



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2007

No. 26

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. INSLEE).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 12, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JAY INSLEE 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.

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 31 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. SIREs) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Lord God, Divine Architect of history, the birthday of Abraham Lincoln is a moment to not only hear his voice echoed in countless prayers of people the world over, now is the time for this Nation to touch his spirit, for we are caught up again in the lingering debate of war and peace.

Perhaps, Lord, the wordsmith Carl Sandburg best describes our debility and Lincoln's vision for us when he writes:

"Decreed beyond any but far imagining of its going asunder was Lincoln's mystic dream of the Union of States achieved. Beyond all the hate or corruption or mocking fantasies of democracy that might live as an aftermath of the war were assurances of long-time conditions for healing, for rebuilding, for new growth.

"As a result flowing from the war, the United States was to take its place among nations counted world powers . . . and as a world power, the expectation was it would be a voice of the teachings of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln speaking for a republican government, for democracy, for institutions 'of the people, by the people, for the people.'

"Though there might come betrayals and false pretenses, the war had put some manner of seal on human rights and dignity in contrast with property rights, and even the very definition of property . . .

"Out of the smoke and stench, out of the music and violet dreams of the war, Lincoln stood perhaps taller than any other of the many great heroes. None threw a longer shadow than he. And to him the great hero was the People. He could not say too often that he was merely their instrument."

Lord God, in our own day, take us beyond the hate and mocking fantasies. Hammer out renewed commitments for healing, for rebuilding and for new growth. Make today's government an instrument of Your people, that we may take our rightful place among the nations as a world power, which is wit-

ness to human rights and dignity for all Your people. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. POE 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.

THE SIGN MUST STAY

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

Mr. POE. "This Is America. When Ordering, Please Speak English." This sign is located in the window of Geno's Restaurant, tourist landmark for the famous Philly cheese steak.

Philadelphia's Commission on Human Relations has been ordering its owner, Joe Vento, to take down the sign, however. They have even suggested that he hire Spanish-speaking employees to help communicate. But Joe is not giving in to the bureaucrats. Vento says that Geno's will serve and his staff will help out customers who don't speak English, but the sign is staying.

Joe Vento is of Italian descent. His grandparents came from Italy. They were proud of their American citizenship and quickly learned English. But

□ 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.

H1425

now the Commission on Human Relations is taking legal action against Vento, charging him with discrimination simply for asking his customers to speak English.

No business owner should be forced to hire a whole gauntlet of foreign-speaking translators because of individuals who feel they won't learn our language. Individuals who come here need to understand that this country is not Mexico, France, Korea or the Middle East. This is America, and English is spoken here.

And that's just the way it is.

PREMATURE WITHDRAWAL FROM IRAQ WILL ENDANGER U.S.

(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, sadly, many people try to separate the current Iraq conflict from the attacks of September 11 and the Global War on Terrorism; it is impossible to do so. The attacks of September 11 were not isolated, random events. Al Qaeda has openly stated Iraq is the central front in the war on terror. And our enemy is highly intelligent, well financed and committed to the destruction of freedoms.

The concept that America's retreat in Iraq will bring an end to sectarian violence and terrorist activity in the region ignores history. Premature retreat will embolden the enemy and make us more vulnerable to attacks. Withdrawals from Beirut and Mogadishu led to the 1993 World Trade Center attack, the 1998 embassy bombings across Africa, the 2000 bombing of the USS *Cole*, and then September 11. Osama bin Laden has characterized the struggle in Iraq as the third world war. We ignore this claim at our peril, which threatens American families.

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

SUPPORTING THE IRAQ MISSION

(Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this week we will debate a non-binding resolution that will do nothing more than undermine the mission in Iraq, weaken the morale of our troops, and embolden our enemy.

No doubt mistakes have been made in the battle with Iraq. With every war mistakes are made. The question before us is, Are we going to learn from the mistakes and correct them and move forward with a plan of success, or are we going to retreat in defeat?

Mr. Speaker, the terrorists themselves believe Iraq is a central front in the war on terror. Al Zawahiri, al Qaeda's deputy leader, has repeatedly said Iraq and Afghanistan are the "two most crucial fields" in the Islamists' war. A policy of retreat and defeat

would result in pervasive instability and embolden radical Islamist terrorists and rogue regimes to expand new areas in the region.

Mr. Speaker, the stakes are real and they are high. And the American people deserve leadership, not partisan politics. I will continue to support our troops by continuing to support their mission.

WE MUST WIN THE BATTLE OF IDEAS

(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, as a member of the Victory in Iraq Caucus, I continue to stand and support our troops. I feel it is imperative that we continue to strongly speak out in favor of the efforts that our troops are carrying out against terrorism, not only in Iraq, but in 30 different countries around the globe.

The terrorists tell us, just as my colleague said, that Iraq is the central battle in the war on terror. War is not quick, and it is not painless. It is up to us here in the people's House to continue to support the troops and to be behind their efforts, funding them 100 percent of the way.

In order to win, Mr. Speaker, we must not only succeed on the battlefield; we must win in the battle of ideas. We must win the civic and economic battles with the Iraqi people. They are as critical as any firefight that they face every day.

The idea of freedom and prosperity is a powerful idea. Our coalition is breathing life into that idea with the Iraqi people. We need to stand firm, fund our troops, support our men and women in harm's way.

PROCESS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, it is not good to talk process in the House of Representatives. I keep hearing that. But when the process that you are talking about is the execution of our right in a democratic society to speak and make a difference, then it is necessary to speak on process.

Mr. Speaker, this week we will spend 4 days on the Iraq resolution. I say "the" Iraq resolution because it has already been crafted by Speaker PELOSI; it already is a final product. The only thing left to do is in fact to vote on it because we will not be allowed to amend it; the rule will be a closed rule. Democracy and speech and debate will not in fact change anything. The final vote will be exactly at the end of the week where it was at the beginning. That is wrong. Republicans never did that when we held the Speaker's gavel.

Democrats should not do that as they hold the Speaker's gavel.

The right to amend and the right to debate that leads to a better bill is a right of this democracy, and this body has been reduced by the taking of that right.

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.

RECOGNIZING AND HONORING THE EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 134) recognizing and honoring the employees of the Department of Homeland Security for their efforts and contributions to protect and secure the Nation.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 134

Whereas the United States must remain vigilant against all threats to the homeland, including acts of terrorism, natural disasters, and other emergencies;

Whereas the Department of Homeland Security marked its 4th anniversary on January 24, 2007;

Whereas the more than 208,000 employees of the Department work tirelessly to prepare the Nation to counter acts of terrorism, natural disasters, and other emergencies;

Whereas the Department's employees work diligently to deter, detect, and prevent acts of terrorism;

Whereas the Department's employees stand willing, ready, and able to respond if catastrophe strikes;

Whereas the Department's employees support the Department's mission to protect continuously the Nation's borders, airports, seaports, rail lines, and other transit systems;

Whereas the Department's employees, together with employees of other agencies and departments of the Federal Government, work with State, local, and tribal partners to enhance disaster preparedness at all levels of government;

Whereas the Department's employees are called upon to sacrifice time with their families to work long hours to fulfill the Department's vital mission; and

Whereas the Nation is indebted to the Department's employees for their efforts and contributions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes and honors the employees of the Department of Homeland Security for their exceptional efforts and contributions to protect and secure the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARNEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and insert extraneous material on the bill into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Just over 5 years ago, September 11 redefined our national security needs. With the loss of thousands of innocent lives at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon and in my home State of Pennsylvania, national leaders realized that the Federal Government needed the ability to better protect the United States from any and all threats, foreign or domestic, natural or man-made. And while emergency management agencies displayed resilience in the aftermath of 9/11, it was clear we needed an organization that could coordinate their efforts. We needed a single agency with the ability to prevent another 9/11 and to respond, if need be, to natural or man-made disasters.

