on this critical issue that often gets lost in much of the noise that we hear in politics of the moment.

As you and I have shared before, what happened on election day, unbeknownst to the vast majority of Americans, is that with the change in majority, every working family in the United States of America voted themselves, or what was voted for was a tax increase of over \$2,000 a year for families making between \$30,000 and \$50,000 a year.

We have been in the business world and worked out there creating jobs, and we understand the issues relating to health care. In fact, when we look at the bigger picture from the standpoint of job creation, I think about my oldest daughter who is in her third year of college and has started her practicum now as an education major. She is working 2 days a week in a local high school in our home county teaching. Where is the revenue going to come from to pay for her health insurance, to provide for her future as she teaches students in the generation coming behind? Ultimately, it is going to be job creation and economic growth that comes from policies that will stimulate that and focus on making our economy more competitive for the long term.

One of the things that I think you have emphasized is that the government is the best steward of money. The

American people should be able to keep more of their own money, and we have proven time and time again, by allowing people to keep more of their own money and creating taxpayers instead of raising taxes, we actually get more revenue into the Federal Government.

One of the things I would like to read into the record tonight which is very important for some of these policy discussions was an editorial in the Wall Street Journal regarding surging revenues, and I think it is important to note when we create taxpayers and don't raise taxes, government will have the revenue that is necessary to function. There is a fundamental world view difference between the parties on the role of government. Liberal Democrats believe the government needs to be paternalistic in telling us how to run our lives to make these decisions.

The reality is that by allowing people to keep more of their own money, which is a bedrock Republican principle, we will make sure that people can make the decision on the spot, they understand the impact of that.

I look back at the time when I started my business. I look back on the decisions we had to make, and we understood everything in terms of the cost that we had, the obligations that we had to our employees, the commitments that we made to each other to keep that money, moving forward to keep us employed to strengthen the business. At the same time, that was when President Clinton in 1993, our first full year in business, allowed us to make an investment in the government that dramatically increased the taxes not for me and the company, but for every member of our team. I think about all of those literally hundreds of thousands of dollars over the following decade. Had those been allowed to stay there, that would not have been simply revenue that the government lost, it would have been more employees, more people who would have been out there generating revenue and creating jobs and helping to keep our economy strong.

This editorial that appeared in the Wall Street Journal on January 17 highlights this and talks about the surging of revenues. What we need to do from the standpoint of Congress is to empower people, not to constrain them.

It says, "The myth persists in some media circles that the Federal budget deficiency is surging or ballooning or something terrible, all of which is served up as ammunition for those in Congress who want a tax increase."

As an aside, I make a parenthetical statement and say we are now a little over 1,400 days away from a very, very large tax increase that will happen unless Congress takes action.

"At the risk of being drummed out of the guild, we thought you'd rather have the real story.

"The deficit has in fact declined by some \$165 billion over the last 2 fiscal years, and according to the most re-

cent data has continued to fall in the first quarter of fiscal 2007. The latest Treasury estimates for January show that tax receipts in December were \$18 billion higher than a year earlier, helping to boost the budget surplus for the month to \$40 billion, up from \$11 billion a year ago. December is typically a good month for revenues due to year-end tax payments.

"Meanwhile, for the first 3 months of fiscal 2007 through December, revenues climbed 8.1 percent, building on double-digit revenue increases in the previous 2 years. Corporate income taxes were up a remarkable 22.2 percent in the first fiscal quarter, showing that the government continues to grab a nice chunk of rising business profits that so many of our politicians like to deplore. Individual income taxes rose 8.8 percent, thanks to strong wage and salary growth. Much of this revenue comes from 'the rich,' believe it or not.

"In the most surprising budget news, Federal spending was nearly flat in the first fiscal quarter. This was despite a 22.1 percent increase in Medicare spending due largely to the new prescription drug benefit, and a 10.7 percent increase in defense spending. Those increases were offset by lower spending for flood insurance and disaster assistance compared with the peaks of post-Katrina payments a year ago. So the first quarter deficit was \$85 billion, down sharply from \$119 billion a year earlier.

"All in all, despite huge outlays for wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Nation's fiscal picture is brightening. We hate to ruin the press corps's day with such cheerful news, but there it is."

That article shows clearly this contrast between the perception that is created with the politics of fear, the politics of class warfare, and what I would like to call the politics of reality and truth. The one thing that we need to remember is the ultimate key to the economic success to our children and their children in the future is not going to be big government, it is not going to be large solutions and increases in taxes, taking away that extra benefit that working families have, but it is going to be allowing them to keep more of their own money.

I think it is critical that we do this. It is critical to funding many of the programs that we do, be it defense, be it education, ultimately comes from somebody who has a job who is not a government employee, somebody out there in the economy creating a job to make that difference and provide that revenue by adding that value that funds all of the critical infrastructure.

Our goal must be to create taxpayers, not raise new taxes. And I think the one thing that we see, and it is one thing that I appreciate my colleague from Pennsylvania taking great leadership on this issue, is to shine a light of truth onto the fact that the Democrats are going to raise taxes. They are committed to that. We are a little over 1,400 days away from that taking place

if Congress does not act, and it is critical that we act to preserve this one thing that has generated so much revenue for the government that allows us to bring the deficit down and control spending and ultimately provide a future for our children.

Mr. SHUSTER. I would just remind the gentleman, it has only been 4 days since the Democrats raised taxes because of their repeal of section 199 for oil and gas which was enacted in 2004 to help manufacturing companies. It took them 13 years to win the majority, and in only 14 days they raised taxes.