To answer this call, Congress passed the Homeland Security Act of 2002 creating the Department of Homeland Security. In the largest reorganization of the Federal Government since the formation of the Department of Defense six decades ago, the Department of Homeland Security was tasked with the Herculean responsibility of coordinating with State, local and tribal entities to prevent future terrorist attacks, to secure our borders and to prepare for and respond to events of national significance.

Comprised of 22 different Federal agencies and employing over 208,000 of our finest Federal employees, DHS has become one of the largest Federal departments. Twenty-four hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, employees from the Department of Homeland Security are working to prevent and prepare for any threats to our country. They are patrolling our skies, securing our borders, sailing our coastal waters and screening people and cargo entering our country. They are also working with State and local governments and first responders in all 50 States and our territories to ensure we can respond to any future large-scale events, either man-made or natural.

□ 1415

These dedicated Homeland Security employees are working tirelessly to improve the safety of all Americans and are doing a job that we must commend.

Recently, the Office of Personnel Management released the results of the 2006 Federal Human Capital Survey, a review of how Federal employees feel about their work. Many Americans may not have heard about this survey or its findings, but they are significant.

DHS employees expressed frustration over a number of issues, most notably the management of the agency. These rank-and-file workers, on the front lines day after day, feel they are not being managed in the most effective manner possible. This disconnect between management and the line officers of the department is very disturbing to a number of us here in Congress. We must work to resolve these issues.

The last thing we need is for the morale problems of the Department of Homeland Security to hamper the duties of those front-line employees. As a former first responder myself, I know how important it is to have trust and faith in your management. While there was certainly shocking failures at the management levels of the Federal Emergency Management Agency in the Hurricane Katrina response, there is a good example; that is, the United States Coast Guard which is part of the DHS. It covered itself in glory by performing one of its most vital and successful missions since its creation. Over 20,000 gulf coast residents were rescued by the devoted men and women of the Coast Guard.

Tens of thousands of other line officers under the purview of the DHS have been doing a thankless job for the last 4 years as well. Our Nation must remain vigilant against all threats to the homeland, against acts of terrorism and natural disasters.

Department of Homeland Security employees stand willing, ready and able to respond should catastrophe strike. They work long hours to deter, detect, and prevent acts of terrorism against the homeland. They can be sure that during this Congress and beyond, my colleagues and I will maintain oversight of the management of Homeland Security, but I cannot stress enough how we truly appreciate the work of the DHS employees who are working tirelessly to protect the safety of all Americans.

On January 24, the Department of Homeland Security marked its fourth anniversary. In light of this anniversary, it is fitting and appropriate for the House of Representatives to take a moment to honor the employees.

I would also like to take a moment to note that Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Management, Investigations, and Oversight, wanted to be here as well. He is currently out of town on a codel, but he stands with me in honoring the employees of the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to unanimously adopt House Resolution 134 in honoring the employees of the Department of Homeland Security.

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

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

I rise today in support of House Resolution 134, which honors and recognizes

the contributions the employees of the Department of Homeland Security make to our country's safety and security.

I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this resolution with my Homeland Security colleague, CHRISTOPHER CARNEY, who chairs the Management, Investigations and Oversight Subcommittee. I also want to acknowledge other original cosponsors, including my subcommittee ranking member, MIKE ROGERS, full committee chairman BENNIE THOMPSON, and full committee ranking member PETER KING, a man who has worked on Homeland Security issues, and I greatly admire his work.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to help bring this resolution to the floor today because I think that DHS employees are too often overlooked and underappreciated, and unfairly criticized in most cases despite their most dedicated and earnest efforts to do their job, which they do very well.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that they have been tasked with an almost impossible job, I think you will agree, and am confident that DHS employees are doing the very best they can under some extraordinary, difficult circumstances.

I was, however, particularly disappointed to learn, as the recent survey shows, that the morale of the department is low, and that DHS employees have less job satisfaction than any other group of Federal employees. That is not good to see. I have heard that the department's employees are concerned that they do not have the resources to do their jobs effectively, that they are not promoted based on merit, that creativity and innovation are not properly rewarded, and, perhaps most troubling, most of them do not believe that they have access to adequate information about what is happening in their department.

This needs to change, as far as I am concerned. I am heartened that department secretary, Michael Jackson, has told DHS employees, "Starting at the top, the leadership team across DHS is committed to address the underlying reason for DHS employee dissatisfaction and suggestions for improvement."

I also commend DHS Secretary, Michael Chertoff, in comments before our committee last week for acknowledging the problem and promising to fix it. I believe it is imperative to the security of our homeland that the dedicated men and women who carry out the directives and policies that Congress puts forward feel good about themselves and the jobs that they are doing so they can best achieve the very noble goals toward which they are working.

It should be proud of the work the more than 200,000 employees at DHS work tirelessly to help prevent and respond to acts of terrorism, natural disasters and other emergencies. I think Secretary Chertoff's directive to the Homeland Security Advisory Council to establish a culture task force to respond on ways to empower, energize,

and create a more mission-focused culture within DHS and among its Federal, State and local partners was a good first step.

I would say, however, that the answers lie not in creating more bureaucracy but in streamlining and better defining the mission of DHS headquarters and allowing its component organizations to use their particular talents and expertise to accomplish their individual mission in as efficient, creative, and innovative manner as possible.

I also believe we must acknowledge the role that Congress has played and will continue to play in the ultimate success or failure of the department in accomplishing its mission of defending America and saving lives. We in this body must be sensitive to the demands and mandates that we place on DHS employees in the conduct of the war.

I think we can all agree that an overwhelming majority of DHS employees are hardworking, as I said. They are dedicated and hardworking individuals who are personally committed to keeping us, our families, our country secure from terrorist attacks and other disasters that could befall this great Nation.

We must remember, however, that decentralized congressional jurisdiction over Homeland Security issues and the desire to provide proper oversight often makes it difficult for them to do their job. I hope that, especially as members of the Homeland Security Committee, we do not unintentionally make their jobs more difficult in our desire to do our jobs.

I want to thank full committee chairman BENNIE THOMPSON, ranking member PETER KING, subcommittee chairman CHRIS CARNEY, and subcommittee ranking member MIKE ROGERS for bringing this resolution to the floor today.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution and recognize the contributions DHS employees make to protect and secure our Nation. They should know that we understand the daily challenges they face and appreciate the dedication and hard work, the professionalism which they embody, and they conduct themselves in a fine manner.