What you are talking about in that article, this is what is going to happen. It is wrong for us to raise taxes, those tax increases that they put in place just 4 days ago, placed squarely on the domestic energy production which will encourage companies to move jobs overseas. When you raise taxes, when you raise the regulatory burden, that is what companies do, they want to go someplace where they can make a profit. And they are going to encourage the domestic energy industry, which employs 1.8 million Americans who have an average salary of \$30 an hour with great benefits, this is going to cause these companies to look to go offshore to produce their product, in this case energy.

Shifting the energy industry and facilities overseas will make America more dependent on foreign oil, not less, as the Democrats claim. So the refining of fuels and, again, exploration is going to occur off the coast of America and not on the coast of America, driving jobs out of this country.

The higher taxes on the oil companies will hurt retirement security because as I have found out in some of the research we have done, 41 percent of the shares of oil and gas companies are in retirement accounts and pension funds. So when Democrats are helping to drive their profits down to make less money to drive them offshore, it is going to hurt those folks who are retired today. Again, 41 percent of the shares of oil and gas companies are owned by pension funds and retirement funds. Once again, this is a wrong-headed plan. It only took them 14 days.

I see the CPA from Texas joins us to remind me of that. It is only 4 days since the Democrats last raised taxes, and we see it is going to come. We talked the past couple of weeks about how they made it easier to raise taxes with the PAYGO rules going from three-fifths majority to a simple majority to raise taxes.

Now the Speaker and her party want to give the vote to the American Samoa here in Congress. They want Guam and the Virgin Islands, they are territories of the United States and wonderful people, but they don't pay taxes. They are going to allow them to vote, so these folks that don't pay taxes are going to have the ability to raise taxes on Americans.

American Samoa has a population of 60,000, which is 91 percent of the aver-

age congressional district. My district is 650,000. The delegate from the American Samoa is going to have the ability to vote to raise taxes.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. And I would add one point on that. We have 10 times that number of folks in my district in Kentucky. I think there is a bit of a double standard on Samoa, too. Though they would be given the vote on the ability to raise taxes, they were denied the fairness on the minimum wage that the Speaker had programmed in for a large company in her district to ensure there would be a double standard.

I think one of the things that is important to understand from somebody who worked in manufacturing after my military life is, and I have talked to many workers in the energy industry in my own district, they are dismayed, regardless of their party, be they Republican, Democrat, union, nonunion, to find out that this legislation that the Democrats passed last week, I would say forced through without regular order and debate, without discussing the impact on working families, to find that the energy industry is not manufacturing.

Mr. CONAWAY. If the gentleman would yield, not only did they kick them out, but they have now defined all workers in the oil and gas industry as foreign workers. Isn't that the effect? Every one of these jobs are no longer American manufacturing jobs, but get the same treatment that the jobs for foreign workers. I know my colleagues in the oil business in West Texas are not excited about that.

I yield back.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. To the gentleman from Texas' point, my constituents, who are members of the International Boilermakers, from a bipartisan standpoint, we have a positive and proactive relationship with our boilermakers and our professional trades in the Fourth District of Kentucky. But it is my boilermakers, my pipe fitters, my millwrights and steelworkers, ironworkers, my operating engineers, my Teamsters, anybody who is affiliated in the energy industry is no longer considered in manufacturing.

What that means for the average working family is a hidden tax increase, because the tax credits that would go for training and professional development, that would relate to a provision of health care, nearly 80 percent of manufacturing employees are covered with full health benefits. In my company we covered every single family with health benefits. The economic incentives are now removed, and it is no different than treating those in our critical bedrock base industry that drives not only manufacturing, drives the automotive industry, drives utilities, drives the transportation infrastructure of this Nation, is now being told they are not manufacturing, they are not value added. Somehow they are a nemesis.

Again, I come back to the fact of this issue of class-warfare politics. Who

gets affected by the tax increases that are buried in that bill? It is not a simple issue of trying to say these are tax breaks for some nebulous, super-rich oil executives. Here is what happens: The entire supply chain is affected. This does not hurt the large international global energy producers, the international oil companies. Who does it hurt? It hurts our wildcatters for natural gas, our small natural gas producers, our small oil producers, the investors. It hurts the supply chain of manufacturing and fabrication industry that supports the oil industry.

Outside of any refinery, one will find a very large base of welding, fabrication, machine tool operations, toolmaking, maintenance. Then we have around that circle there the provision of parts, the supply chain of manufacturers' representatives for components that come into the industry. And then who else is affected by that? It is the small business owner. It is the distributor of gasoline and oil and energy products. It is the parts manufacturer for vehicles. It is the convenience store operator who is affected by that.

And ultimately all of these people who I have mentioned so far in the chain are taxpayers. They are contributing to the public welfare and public infrastructure. Who is going to be lost when we lose those taxpayers because we eliminate those jobs by what seems to be a good thing on the surface but is very hurtful? We are eliminating funding, in effect, that provides for law enforcement, provides money for education, and provides money to deal with transportation and infrastructure, that funds the operation of government. And ultimately it is a regressive issue and it comes back to your fundamental point: When we leave money in the hands of taxpayers, they will invest it, they will save it, or they will spend it in such a way that we create taxpayers and we don't need to raise taxes, and I think the numbers bear that out.

Mr. SHUSTER. The gentleman is correct. All Americans want to pay less at the gas pump and less for heating oil. As we have seen in the last month alone, prices have come down to about \$50 to \$52 a barrel.

□ 2200

But the answer is not to increase the cost on the oil and gas producers. The answer is to have more supply. The answer is for us to conserve more, to use it in more efficient ways. The answer is to come up with alternative fuels, which I hope to hear the President talk about that initiative tomorrow night.

But when you talk about the oil industry and you talk about dollars and cents, there is nobody better to talk about it than the gentleman from Texas, our resident CPA, who can keep us on the dollars and cents.

And with that I would like to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania's hosting tonight and allowing me to participate in it.

Let me kind of flesh out what our good colleague from Kentucky said about the mechanics of those impacts on tax increases. He talked about a variety of manufacturing and some service industries who may or may not be directly impacted by section 199, but here are the mechanics of what happens:

The small E and P companies, the exploration and production companies, those companies that are out there trying to find crude oil and natural gas, on average in 2005 spent 617 percent of their profits. In other words, for every dollar that they earned, they spent \$6.17 reinvesting in the ground. And here is how they are able to do that: if you are a successful oil and gas finder, you find reserves in the ground that have a value. The value is based on the price and the length of time you expect it takes to get that crude oil and natural gas out of the ground; the lifting costs, depending on what that costs; lease operating expenses. All those expenses go into that, and they make a reasonably scientific guess as to the future value today of those reserves in the ground. Proved oil and gas reserves.

In other words, you take the life of that well, those cash flows. You discount that back to today's number, and that creates a value that in many instances these E and P companies go to the bank. They take the reserve report that shows that they have got a cash flow stream over the next 10 years, as an example, to their banker, and they say, Mr. Banker, we want to borrow against those reserves because we want to replicate what we have done. We want to put those dollars that we borrow from you back into the ground to find additional reserves for oil and gas or develop additional wells that are currently in the proved undeveloped category that they will continue to expand our reserve base, in other words, continue to expand the cash flow stream that we are going to earn as that oil and natural gas is produced over the next 30, 40 years, whatever the life of the well is, 10 years, 5 years, whatever the economic life of that well may be.

The large companies, to my recollection off the top of my head, reinvest about 175 percent of their profits. So everybody in the exploration and production food chain spends more money than they make going back in the ground.

So this tax increase that this Congress, and some of our good colleagues on the Republican side joined in, passed last week, a mere 4 days ago, what that does is it reduces the cash flow, reduces the profits of all of these companies. And as you reduce those dollars, like in the small E and P company, if you reduce them a dollar, you have really cut expenditures in the oil

business by \$6. So for every dollar of taxes that are increased as a result of this action, we have eliminated \$6 out of the reinvestment in the ground. And it is that reinvestment that my good friend from Kentucky was talking about, because that money goes to all of these suppliers, goes to all these sub-contractors, goes to all the folks who actually do the work and try to find this business.

So when that doesn't happen, then there is less work for them to do. There is less need for employees, less of everything. So just the mechanics of the tax increase has that effect.

Here is the twisted logic that our colleagues on the other side have used, and I have been thinking about this for all of last week when we found out what that bill was going to do, as well as over the weekend. I think one of the things we can all agree on is that we want to be less dependent on foreign sources of crude oil and natural gas, sources that we pay our good hard-earned money for. These are foreign sources. So all of us agree on that. The road forward or how we get that done is a multidecade journey.

While we are on this journey, it would make sense to me that the more domestic production we can produce, the more domestic barrels, the more domestic Mcf of natural gas that we produce means that that offsets or reduces in and of itself the crude oil and natural gas that we are importing. So the logic that our good colleagues used last week was if we can reduce the domestic supply of crude oil and natural gas, then we have also reduced our dependency on foreign crude natural gas.

Well, that doesn't make any sense. I grew up in Odessa, Texas, and I am just a country boy from west Texas and grew up in the oil fields. That is twisted logic. It does not make any sense whatsoever.

It would seem that we would want to promote the production of domestic supplies so that we could increase the domestic supply and therefore offset, in some small way, the need for foreign imports. Now, that does make sense. So a bill and a mechanics that reduces directly the domestic production seems awfully weird to me and a convoluted logic that I have been unable to kind of work my way through that.

Now, you and I and many of our colleagues have stood at these microphones and bemoaned the fact that that happened. Will we be able to point specifically at last Thursday's vote 5 years down the road and say, okay, had we not had that tax increase, had we not abrogated those contracts, if we hadn't done the things that the Democrats decided were in the best interests of this country, production would be some percentage greater than it currently is? We will not have that analysis. We just won't be able to do it, partly because the industry that we hit upside the head with a big old stick last week is incredibly resilient.

These are tough, independent, self-sufficient folks, and whatever hand

they are dealt, they are going to go back to the drawing board and try to find domestic crude oil and natural gas. That is what they do. We have just simply made their job harder. We are going to force them to do a little bit less of it, or we are going to force them to go to other sources for their backing. But whatever it is we did, it will have an impact on the volume of crude oil and natural gas produced in this country over the next decades.

The bad news is we won't be able to quantify that. We won't be able to come to these microphones and say, as many of our colleagues did over the last 2 years, I told you so, Monday morning quarterbacking. We are telling you ahead of time that this will happen, and we will be more dependent on foreign sources of crude oil and natural gas than we would have otherwise been, and that is really the differential here. We didn't have to be that dependent. We are going to be dependent on it, but we could have helped ourselves just somewhat by every increased barrel of crude oil produced and every increased Mcf of natural gas produced domestically and whether those restrictions come and where we can explore for crude oil and natural gas, the resources that companies have available to them after they comply with all of the regulatory schemes and the tax schemes that we have put in place.