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

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 134. This resolution recognizes and honors the employees of the Department of Homeland Security for their exceptional efforts and contributions to protect and secure the Nation.

Since the creation of the Department of Homeland Security 4 years ago, the department has made significant steps in ensuring the safety of the American people, specifically with regard to pre-

paring, equipping and training our first responders, protecting our skies, and securing our borders and ports.

In my home State of Washington, we have almost 2,000 people working for the Department of Homeland Security, including 178 members of the Coast Guard, 337 Immigration employees and Custom Enforcement officers, and 1,282 Transportation Security Administration employees. Many of these men and women put their lives on the line every day to ensure that another 9/11 attack does not occur.

In addition to protecting us from another terrorist attack, the Department of Homeland Security employees thwart human smuggling networks and disrupt the international drug trade. An example of these efforts is in 2005 a discovery of a tunnel between the United States and Canada that would have been used to smuggle drugs into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to come to this floor and come together in a bipartisan way and pass a resolution to say that we support the men and women who work in the Department of Homeland Security. It is easy to talk about morale. It is easy to criticize the men and women who protect our children, protect our neighbors and protect our communities and are out there every day. We need to show by action.

We need to support them in our legislation that we pass that provides them with the tools and the resources they need to do their job. I was in law enforcement 33 years in the Seattle area. I know that when I made a life-and-death decision, I had the support of my administration, I had the support of my leadership.

Our men and women who work for the Department of Homeland Security need a strong leadership. And our strong leadership can be supported by people right here in this body, by supporting them again with their resources and the tools that they need.

Mr. Speaker, the employees of the Department of Homeland Security have a tough job, a very tough job. They not only need our strong words of support here today, and the support that we bring with our vote in supporting this resolution, but they need our respect, and our admiration each and every day as they are out there protecting our country, our children, and the future of our grandchildren.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I too support the efforts of the men and women who work in Homeland Security. As a former judge in Texas for over 20 years, I appreciate all of those in our country who are in law enforcement. But I was disappointed and concerned to hear that this department who is tasked with protecting our Nation's borders, ports, and other critical infrastructure

is ranked dead last in employee attitude and morale of all 36 Federal departments surveyed.

To me it reflects the poor and often ambiguous leadership and policies at the top of the department, and I hope Congress can work together to correct this and correct it soon before someone does harm to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, let me provide a couple of absurd examples of maybe the reason why those who are working at the Department of Homeland Security are so frustrated. Three years ago this Saturday, a couple of our border agents witnessed a drug smuggler illegally entering our country, bringing a million dollars worth of drugs.

They order the perpetrator to stop, he doesn't, the agents pursue the suspect, a scuffle ensues and shots are fired. Mr. Speaker, a different kind of environment exists on our Nation's border in the fight against drug smugglers, human traffickers, and terrorists. These two border agents, Ramos and Compean entered the Border Patrol and were trained with the sole duty of protecting Americans, you and me, and the sovereignty of this country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, these agents were not commended for their actions in preventing what turned out to be 700 pounds of marijuana from reaching the streets of America. No, they were prosecuted for it, convicted, and now sit in Federal prison for a decade for doing what they felt like was the right thing to do.

Our Federal Government made a deal with the drug smuggler, a back-room deal and let him loose to go after the border agents. No wonder there is low morale. You see, it is a violation of Border Patrol regulations to go after someone who is fleeing. The Border Patrol pursuit policy is unrealistic by prohibiting the pursuit of someone. This is ridiculous.

Also border agents cannot fire their weapon unless they are fired upon first. This is absurd. Now, some old Texas Ranger once said, No lawman should have to take a bullet before he can use his weapon. When border agents are approached by illegals carrying automatic weapons, they should not have to run away and retreat or be fired at before they stop the intrusion.

□ 1430

I guess this rule was conjured up by some bureaucrat up here in Washington, DC that has never been to the southern border, maybe conjured up for some political reasons.

Mr. Speaker, when we ask the border agents to protect the lawless and violent southern border, we need to give them clear rules of engagement to prevent the invasion into our Nation. We need to support them, and we need to let them know that Congress will support their actions.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Thank you, Congressman CARNEY, for bringing this important piece of legislation before the House.

Today, friends, we will honor and we will respect the fourth anniversary of the Department of Homeland Security. In so doing, we understand that it has been a rocky 4 years, but the importance of this mission of Homeland Security has only grown.

We must never forget the crucial mission of the Department of Homeland Security and that it cannot be fulfilled without the people who make up the Department of Homeland Security.

While there have been some difficult times, it is time for us to acknowledge that there are some good people working in the Department of Homeland Security. These people are heroes who work day and night keeping our country safe. They sacrifice their time. They are often away from their families, and they do a thankless job too often. So we are here today to say thank you, not only to those who are in the lofty offices and who hold high positions, but we are also here today to say thank you to those who sweep the floors, those who file the paperwork, those who answer the phones, those who are making a difference in the lives of Americans by making sure that while we are on their watch we are protected.

I want you to know that while the Department came in dead last with reference to job satisfaction for Federal employees, according to a recent OPM survey, and we know that this is unacceptable, they were dead last; but I believe that they can improve. I believe that they will do better. And I want to share my optimism because the Department of Homeland Security is a Department that every one of us is depending on who lives in the homeland. So the leadership in this Department must do better.

Congress today, I believe, stands with the rank and file employees of this Department, and we want everyone to do better, and we are here to support all of those many employees who are working hard for us.

So I ask today that my colleagues join me in supporting and in embracing this resolution for the Department of Homeland Security. They are making a difference in our lives.

The Department recently saw its fourth anniversary. It has been a rocky 4 years, but the importance of its mission has only grown.

We must never forget that the crucial mission of the Department cannot be fulfilled without the people who make it up.

These heroes work day and night keeping our country safe, sacrificing time with their families, doing often thankless jobs. We are here today to thank them.

The Department came in last in the recent OPM survey of job satisfaction of Federal employees. This is unacceptable. The Department's leadership must do better; it must listen to the people on the front lines.

Congress stands with these rank-and-file employees. We will do our part to see that the Department does better by them.

We have criticized the Department's management and decisions in the past, but no one should mistake this for criticism of the men and women on the front lines, day after day.

Please join me in honoring these everyday heroes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to be here today to honor the employees of the Department of Homeland Security. Four years ago the Department came into being with the crucial mission of protecting and securing our homeland.

It has been a tough 4 years, and the importance of this mission has only grown with time. If you watch the news, you hear all the acronyms for the different parts of the Department—DHS, CBP, FEMA, ICE, FPS, TSA, and the list goes on.

I fear that this alphabet soup may hide the faces of the people who make up the many pieces of the Department. But the vital mission of these different components cannot be fulfilled without the people who make them up. For example, the U.S. Secret Service does not protect the President—Secret Service Agents protect the President. United States Customs and Border Protection does not protect our ports of entry, Customs and Border Protection officers do that.

The Border Patrol does not guard our border, Border Patrol Agents guard the border. The Coast Guard does not watch our shores and rescue our citizens, Coast Guard men and women do. I could go on, but the point is the same: It is not the "Department" that gives up family time to help secure our Nation. It is not the "Department" that works nights, weekends, and holidays. It is not the "Department" that puts its life on the line. It is the people of the Department who make these sacrifices.