And just to whine the most, the contracts we abrogated last week, you saw some of the estimates of why that is important to the folks on the other side, which is that money stolen from those oil companies is big dollars. The leases signed in 1998 and 1999 when the price of crude was 10 bucks a barrel, when that seemed to make sense, if it did at that point in time, it takes 5 or 6 years to get that crude oil to market, as it were. By the time you get the rigs put in place and all the things that have to go on when you drill in deep water, it takes awhile. And now we are beginning to see the fruit of all that hard work, the fruit of the risks taken by those companies.

There is a particular company I am aware of that, along with one of the major oil companies, has recently discovered what looks to be a very large oil discovery in the gulf, and it is off of one of those leases in which they were incented to buy and pay the lease bonus on at a time when it really didn't make a lot of economic sense, 10 bucks a barrel. They are estimating the cost to themselves, if this process that went through last week is sustained, that it will cost that one company \$1 billion. And as you mentioned earlier, 41 percent of the stock is in individual retirement accounts. But I wonder if you picked up in addition to retirement accounts mutual funds owned outside of retirement accounts, individuals who owned stock directly in these oil companies.

□ 2210

My guess is the percentage ownership would be much higher than the 41 percent.

Mr. SHUSTER. Retired folks that have mutual funds.

Mr. CONAWAY. That is right, separate and apart.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. If the gentleman would yield on one point to emphasize this. Again, I come back to the issue of the politics of fear versus the politics of hope and a practical and truthful vision of what the future is.

Again, I come back to my real-world experience in manufacturing, which wasn't as a Democrat or a Republican, it was simply as an operations person. The average manufacturing company in this country, gross profit is about 7 percent per year if they are successful. That is an important thing to understand, if they are successful.

The oil companies who right now are achieving record profits and are being portrayed as these great robber barons, and I am going to come back to my district here in just a minute, are making slightly over 8 percent gross profit. So they are 1 percent higher than the average manufacturing company in terms of truthful and real numbers versus the hype, versus the rhetoric and the emotion.

Who actually gets hurt by this foolish bill that was passed last week on a motion without regular order? Democratic friends of mine shared privately they are extremely upset about the fact of adverse economic impact that it had on their districts. I can tell you the impact on our district. One of our larger employers in the Fourth District of Kentucky, the Marathon refinery, which has many, many first- and second-tier vendors that do work with them, this was a huge tax increase on their ability to refine and produce oil that directly affects our transportation industry. Their largest customer in Kentucky is the worldwide air hub of United Parcel Service, a great job creator in the Louisville area. It is one of the largest employers in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, really in the tri-state area.

So what was done by this seemingly well-meaning issue to support energy independence has actually hurt a local job-producing entity and affected the entire supply chain. And I think the one thing that to me the reality is not the hype, not the emotion, not the class warfare, but it is the old comment: Do the numbers. What are the real numbers? What is the impact?

A job-creating manufacturing entity, a job-creating technology entity will have a 3-1 multiplier for its community on average. That is the convenience stores, the retail outlets, the personal service companies. It is the other types of businesses that supports the public infrastructure, law enforcement, education, transportation and public works.

Mr. CONAWAY. The property tax base.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. The property tax base that pays for the schools. In my home county, which has got a growing and thriving manufacturing industry, that payback is 7-1. One of the reasons we have some of the top schools in the Commonwealth of Kentucky is the fact that we have a tremendously powerful economic engine that ironically is directly affected by energy prices and access.

One of the issues in this so-called bill, which was really a tax increase. Calling it energy independence is not only disingenuous, and maybe that points back to the discussion which took place earlier this evening in the House, but it really misrepresents the entire reality of what is happening.

BARACK OBAMA from Illinois, someone that would not be considered a strong conservative by the standards of human events, but is a very committed Senator, and JIM BUNNING, who is the junior Senator from Kentucky, cosponsored a bipartisan bill for energy independence that focused on an alternative source which is one we really have; instead of building lots of windmills and solar generators in the colder areas, was to use the resource that we have. And coal is environmentally friendly, it is a proven technology, and he was attacked from the left from environmental groups that strongly supported this bill that hurts jobs for being bad on environmental issues because he would support this very thing that he sees the facts on that would create a second industrial revolution in this country.

And it all comes back to the reality of what the role of government would be here in the long run, missing the truth that we need to allow people, those who create the jobs, to keep more of their own money, to allow working families to keep more of their own money to invest.

Mr. SHUSTER. And you look at another measurement when you look at investments and profitabilities. In 2004, a 10-year period ending in 2004 shows that the return on investment the refining marketing segment of the oil companies are in was 7.7 percent return on investment, which was well behind the 13.9 average of the S&P 500. So I think, as our friend from Texas was talking about, huge investments, huge investments. They are certainly making returns, and they are certainly making profits, but it is far behind what many of the other manufacturing and the other companies in the S&P 500 are making.

So this is a capital investment industry. We have got to encourage them to keep on going out and looking and looking and finding the reserves. But it is also important, I think, as you pointed out, coming from Kentucky, I come from Pennsylvania, the importance of that other natural resource we have from coal and how we utilize that to truly make us energy independent or move toward energy independence, not this wrong-headed tax increase.

And, again, I believe that it is just the first of many we are going to see, statements by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee over the last several months, the rules that the Speaker and the Democrats put into place to make it easier to raise taxes, not harder, to make it easier. And I think the American people need to know that the Democrats, the majority in the Congress, are going to raise your taxes. And when it happens, as it happened 4 days ago, this was a targeted tax increase, they think, just to one industry, but it is going to flow down through the economy, and every American is going to feel it. But we are going to see tax increases. They are not going to control spending, they are going to continue to increase spending. And they said they are going to pay for it, and they are going to pay for it by taking away hard-earned dollars from Americans.