Let's not forget that these everyday heroes I just mentioned can't do their jobs without the support personnel in their agencies and Directorates—the contracting officers, administrative assistants, technical support teams, financial managers, and many more. While these folks don't always get the best support and guidance from their management, that in no way diminishes their efforts and sacrifices. It pained me to see the recent Office of Personnel Management survey, in which the Department ranks last in terms of job satisfaction. For the sake of its employees—and for the security of our Nation—the Department's management must do better. I have been critical of the Department's management and some of its decisions in the past, and I'm sure I will be in the future. But no one should mistake my occasional criticism of the way this Department has been run with criticism for the fine men and women who are on the front lines, day after day. I pledge to the employees of the Department that the Committee on Homeland Security will not ignore this problem. We will do our part to see that things improve. We will work with the management of the Department when we can—but we will also give them a gentle push in the right direction when we need to. As Chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, it is an honor for me to stand here today in support of this resolution. This Nation must never forget the lessons of 9/11 and Katrina. And it must never take for granted the men and women who go out every day with one purpose: to do their best, in ways small and large, to keep us all safe. I urge all the Members of the House to join me in honoring these everyday heroes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 134, to recognize the employees of the Department of Homeland Security for their efforts and contributions to protect and secure the Nation.

The Department of Homeland Security is critical in ensuring our great nation's preparation for future terrorist threats and attacks. Its employees step beyond the ordinary call of duty and tirelessly help to prepare our Nation to counter acts of terrorism, natural disasters, and other emergencies.

After the events of September 11, 2001 the American people became painfully aware of the difference between feeling secure and actually being secure. The president responded to the need for development and implementation of a comprehensive national strategy to secure the U.S. from terrorist threats or attacks and thus on November 25, 2002 with the largest government reorganization in 50 years, DHS was established.

More than 208,000 employees of the Department work with state, local and tribal partners to ensure disaster preparedness at all levels of government while sacrificing their invaluable time with their family and working long hours to stand willing, able, and ready to respond if catastrophe strikes.

The Homeland Security Department's employees not only stand vigilant and steadfast against terrorist attacks but fulfill the mission of the department to protect continuously our Nation's borders, airport, seaports, rail lines, and other transit systems.

While it is fitting and appropriate to recognize the contributions of DHS employees, Mr. Speaker, it is also necessary to recognize that this Administration continues to deny labor rights to some of the most vital workers in the Transportation Security Administration—the TSA Screeners. Hiding behind the argument and the rhetoric that it needs a flexible security screening force, the Bush Administration continues to equate basic collective bargaining rights with a lack of patriotism. That is, the Administration is operating under the mistaken belief that allowing employees to collectively bargain for rights that others at DHS have will negatively impact homeland security. This is simply untrue.

If the Administration's argument were true, then this means that the law enforcement officers at the Border Patrol, Customs and Border Protection, and the Federal Protective Services are all negatively impacting homeland security—since these brave men and women have collective bargaining rights. And, despite having these rights, these folks are part of a flexible and highly sought after human resource, just like the TSA Screeners. So, as we honor all DHS employees, Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that we must do more to make DHS a fair and equitable place to work.

I thank Congressmen CARNEY and BILIRAKIS for managing this important bipartisan legislation and I strongly urge my colleagues to stand together to commend, applaud and commemorate the employees of the DHS. Their important duties extend beyond the ordinary. They protect our homeland and our people.

DHS employees have sacrificed and worked tirelessly to safely protect us not only from terrorist attacks but our borders as well as our airports, seaports, rail lines, and other transit systems. For this, they deserve our gratitude.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire as to whether the gentleman from Florida has any more speakers.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I do not.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "aye" on House Resolution 134.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 134.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CARNEY. 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.

ESTABLISHING A PILOT PROGRAM IN CERTAIN DISTRICT COURTS TO ENCOURAGE ENHANCEMENT OF EXPERTISE IN PATENT CASES AMONG DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 34) to establish a pilot program in certain United States district courts to encourage enhancement of expertise in patent cases among district judges.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 74

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

SECTION 1. PILOT PROGRAM IN CERTAIN DISTRICT COURTS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established a program, in each of the United States district courts designated under subsection (b), under which—

(A) those district judges of that district court who request to hear cases under which one or more issues arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents or plant variety protection must be decided, are designated by the chief judge of the court to hear those cases;

(B) cases described in subparagraph (A) are randomly assigned to the judges of the district court, regardless of whether the judges are designated under subparagraph (A);

(C) a judge not designated under subparagraph (A) to whom a case is assigned under subparagraph (B) may decline to accept the case; and

(D) a case declined under subparagraph (C) is randomly reassigned to one of those judges of the court designated under subparagraph (A).

(2) SENIOR JUDGES.—Senior judges of a district court may be designated under paragraph (1)(A) if at least 1 judge of the court in regular active service is also so designated.

(3) RIGHT TO TRANSFER CASES PRESERVED.—This section shall not be construed to limit the ability of a judge to request the reassignment of or otherwise transfer a case to which

the judge is assigned under this section, in accordance with otherwise applicable rules of the court.

(b) DESIGNATION.—The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall, not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, designate not less than 5 United States district courts, in at least 3 different judicial circuits, in which the program established under subsection (a) will be carried out. The Director shall make such designation from among the 15 district courts in which the largest number of patent and plant variety protection cases were filed in the most recent calendar year that has ended, except that the Director may only designate a court in which—

(1) at least 10 district judges are authorized to be appointed by the President, whether under section 133(a) of title 28, United States Code, or on a temporary basis under other provisions of law; and

(2) at least 3 judges of the court have made the request under subsection (a)(1)(A).

(c) DURATION.—The program established under subsection (a) shall terminate 10 years after the end of the 6-month period described in subsection (b).

(d) APPLICABILITY.—The program established under subsection (a) shall apply in a district court designated under subsection (b) only to cases commenced on or after the date of such designation.

(e) REPORTING TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the times specified in paragraph (2), the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, in consultation with the chief judge of each of the district courts designated under subsection (b) and the Director of the Federal Judicial Center, shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report on the pilot program established under subsection (a). The report shall include—

(A) an analysis of the extent to which the program has succeeded in developing expertise in patent and plant variety protection cases among the district judges of the district courts so designated;

(B) an analysis of the extent to which the program has improved the efficiency of the courts involved by reason of such expertise;

(C) with respect to patent cases handled by the judges designated pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(A) and judges not so designated, a comparison between the 2 groups of judges with respect to—

(i) the rate of reversal by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, of such cases on the issues of claim construction and substantive patent law; and

(ii) the period of time elapsed from the date on which a case is filed to the date on which trial begins or summary judgment is entered;

(D) a discussion of any evidence indicating that litigants select certain of the judicial districts designated under subsection (b) in an attempt to ensure a given outcome; and

(E) an analysis of whether the pilot program should be extended to other district courts, or should be made permanent and apply to all district courts.

(2) TIMETABLE FOR REPORTS.—The times referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) not later than the date that is 5 years and 3 months after the end of the 6-month period described in subsection (b); and

(B) not later than 5 years after the date described in subparagraph (A).

(3) PERIODIC REPORTING.—The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, in consultation with the chief judge of each of the district courts designated under subsection (b) and the Direc-

tor of the Federal Judicial Center, shall keep the committees referred to in paragraph (1) informed, on a periodic basis while the pilot program is in effect, with respect to the matters referred to in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (1).

(f) AUTHORIZATION FOR TRAINING AND CLERKSHIPS.—In addition to any other funds made available to carry out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated not less than \$5,000,000 in each fiscal year for—

(1) educational and professional development of those district judges designated under subsection (a)(1)(A) in matters relating to patents and plant variety protection; and

(2) compensation of law clerks with expertise in technical matters arising in patent and plant variety protection cases, to be appointed by the courts designated under subsection (b) to assist those courts in such cases.

Amounts made available pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 34 and ask my colleagues to join me in voting to pass this legislation. Last Congress, an identical bill passed unanimously through the Judiciary Committee and then passed by voice vote on suspension on the House floor.

Patents are the cornerstone of our economy and provide incentives for innovation. Therefore, it is all the more important to continually assess the effect patent litigation has on the preservation of patent quality and intellectual property rights.

H.R. 34 authorizes the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to establish pilot programs in the United States district courts where the most patent cases are filed. At minimum, five courts, spread over at least three circuits, will take part. To qualify, a court must have at least 10 judges, and at least three judges must request to take part in that program in each of the districts.

The chief judge randomly assigns the patent cases. Should that judge, who is assigned the case, decline that assignment, one of the several judges who has opted to take part in the pilot program receives the case. Further, H.R. 34 requires the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to report to Congress on the pilot program's success in developing judicial expertise in patent law and authorizes funds to increase both judges' familiarity with patent law and provide additional funding for clerks.

Patent law is an extremely complex body of law involving analysis of intricate technologies, and Federal district court judges spend an inordinate

amount of time on patent cases, even though patent cases only make up 1 percent of the docket. The combination of the complex science and technology, the unique patent procedures and laws, the administration of the courts and their dockets, and the sheer number of issues raised by patent litigation makes improvement of the patent adjudication system a uniquely complicated, difficult, but necessary, task.

The impetus behind this bill, in part, is the high reversal rate of district court decisions. The Federal Circuit Court of Appeals, which has exclusive jurisdiction over patent appeals, reverses over 30 percent of the district court patent claim constructions. Critics assert that the high reversal rate is due to judicial inexperience and misunderstanding of patent law. The pilot program we are proposing here would address this problem by increasing judicial familiarity with patent law and providing funds to pay additional clerks to assist with patent cases.

The Administrative Office of the United States Courts had concerns about the effect of the pilot program on randomness of assignments. Therefore, in an amended version of the bill, we address this issue by only allowing the district courts with a large enough pool of judges to participate in the pilot program. As a result of this change, at least three judges will take part in the program to ensure that the selection of a certain court does not mean the selection of a certain judge.

Therefore, as the pilot program increases the expertise of judges who opt into the program, it also ensures that the selection of a certain district court is not outcome-determinative, and thus it does deter forum shopping.

While recent accounts demonstrate that as time passes Federal district court judges are becoming more proficient at the application of patent claim construction rules, and while reversal rates are coming down, judicial inexperience in patent law still frequently gives weak, untested and presumptively valid patents the same kind of protection previously reserved for strong and judicially tested patents.

As the importance of intellectual property continues to grow in our economy, we can expect that the Federal courts will spend even more time on patent cases. Thus, we must act now to improve the timeliness and quality of their decisions.

A patent program, combined with a study of its results, serves as a valuable tool in assessing the ability of the courts to become more knowledgeable about the specific laws and technologies involved in patent cases. By providing extra resources and fostering judicial experience in patent law, we can lower the reversal rate of district court decisions and ensure that invalid patents do not receive protections.

Questions have arisen about why the legislation is necessary. All Federal district judges should already be striving, obviously, to enhance their knowl-

edge of patent law through extra classes and training. I want to make clear, this bill does not serve as a cushion for judges who shy away from patent law. Instead, H.R. 34 will assess the benefits of the channeling of patent cases towards judges with greater interest and expertise in patent law and determine whether the program improves patent quality and expedites the adjudication process. This bill is only a pilot program.

Patent quality has been a long-time priority of mine, and I believe H.R. 34 is a first step to resolving some of the deficiencies in the patent system. But this in no way substitutes for comprehensive overhaul of the patent system designed to ensure that innovation is not at risk in the 21st century. By increasing judicial expertise in patent law, H.R. 34 should ultimately improve both patent quality and the litigation process.

As I mentioned previously, this bill has the full support of the Judiciary Committee and many industries and trade groups, including the pharmaceutical, technology, biotech and consumer electronics industries and intellectual property owners and other intellectual property organizations.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 34.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is widely recognized that patent litigation is too expensive, too time consuming, and too unpredictable. H.R. 34 addresses these concerns by authorizing the establishment of a pilot program in certain United States district courts that is intended to encourage the enhancement of expertise in patent cases among district judges.

The need for such a program becomes apparent when one considers that fewer than 1 percent of all cases in U.S. district courts, on average, are patent cases and that a district court judge typically has a patent case proceed through trial only once every 7 years. These cases require a disproportionate share of attention and judicial resources, and the rate of reversal remains unacceptably high.

The premise underlying H.R. 34 is simple. Practice makes perfect, or at least better. Judges who focus more attention on patent cases can be expected to be better prepared and make decisions that will hold up under appeal.

This bill is the product of an extensive oversight hearing which was conducted by the Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet and Intellectual Property in October 2005. The authors of H.R. 34, Representatives DARRELL ISSA and ADAM SCHIFF, introduced this measure on January 4, 2007. This legislation is identical to H.R. 5418, a bill that passed the House unanimously last September. Unfortunately, the clock on the 109th Congress expired before the other body could take up this bipartisan measure.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 34 will require the Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts to select five district courts to participate in a 10-year pilot program that is to begin no later than 6 months after the date of enactment.

The bill specifies criteria the director must employ in determining eligibility of districts. It contains provisions to preserve the random assignment of cases and to prevent the selected districts from becoming magnets for forum shopping litigants.

The legislation also requires the director, in consultation with the director of the Federal Judicial Center and the chief judge of each participating district, to provide the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate with periodic progress reports.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the superb job that the bill's sponsors did in seeking out and incorporating the advice of numerous experts as they developed this bipartisan legislation. Congratulations go to Congressmen DARRELL ISSA and ADAM SCHIFF. Their success and cooperation have resulted in a worthy bill that deserves the support of the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill.

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

□ 1445

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I simply join with my friend the ranking member in complimenting both the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the other gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

If one could patent all of Mr. ISSA's ideas, the Patent Office would truly be backlogged for a very long time.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), the ranking member of the Intellectual Property Subcommittee and a former chairman of the Intellectual Property Subcommittee.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for yielding.