I was talking today, I went to see my accountant to prepare myself for tax season this year. And I wonder if the gentleman from Texas would comment on it. My accountant told me that just the sheer difficulty, the complexity, of keeping up with the Tax Code, he said to me that he thinks he produces a reasonably correct, he can't assure anybody that it is correct because it is so difficult. We passed the extenders last year, and he told me that the IRS has informed him he cannot file electronically until February 1. So he is going to have a backlog; he is trying to figure it out, but he doesn't get an extension from April 15 to May 15 because he doesn't file electronically.

So I think that the time has not only come to continue to keep tax rates low, but to change our Tax Code. He had on his wall, I am going to get a copy of it, 1913 was the first year that we had the income tax. It was three pages long, it was pretty simple, and basically it was a graduated flat tax. And, again, I am going to bring that in here next week and have it blown up to see how simple it was, and I think the time has come that we go to some different kind of tax.

But if the gentleman CPA from Texas would like to comment on that.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman.

I think it is Money Magazine every year or so runs a contest where they will present a set of facts, the same set of facts to a variety of tax preparers. And it is interesting the variety of taxes due number that comes up. You would think, the same facts because everybody is working off the same codes, the same set of regulations, that all these tax return preparers would come up with the same answer. But it is very rare that even two out of the group come up with the same answer because of the complexity of the code.

I spent 32 plus years of my professional career helping clients comply with the code or a company that I was working for and attempting to do my own tax return, because most folks

really wouldn't understand a CPA screwing up his own tax return. So if I couldn't do mine right, why would I hold myself out for doing somebody else's right? And every time you signed one of those returns, it gives you a pause, because this is complicated stuff. And the legend at the bottom where you sign doesn't say, I have got this as close as I can to the right answer, sign your name; it requires you under penalties of perjury to say you have got it right. And that does give you some pause, because it is an incredibly complex code, unnecessarily complex.

And we will have hopefully another night where we can talk about ways that we ought to be looking at how we collect the minimum amount of money needed to fund this Federal Government in a fair, straightforward, easy-to-comply-with way that most Americans would buy into, because I think our voluntary compliance in that arena would be far greater than it currently is with this incredibly complicated code.

If you want to file manually, your client, you can file manually. I am trying to remember, I was reading one of those tax credits that was extended.

□ 2220

There is no line for it on the form, and so the services said if you want to claim this credit or deduction, one of the two, since we did not put a line item on the return for it, stick it on a different line and tell us what that is. So you can go ahead and file manually if you would like to, but you are right. I thought it was February 4 maybe.

Mr. SHUSTER. Beginning of February.

Mr. CONAWAY. Electronic filing before the IRS will have their computer systems ready to be able to receive that information coming in as a result of the late-breaking changes that we Republicans made in December to extend many of the tax credits that some had already expired and others that were set to expire with the close of business in 2006.

Mr. SHUSTER. My accountant also told me that he believes this year the AMT that is starting to catch more and more people in the AMT to pay higher tax. He said he believes next year he will see for the first time dual income husband and wife that are teachers that are making in central Pennsylvania about 110, 120 combined income, he thinks for the first time they are going to be caught up in the AMT and they are going to pay several hundred to a thousand dollars or more in taxes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Could I give the gentleman a quick history lesson?

Mr. SHUSTER. Absolutely.

Mr. CONAWAY. The alternative minimum tax was put in in 1969 at a point in time where our marginal tax rate, upper marginal tax rate was like 70 percent, and it was a point in time where there were a lot of gimmicks and

tax loopholes, not loopholes because the code was written that way, but there were a lot of deductions and a lot of activities that folks could deduct against that 70 percent number.

So consequently you had a lot of folks incented to do that, to take risks they might not have otherwise taken. So, as a matter of fairness and equity, the Congress put in an alternative minimum tax. In other words, they felt like everybody in America ought to pay something and that these folks were taking advantage of tax shelters in a way that was keeping them from paying any tax at all. Congress and the President, Johnson I guess, at that point in time felt like everybody ought to pay a little something.

This was targeted at the really larger tax returns, really big investors, the big folks who made a lot of money. It was never intended to catch those two teachers who make together, what did you say, about \$110,000, \$120,000. The spirit of that was never intended to catch them in this loop.

In the interest of full and fair disclosure, I had to pay the alternative minimum tax this year which irritated me.

So the AMT is something that we did not do a good job of it. As Republicans, we kind of kicked the can down the road for a couple of years, a year at a time. This Democrat-led Congress is going to have that issue wrapped around their neck, and we will see how they go about trying to propose a fix for it, but it is an issue that is going to catch millions and millions of new taxpayers through the alternative minimum tax scheme each year that we move forward.

Mr. SHUSTER. We seem to be wrapping up, so if the gentleman from Kentucky has any closing remarks.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I think one thing to put into perspective is the real question, what I like to do is come back to the facts and the numbers.

There is a lot of talk about, again, the politics of fear, the politics of class warfare, who actually will be rewarded or hurt by these tax cuts or tax increases. Here is the reality in a practical sense.

The tax cuts that have been put in place have created record revenues for government because of job creation. Millions of people were taken off of the tax rolls all together. The floor for tax payments was pushed upward. The 10 percent tax bracket was created for those who are just starting out, those who are just in transition, so their burden would not be unduly high. All of that goes away. What are some other things that go away?

One of the things that I think is kind of interesting, as somebody who is the grandson of a teacher, the husband of a teacher and the father of a soon-to-be-certified teacher, how does it impact education? Well, let us look at this.