And I probably won't use 5 minutes, but, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 34, a bill to establish a pilot program in certain United States district courts to encourage enhancement of expertise in patent cases among district judges, is a bill that deserves the continued support of the Members of the House. As has been indicated both by Mr. BERMAN and Mr. SMITH, drafted by Representatives ISSA and SCHIFF, this bipartisan legislation was passed unanimously by the House last year, but due to the press of time the other body did not consider the measure. With House action early in this Congress, we will be able to ensure our colleagues on the other side of the Hill have maximum

opportunity to fully and fairly consider this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that our Nation's patent laws have become the subject of much scrutiny and debate. Indeed, Judiciary Committee Ranking Member LAMAR SMITH and the chairman of the Intellectual Property Subcommittee, Representative HOWARD BERMAN, with whom I look forward to working this Congress, have been leaders in developing substantive and comprehensive reforms to our Nation's patent system. The further consideration of these proposals is the IP Subcommittee's highest priority this Congress. I am encouraged and hopeful that we will be able to look back at the end of the 110th Congress satisfied that we ran the course and completed this important task.

But there is related work this House can complete immediately that will serve as a step in the right direction. By passing H.R. 34, a commonsense and narrowly tailored measure that will provide designated Federal district judges the opportunity to improve their expertise in the handling of patent cases, the House will be taking an early, positive first step along the road to comprehensive patent reform.

Mr. Speaker, a typical Federal district judge may preside over no more than three or four, five at the most, patent cases which are litigated to conclusion during the course of his or her career. Patent cases comprise only 1 percent of cases filed in Federal court, yet they make up nearly 10 percent of complex cases. The timely and appropriate resolution of these cases is vital to uphold the rights of individual litigants. But it also serves the larger interests of consumers and the economy.

Patent litigation, Mr. Speaker, is characterized by disputes that involve the interaction of numerous parties, the integration of sophisticated technologies, and the application of technical aspects of substantive patent law by judges who are rarely presented with such cases.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 34 is a modest bill that will enable a small number of these district judges to be designated to gain additional experience and resources in handling these cases, the outcome of which is so crucial to our economy.

This legislation also includes safeguards to prevent these districts from being used to promote "forum shopping" as well as provisions to ensure that the Congress is provided with useful periodic reports on the progress of this new initiative.

Again, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), and Representatives SCHIFF and ISSA for their work.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 34.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), a member of the Intellectual Property Subcommittee and one of the two principal sponsors of this very worthy legislation.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, there are few things in this body that truly transcend party lines. The respect for the Constitution and our obligations under it clearly are the most important among them.

The Constitution makes it clear that inventors and authors and artisans are entitled to protection for a limited period of time under the Constitution. And yet, if it takes years to get through a patent case and only to have it reversed 30 to 40 percent of the time, much more often if it is a first-time case before a Federal judge, then justice is not only delayed but in some cases denied if you don't have the ability, after paying maybe \$2 million, to pay another \$2 million to go through the appeal process. Therefore, it is essential at the district court that the judges get it right the first time.

Under the Markman decision, a Federal judge must decide what the patent means. It is incredibly technical often to decide what 5,000 claims, sometimes looking thicker than the Bible and the Koran put together, really mean; and yet that is an obligation of the judge. Those obligations may be in the areas of mechanical engineering, electrical engineering. It could be chemical. It could be bio. It could be so technical as to require outside experts just to decipher some of the language. And yet we ask a Federal judge, most often the one who has just ascended to the bench, to take on these patent cases. This bill is designed to reduce the times in which the most complex cases get before the least prepared and sometimes even the least willing Federal judges.

It also is an example of something that has been used in other ways, but appropriate here: a theory that you must mend it, not end it. We have an obligation, and the Federal courts with us have an obligation, to deal with intellectual property properly because it is a right under the Constitution, and yet it is broken. My colleagues, Mr. SCHIFF as the cosponsor but, more broadly, Ranking Member SMITH have been supportive. The now chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BERMAN, helped all along the way. Mr. CONYERS has been supportive, both in the last Congress and this Congress, in getting this bill out; and Senator LEAHY and Senator FEINSTEIN are working on the Senate side for a counterpart.

This type of legislation is narrowly crafted but deals with the exact problems we are facing. Let me just give you one example, Mr. Speaker. Most

Americans understand in the last Congress the RIM or BlackBerry case, a case in which for years the litigation continued on and we were dealing with over half a billion dollars of final damages. Reversal after reversal, decision and indecision. That shouldn't happen when we are dealing with billions of dollars.

This legislation seeks to spend only \$5 million a year to check out the feasibility of what would probably be only \$50 or \$60 million in total a year to make our Federal courts able to deal with what turns out to be tens or hundreds of billions of dollars of commerce.

Therefore, I hope that because we pass this early and, I trust, unanimously once again, that we will be able to deal with the Senate, bring this to the President's desk, and begin working with the courts to implement it.

Last but not least, an unusual "thank you." Justice Breyer was a major part of this discussion from the earliest stages, and as somebody who, while as a Senate staffer, was considered to be the father of the Fed circuit, his opinion that there needed to be a fix in the district court so as not to have to take from the district courts the very jurisdiction that we speak of here today, was crucial to the development of this bill.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for this bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 34, a bill to establish a pilot program in certain United States district courts to encourage enhancement of expertise in patent cases among district judges. Congressman ADAM SCHIFF and I have worked together on this legislation since the last Congress, and I am grateful for the chance to move this legislation forward today.

The high cost of patent litigation is widely publicized, and it is not unusual for a patent suit to cost each party over \$10,000,000. Appeals from district courts to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit are frequent. This is caused, in part, by the general perception within the patent community that most district court judges are not sufficiently prepared to hear patent cases. I drafted this legislation in an attempt to decrease the cost of litigation by increasing the success of district court judges.

H.R. 34 establishes a pilot project within at least five district courts. Under the pilot, judges decide whether or not to opt into hearing patent cases. If a judge opts in, and a patent case is randomly assigned to that judge, that judge keeps the case. If a case is randomly assigned to a judge who has not opted into hearing patent cases, that judge has the choice of keeping that case or sending it to the group of judges who have opted in. To be a designated court, the court must have at least 10 authorized judges with at least 3 opting in.

The core intent of this pilot is to steer patent cases to judges that have the desire and aptitude to hear patent cases, while preserving random assignment as much as possible. Each of the test courts will be assigned a clerk with expertise in patent law or the scientific issues arising in patent cases, and funding is also allocated to better educate participating

judges in patent law. The pilot will last no longer than 10 years, and periodic studies will occur to determine the pilot project's success.

I am happy to say that H.R. 34 is supported by software, hardware, tech and electronics companies, pharmaceutical companies, biotech companies, district court judges, the American Intellectual Property Law Association, and the Intellectual Property Owners Association among others.

This legislation is a good first step toward improving the legal environment for the patent community in the United States. H.R. 34 should not, however, be taken as a replacement for broader patent reform. We still need to address substantive issues within patent law, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on that broader effort as well.

I thank Judiciary Committee Chairman JOHN CONYERS and Ranking Member LAMAR SMITH, as well as Intellectual Property Subcommittee Chairman HOWARD BERMAN and Subcommittee Ranking Member HOWARD COBLE for all of their efforts in moving this legislation. I also thank Committee staff David Whitney and Shanna Winters for their counsel during the development of H.R. 34.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support H.R. 34.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support of H.R. 34, which authorizes a new 10-year pilot program designed to increase judges' expertise in presiding over patent cases. Under the new pilot program, district judges could request to hear cases relating to patent law or plant variety protection. Currently, cases in Federal district courts are assigned randomly. Under the measure, if one judge declines to hear a patent case, the case could be reassigned to one of the judges in the pilot program who has requested to hear such cases.

The bill directs the Administrative Office of the Courts, within six months of enactment, to designate at least five courts in at least three different judicial circuits in which the pilot program would be conducted. It requires that these districts for the pilot program be chosen from the 15 districts that have had the largest number of patent and plant variety protection cases filed within the past year, and that the pilot program is conducted in districts in which at least three judges will participate. It also requires the administrative Office of the Courts to submit periodic reports to the Committee on the Judiciary for the House and the Senate regarding the effectiveness of the pilot program.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 34 enjoys strong bipartisan support in the Judiciary Committee. I urge my colleagues to support this pilot program.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, 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. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 34.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING AND PRAISING THE NAACP ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 98TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 44) honoring and praising the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its 98th anniversary.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 44

Whereas the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), originally known as the National Negro Committee, was founded in New York City on February 12, 1909, the centennial of Abraham Lincoln's birth, by a multiracial group of activists who answered "The Call" for a national conference to discuss the civil and political rights of African Americans;

Whereas the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was founded by a distinguished group of leaders in the struggle for civil and political liberty, including Ida Wells-Barnett, W.E.B. DuBois, Henry Moscowitz, Mary White Ovington, Oswald Garrison Villiard, and William English Walling;

Whereas the NAACP is the oldest and largest civil rights organization in the United States;

Whereas the mission of the NAACP is to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of rights of all persons and to eliminate racial hatred and racial discrimination;

Whereas the NAACP is committed to achieving its goals through nonviolence;

Whereas the NAACP advances its mission through reliance upon the press, the petition, the ballot, and the courts, and has been persistent in the use of legal and moral persuasion, even in the face of overt and violent racial hostility;

Whereas the NAACP has used political pressure, marches, demonstrations, and effective lobbying to serve as the voice, as well as the shield, for minority Americans;

Whereas after years of fighting segregation in public schools, the NAACP, under the leadership of Special Counsel Thurgood Marshall, won one of its greatest legal victories in the Supreme Court's 1954 decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*;

Whereas in 1955, NAACP member Rosa Parks was arrested and fined for refusing to give up her seat on a segregated bus in Montgomery, Alabama—an act of courage that would serve as the catalyst for the largest grassroots civil rights movement in the history of the United States;

Whereas the NAACP was prominent in lobbying for the passage of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006, and the Fair Housing Act, laws which ensured Government protection for legal victories achieved; and

Whereas in 2005, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People launched the Disaster Relief Fund to help survivors in Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, Florida, and Alabama to rebuild their lives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) recognizes the 98th anniversary of the historic founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and

(2) honors and praises the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of its anniversary for its

work to ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of all persons.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 44.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today I rise to join my colleague AL GREEN of Texas in honoring the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the NAACP, on its 98th anniversary. As we observe Black History Month this February, it is only appropriate that we recognize the Nation's oldest and largest civil rights organization. Ninety-eight years after its inception, we salute the NAACP for its continued commitment to promoting equality and justice for all Americans.

The NAACP has been at the forefront of every brave and courageous moment in this Nation's civil rights history. This was particularly evident during the height of the Civil Rights Movement. In 1954 the NAACP secured one of the greatest legal victories with the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision. In 1960 the NAACP Youth Council organized a series of sit-ins at lunch counters throughout the country, an activity which I think for many of us, I know for myself, helped to pique and motivate our interest in the ability of politics and movement to make change on behalf of people. And in 1965 the NAACP successfully sought enactment of the Voting Rights Act.

Today the NAACP priorities continue to "ensure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of rights of all persons," as its mission statement reads. Last year the NAACP addressed such issues as voter disenfranchisement, HIV/AIDS, and the conflict in Sudan. In 2007 the organization continues to confront these and other domestic and international concerns. Most recently, the NAACP supported Congress' efforts to increase the minimum wage.

We in this body congratulate the NAACP for this work and their continued efforts to protect the civil and human rights of our citizens. On its 98th anniversary, the NAACP remains an integral and essential part of this society. We salute the NAACP on this significant occasion.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support House Concurrent Resolution 44, which recognizes the 98th anniversary of the NAACP.

For almost a century, the NAACP has fought to bring justice and racial equality to all parts of America. In 1917 the NAACP won a legal victory in the Supreme Court which held that States could not restrict and officially segregate African Americans into residential areas. The same year the NAACP fought for the right for African Americans to be commissioned as officers in World War I. In 1920 the NAACP held its annual conference in Atlanta, which at the time was one of the most active areas for the Ku Klux Klan. As a result, the NAACP showed the world it would not be intimidated by racial violence.

□ 1500

In 1935, NAACP lawyers Charles Houston and Thurgood Marshall won a legal battle to admit a black student to the University of Maryland.

During World War II, the NAACP led the effort that resulted in President Franklin Roosevelt's ordering a non-discrimination policy in war-related industries and Federal employment.

And in 1948, the NAACP convinced President Harry Truman to sign an executive order banning discrimination by the Federal Government.

In 1954, under the leadership of Special Counsel Thurgood Marshall, the NAACP won one of the greatest legal victories in *Brown v. Board of Education*.

In 1960, in Greensboro, North Carolina, members of the NAACP Youth Council launched a series of nonviolent sit-ins at segregated lunch counters. The segregation ended, and all Americans could finally break bread together.

The history of America's modern struggle to live up to our constitutional principles was often written by the NAACP, and it continues to champion the cause of social justice today. The NAACP has served as the voice of those who were mute with fear. It has served as a key for those who were handcuffed and jailed under segregationist policies. And it carried the weight for those whose backs were broken by brutal beatings. It did so peacefully, and with dignity; and, as a result, America can hold its head higher.

It is with great pleasure that I support this concurrent resolution, which I hope raises even higher the awareness of this organization's historic contributions to the cause of civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ISSA), and would ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control said time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the sponsor of the resolution, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, thanks to the subcommittee chairman, Congressman HOWARD BERMAN. I thank you much for the many things that you have done.

Mr. Speaker, I also think it appropriate to thank today chairman JOHN CONYERS of the Judiciary Committee for assisting in this and causing this piece of legislation to move forward quickly. I thank Senator HILLARY CLINTON and the more than 20 cosponsors in the United States Senate.

My understanding is that companion legislation will be filed there today. We would like to thank the 117 cosponsors in the U.S. House of Representatives, all of whom believe that this legislation is exceedingly important. And, of course, I would like to thank last year's cosponsor with me, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, Congressman JAMES SENSENBRENNER.

Mr. Speaker, there are many organizations that have endorsed this legislation: the American Jewish Committee; the ADL, the Anti-Defamation League; LULAC, the League of United Latin American Citizens; and NCLR, the National Council of La Raza.