We passed an extension in the last Congress, carrying on above-the-line deduction for higher education expenses. The provision allows taxpayers

to deduct up to \$4,000 depending upon their income for higher education expenses to improve their lives in lieu of claiming the hope or lifetime learning tax credits. The deduction can be claimed by all individual taxpayers regardless of whether they itemize and use specific deductions or do not itemize, and it is extended for 2 years through 2007.

The incoming chairman of the Ways and Means Committee put this, along with an entire bushel basket of tax incentives for working families, for people to improve their lives, and that goes away. For teachers, we passed an above-the-line deduction that became law for teacher classroom expenses.

I remember when I was a young officer in the Army and my wife was teaching school. She paid for a tremendous amount of classroom expenses out of her own pocket because she cared about her students and wanted to invest.

What is the response of the Republican Congress to that was to give them the incentive to invest and to know that that will not be a personal penalty for them to make that investment in their children, to make that investment in their future. It is a provision that allows teachers to deduct up to \$250 of out-of-pocket costs incurred to purchase books, supplies and other classroom equipment. It is available to all individual taxpayers, regardless of whether they itemize their deductions or not.

This provision was extended for 2 years through 2007. That is in that bushel basket of things that go away when we enact these tax policies, these tax cuts that ultimately will be in full force in 1,440 days.

As a former small business owner who helped companies to create jobs in the manufacturing industry and operations, we dealt with many entry-level people. People would come in with difficult tasks or in transition. We passed a welfare-to-work tax credit that would incent small business owners and employers to create jobs, to give people a leg up, to give them an opportunity to create value, to become a taxpayer, not a burden on the system, to create a future for their children.

Employers can claim that welfare-to-work tax credit if they hire individuals who receive public assistance to help them move from a receiver to a giver. The maximum credit is \$3,500 during an employee's first year and \$5,000 during the second year. That incentive for small business owners goes away with this.

All of these small things, these numbers that are hidden from the American people out of this politics of fear get lost in this whole issue, and ultimately, we need to allow people to keep more of what they earn to create that future.

I appreciate your leadership on this issue greatly.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman for joining us tonight. The gentleman from Texas, if he has any closing remarks?

Mr. CONAWAY. I do. I wonder how many words have been spoken from these microphones over the almost 160 years that we have been just in this chamber.

Mr. SHUSTER. Too many.

Mr. CONAWAY. Too many, clearly. There are not a lot of lines created or spoken here that many people quote. The inaugural address produces great lines. It is not what you do for your country, all those kinds of lines that come out. I do not know of anything spoken here that many people quote.

Lincoln said, and I will butcher this, but I think he said in his Gettysburg Address, the world will little remember what is said here. As it turns out, he was wrong, but I think that is exactly what happened here.

In West Texas, I suspect, and in central Pennsylvania as well as Kentucky, talk is cheap, but what we do here is important and it is remembered. When we vote, as we did last week, to abrogate contracts with the Federal Government, when we vote, as we did last week, to tell people who have business deals with this Federal Government you really cannot trust the contract because if it begins to look like you are making a little money off this contract, some Member of Congress will think that is a bad idea and they will convince a party, maybe both parties, to take and redo that contract.

When we vote, as we did two weeks ago, to say there are some lives in this country, they are not particularly important, lives on the front end of creation, that is remembered. That is important. That has an impact on what we do.

When we vote here to do things to protect America, as I suspect over the next coming couple of weeks we will vote as to how we think this Congress ought to be commander-in-chief, that is important what we do.

The good is important and the bad is important just as well. It is long remembered and long noted by the people of this country, the people in West Texas in District 11, and many instances, the people around the world.

As I hear tonight our good colleague from Maryland talking about flaws in the bill that we will vote on tomorrow with respect to pensions, that I think all of us would love to support, when he says, well, guys, do not worry about it, this is just the House version; we will fix it in conference or we will fix it in the Senate.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Heard that before.

Mr. CONAWAY. We said it, our guys said it, but today was a particular one where our good colleague from Maryland just seemed to pooh-pooh the idea that there were some flaws in this bill that we did not need to worry about because we are the House of Representatives. I challenge that. We are the

House of Representatives, and what we do here is important. I do not know that what we say here is of particular importance, but what we do here is important.

I appreciate being with you tonight.

□ 2230

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is absolutely correct. What we did here in 2001 and 2003 by reducing the tax rate on American people, it is going to expire in 1,440 days, unless this Congress acts.

You need to look at the numbers that the gentleman from Kentucky pointed out. Record revenues are flowing into the Federal Government. Since August of 2003, we have created 7.2 million jobs. In December alone, 167,000 jobs were created. The October and November numbers increased by 29,000 jobs. In 2006 alone, there was an increase of 1.8 million jobs. In the 2003 period to today, 7.2 million have been created. That is more jobs than the European Union and Japan combined have created.

Our economy has added jobs for 40 straight months, and I believe it is going to do that with an unemployment rate of 4.5 percent. That is well below the 5.1 percent rate of 2005, and below the average of the past 4 decades. So these tax cuts have worked.

We need to make sure that we act in this Congress and not run out the clock. The American people need to know that if this Congress does not act, if it just sits on the ball and runs out the clock, come 1,440 days, January 1, 2011, the American people will have seen a \$200 billion tax increase, and that is not good for America.

TAKING CREDIT FOR RISING GAS PRICES

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, friends from this side of the aisle have been talking tonight about the tax increase we had last week.

One of the things that I have observed in my 2 years that I have been here is sometimes people take credit for things that maybe they had an effect on, and maybe they didn't. But over the last couple of years, one of the things we have been doing is we have tried to provide for drilling for gas.

There are trillions of cubic feet of natural gas in the Gulf Coast. It is a fact, we have trillions of cubic feet of gas. You can go along the Outer Continental Shelf along both coasts, and many States do not want any drilling out there. They want all the energy, they want it cheap. They don't want any of it drilled where they may have to look at it, but they want the energy. People fight that. They don't want any drilling out there.

Then we have this area that is tundra, as we were taught growing up in

public school, tundra, where there is just not much of anything. Yet people don't want to allow drilling in that area, even though it could provide 1½ million barrels of oil a day.

The OCS and ANWR, those are not be-all-end-all solutions to our energy needs, but they are a small part of the solution. Alternative fuels, bioethanol. We have biomass in East Texas, where I am from, and we have oil and gas as well. We have coal. We have all these things. There are projects to produce energy with zero emissions from coal. All of these great things are going on that we are trying to push, and so much of it met with opposition.

Then we came along last week, and we end up having the incentives to do domestic drilling in the United States or off our coasts to provide additional energy and to do it with domestic people, domestic companies, domestic jobs to help the economy, as well as provide fuel that we don't have go overseas to get, and yet those incentives, it was voted by the majority as pushed by our Democrat friends across the aisle to remove those incentives.

The thing that struck me over the last couple of years as we fought against Democrats who didn't want to drill the Outer Continental Shelf, didn't want to drill ANWR, they fought like crazy against having incentives for new refineries. We are realistic enough. We know that the big oil companies are not going to build more refineries here. They do it in other places where it is cheaper. But it was to encourage independent oil companies to drill here in America, and also to refine here in America, because we need the gasoline to keep things going until we get sufficient alternative fuels.

But after fighting against us to allow those things to bring down the prices of gasoline, as gasoline skyrocketed, I was amazed. People on the other side of the aisle blamed Republicans for the skyrocketing gas prices.

The thing that struck me, and I just wanted to leave my friends in the House with this thought, if you are going to fight against the things that make for cheaper fuel, then when the price of gasoline skyrockets, at least have the decency to take credit for it. "Yes, we got the high gas prices. America, you ought to love us. We drove up the price of gasoline, and now it is way up and you ought to love us for it." Instead, we got blamed because gasoline got high.

So I hope as a result of what we saw what happen last week, as it ends up in the next year or so causing a spike in the price of gasoline, that our friends across the aisle that caused this spike that they have put in the pipeline now to generate a skyrocketing gasoline price, that when that occurs, they will go ahead and stand up and say, "You bet gasoline is high; and we Democrats, we proudly caused it."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GUTIERREZ (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. POMEROY (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. BUYER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week 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. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO, 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.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and January 23, 24, and 29.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and January 24.

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

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 23, 2007, at 10:30 a.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:

366. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Beauveria Bassiana HF23; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0316; FRL-8108-4] received January 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

367. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 2007-6, Waiving Conditions on Obligation and Expenditure of Funds for

Planning, Design, and Construction of a Chemical Weapons Destruction Facility in Russia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

368. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality: Revision to Definition of Volatile Organic Compounds — Exclusion of HFE-7300 [EPA-HQ-OAR-2005-0124; FRL-8270-6] (RIN: 2060-AN34) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

369. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Correction [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0797; FRL-8269-2] received January 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

370. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Environmental Protection Agency Implementation of OMB Guidance on Nonprosecution Debarment and Suspension [FLR-8270-5] (RIN: 2030-AA94) received January 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

371. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Identification of the Northern Virginia PM2.5 Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2006-0648; FRL-82661] received January 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

372. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Plans For Designated Facilities; New Jersey; Delegation of Authority [Docket No. EPA-R02-OAR-2006-0615, FRL-8268-9] received January 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

373. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Control of Volatile Organic Compounds from Medical Device Manufacturing [EPA-R03-OAR-2006-0638; FRL-8267-7] received January 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

374. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment, Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Indiana; Redesignation of the Allen County 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0399; FRL-8267-9] received January 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

375. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District and Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2006-0843; FRL-8261-3] received January 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

376. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of

State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

377. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of the Memorandum of Justification under Section 610 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 regarding the determination to transfer prior year funds to the FY 2006 International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement Account for the Women's Justice and Empowerment Initiative; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

378. A letter from the General Counsel, General Accounting Office, transmitting the FY 2006 report of the instances in which a federal agency did not fully implement a recommendation made by the GAO in connection with a bid protest decided the prior fiscal year, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3554(e)(2); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

379. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

380. A letter from the Chief, Compliance Operations Division, Department of Transportation, transmitting revisions to the Department's annual report for FY 2005 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Anti-discrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

381. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Financial Report of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2006, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 331(e)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

382. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2006 through September 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

383. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting in accordance with the Reports Consolidation Act of 2000, Pub. L. 106-531, the Administration's FY 2006 Performance and Accountability Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

384. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's report on Fiscal Year 2006 Competitive Sourcing Efforts as required by the Consolidated Appropriations Act of FY 2004; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

385. A letter from the Director, U.S. Trade and Development Agency, transmitting the Agency's Annual Report for FY 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

386. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period October 1, 2006 through December 31, 2006 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a Public Law 88-454; (H. Doc. No. 110-9); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DENT, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 599. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to streamline the SAFETY Act and anti-terrorism technology procurement processes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 600. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a deferral of tax on gain from the sale of telecommunications businesses in specific circumstances or a tax credit and other incentives to promote diversity of ownership in telecommunications businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 601. A bill to expand the definition of independent student in the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include homeless youth; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 602. A bill to amend section 119 of title 17, United States Code, to allow the secondary transmission to any subscriber in the State of Oklahoma of primary transmissions of local network stations in that State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYES:

H.R. 603. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an incentive for expanding employment in rural areas by allowing employers the work opportunity credit for hiring residents of rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES:

H.R. 604. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the incentives for E-85 fuel vehicle refueling property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES:

H.R. 605. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an increased maximum penalty for telemarketing fraud targeting seniors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Energy and Commerce, 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. HAYES:

H.R. 606. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income mileage reimbursements to volunteer emergency medical responders and volunteer firefighters and to increase the mileage allowance for charitable contributions for the benefit of volunteer fire departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 607. A bill to prohibit defense contractors from requiring licenses or fees for use of military likenesses and designations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas (for himself, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. HASTERT):

H.R. 608. A bill to further inform consumers about the transition to digital television; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 609. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Central Texas Water Recycling and Reuse Project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARNAHAN (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio):

H.R. 610. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the incentives for the rehabilitation of older buildings, including owner-occupied residences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. HOLDEN):

H.R. 611. A bill to eliminate the requirement that States collect Social Security numbers from applicants for recreational licenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 612. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the period of eligibility for health care for combat service in the Persian Gulf War or future hostilities from two years to five years after discharge or release; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FORTUÑO (for himself and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 613. A bill to amend section 1011 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 to permit Puerto Rico to qualify for Federal reimbursement of emergency health services furnished to undocumented aliens; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FORTUÑO (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 614. A bill to amend titles XI and XIX of the Social Security Act to remove the cap on Medicaid payments for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FORTUÑO (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DENT, Mr. WELLER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 615. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase inpatient hospital payments under the Medicare Program to Puerto Rico hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORTUÑO (for himself, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 616. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for equity in the calculation of Medicare disproportionate share hospital payments for hospitals in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. MEEK of Florida):

H.R. 617. A bill to authorize ecosystem restoration projects for the Indian River Lagoon-South and the Picayune Strand, Collier County, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HAYES, Mr.

DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. RENZI, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. CUBIN, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. TIAHRT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. AKIN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. FOX, Mr. SALI, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. TERRY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 618. A bill to implement equal protection under the 14th article of amendment to the Constitution for the right to life of each born and preborn human person; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HOLT, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. WU, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. STARK, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 619. A bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OLVER (for himself, Mr. GILCHRIST, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KIRK, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DICKS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. HARE):

H.R. 620. A bill to accelerate the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States by establishing a market-driven system of greenhouse gas tradeable allowances that will limit greenhouse gas emissions in the United States, reduce dependence upon foreign oil, and ensure benefits to consumers from the trading in such allowances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science and Technology, and 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. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 621. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to restore the Medicare treatment of ownership of oxygen equipment to that in effect before enactment of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. RANGEL:

H.R. 622. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional gold medal to Shirley Chisholm; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 623. A bill to permit expungement of records of certain nonviolent criminal offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 624. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and Agriculture, 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 Ms. SOLIS:

H.R. 625. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4230 Maine Avenue in Baldwin Park, California, as the "Atanacio Haro-Marin Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 626. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 to provide that a current connection is not lost by an individual who is misled or not properly informed by the Railroad Retirement Board of the requirement for, and the circumstances resulting in the loss of, a current connection; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HARE, Mr. BACA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 627. A bill to require full funding of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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 Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico (for herself, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia):

H.R. 628. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to ensure that an individual may file an orphan petition for at least 2 years after approval of an advanced processing application; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WU (for himself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California):

H.R. 629. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize grants for institutions of higher education serving Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOODE (for himself, Mr. WAMP, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. PAUL, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. DUNCAN, and Ms. FOXX):

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not engage in the construction of a North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) Superhighway System or enter into a North American Union with Mexico and Canada; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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 Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. ISSA):

H. Res. 83. A resolution congratulating Tony Gwynn for his election to the Baseball Hall of Fame, for an outstanding career as an athlete, and for his contributions to baseball and to his community; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KUHLMAN of New York (for himself and Mr. MICA):

H. Res. 84. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Glenn Curtiss's achievement of record-breaking speed and his contributions to the motorcycle and aircraft industries; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. FILNER introduced A bill (H.R. 630) for the relief of Flavia Mabloc Cahoon; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 14: Mr. CASTLE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GINGREY, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 22: Mr. PICKERING, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. BONNER, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 25: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 27: Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 60: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 65: Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr.

WHITFIELD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 133: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 134: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 136: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 137: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 138: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 159: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 161: Mr. WU.

H.R. 169: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 210: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 217: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 269: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GINGREY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 279: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 303: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 323: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 353: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 358: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 359: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 365: Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. LATHAM, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. UPTON, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MCHUGH, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 369: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 390: Mr. NADLER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 403: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. REYES, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 410: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 413: Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 440: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 451: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 464: Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 468: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. DELAURIO, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 476: Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BARROW, Ms. CASTOR, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 491: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. BEAN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 508: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 511: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WICKER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. EVERETT, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. NUNES, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MACK, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. KUHLMAN of New York, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. KIRK, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BONNER, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 522: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 563: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 566: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 567: Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 584: Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 589: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 592: BOOZMAN and Mr. WALSH of New York.

H.J. Res. 18: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H. Con. Res. 5: Mr. COHEN and Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. CARNEY.

H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. FERGUSON.

H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. COHEN and Mr. GINGREY.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Con. Res. 35: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. LEWIS of Geor-

gia, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 37: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H. Res. 41: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H. Res. 51: Ms. SUTTON and Mr. WALBERG.

H. Res. 52: Mr. COHEN and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H. Res. 59: Mr. AKIN.

H. Res. 68: Ms. BALDWIN.