Today, H. Con. Res. 44 honors the NAACP for 98 years of service to America. Mr. Speaker, that is 98 years of upholding the constitutional notion of government of the people, by the people, and for the people. That is 98 years of standing on the Declaration of Independence and the premise that all persons are created equal; 98 years, Mr. Speaker, of saluting the proposition in the Pledge of Allegiance that we are indeed one Nation, with liberty and justice for all.

I thank God, Mr. Speaker, for the NAACP and those brave souls who assembled 98 years ago today on February 12, 1909, a group of people who met to fight for the rights of black people. They were an integrated group, both black and white, who believed in the Constitution of the United States of America.

And while we must remember that the NAACP was founded to make democracy work for black people, we shouldn't forget that it was Mary White Ovington, a white woman, who is said to have hosted the founders meeting. And we shouldn't forget that she did this in response to William English Walling, a white man who wrote an article asking citizens to rally in support of African Americans.

We don't forget in the NAACP, and we should never forget, the fact that this organization has never been a black-only organization. So, today, I salute the NAACP-ers, current and those who have gone on for their great work in this great country. I want to salute them by remembering those who are black, but I also pledge that we will never forget those who are white.

So as we remember Dr. Louis T. Wright, who in 1935 became the first black NAACP board Chair, we should not forget Oswald Garrison Villard, the white man who in 1911 became the very

first Chair of the board of the NAACP. You see, there were two white NAACP board Chairs, Oswald Villard and Joel Spingarn, before we had a black NAACP board Chair.

And I believe we should remember James Weldon Johnson. He was the first black executive secretary and director of the NAACP. However, we should never forget Francis Blascon and Mary White Ovington, along with Mary Nurney and Royall Nash, all of whom were white and served before James Weldon Johnson.

Let us remember the brilliant lawyer and Supreme Court Justice, Thurgood Marshall. However, we should not forget Arthur Spingarn, the white NAACP-er who donated large sums of money and raised even more money for the NAACP Legal Redress Committee. While Thurgood Marshall was a great litigator, and he was, we should never forget that the Spingarns were great donors and made it possible for a lot of the litigation to take place.

I will remember and I beg that we all remember Medgar Evers, the black NAACP field representative who was assassinated in his front yard in 1963. However, we shouldn't forget John R. Shillady, the white NAACP executive secretary, because he was beaten by a mob in Austin, Texas, and he never recovered.

Through the efforts of a multiracial, religiously diverse and ethnically inclusive group, the NAACP has made great contributions to our society: the passage of the Voting Rights Act; the passage of the Civil Rights Act; the Fair Housing Act of 1968; filed and won many lawsuits, including *Brown v. Board of Education*; *Shelley v. Kraemer*; and recently contributed millions of dollars to assist the Hurricane Katrina victims.

So today we can literally say we eat where we eat, we live where we live and we sleep where we sleep in part due to the NAACP, and we are grateful that they have been there for us.

Mr. Speaker, I beg that all of my colleagues will support this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 44 is and should be about the NAACP, but it is also about a history of a struggle, not just the 98 years that the NAACP has been pushing and prodding this body, the courts and the executive branch for fairness for all people, all people in the United States, but for the history of this struggle. Whether it is the *Marbury v. Madison* decision, or the dreaded *Dred Scott* decision, the Court has had to be prodded by the public, the Congress has had to be prodded by the public, and, yes, just as with Harry S. Truman, the President has had to be prodded by the public. No organization in American history has sustained the consistent legacy of being an effective prod to the government greater than the NAACP.

So I join with my colleagues on a bipartisan and undoubtedly bicameral

basis to celebrate this 98 years and the struggle that it represents.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise to congratulate the NAACP on its 98th Anniversary. As the Nation's oldest civil rights organization, the NAACP has for 98 years fought to ensure the political, educational, social and economic equality of all persons, so that all may share and participate in this country's great Democracy.

The NAACP was founded by a multiracial group of activists who answered "The Call" for a national conference to discuss the civil and political rights of African Americans. This conference was in response to the race riots that took place in Springfield, Illinois in the summer of 1908. Since that time, the NAACP has sought to ensure equal rights for all citizens and to eliminate race prejudice in the United States by working to improve the democratic process and by seeking the enactment and enforcement of laws that secure civil rights. The NAACP also acts as a watchdog and informs the public of the adverse effects of discrimination. The NAACP also educates the public about their constitutional rights, and when necessary, undertakes court cases to enforce and secure those rights.

The NAACP has a long and impressive history of activism and has contributed greatly to shaping America as we know it today. One of its first legislative initiatives was an anti-lynching campaign in the early 1900s. In the 1940s, the NAACP was influential in President Roosevelt's decision to issue an Executive Order prohibiting discrimination in contracts with the Department of Defense and in President Truman's decision to issue an Executive Order ending discrimination in the military. In the 1950s, the NAACP worked to bring an end to segregation in public schools; that work culminated in the case of *Brown v. Board of Education*. In the 1960s, the NAACP worked to raise support for the passage of the Civil Rights Act. In the 1970s, it helped expand voter participation through voter registration efforts. And the list goes on.

Today, the NAACP continues to eliminate race prejudice whenever it rears its ugly head. It continues to act as a watchdog to protect the civil rights of all people. And it educates the public about civil rights so that future generations will know tolerance and equality as the norm, rather than the exception.

I am proud to be a Diamond Life Member of the NAACP and to have served as a Branch President of the Newport News Chapter.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the NAACP on 98 years of service to our great country and its people, and I wish them another successful 98 years.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on its 98th Anniversary. In 1909 the founder of the NAACP came together with the purpose of promoting the rights guaranteed under the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution. Today, the NAACP works to ensure that all individuals have equal rights and to eradicate racial hatred and discrimination.

The NAACP has influenced some of the greatest civil rights victories of the last century, including: integration of schools and the *Brown v. Board* decision; the Voting Rights Act; striking down segregation; and the Equal Employment Opportunity Act.

Despite the advancements of the past 98 years under the leadership of the NAACP, there is still much work to be done. The NAACP continues to promote new ideas and leadership in the fields of educational and employment opportunities, ending health care disparities, and economic empowerment.

The NAACP instilled in America a sense of consciousness, and continues to do that today through the thousands of individuals who continue to fight for equality and justice.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) as we celebrate the 98th anniversary of their inception.

Since 1909, the NAACP has been a leader in advancing civil rights and has sought to remove all barriers of racial discrimination through their use of legal and moral persuasion.

This organization has provided communities around the United States with strong and passionate leaders who have fought for social change. Among these organizations, it is an honor to note that California is home to 72 branches and youth units, each providing inspiration to their respective communities.

As we celebrate the accomplishments of the NAACP, we must also honor the values upon which it was founded, for there is much work left to be done, and the same tireless dedication and clarity of purpose will be required to continue onward.

I commend the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People for being champions of social justice and for their tireless efforts for almost a century. I look forward to celebrating their centennial in two years.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 44, which gives fitting honor and praise to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of the 98th anniversary of its founding.

The NAACP is the oldest, largest, most historic and most influential civil rights organization in the United States. First organized in 1905, the group was known as the Niagara Movement when they began meeting at a hotel situated on the Canadian side of the Niagara Falls. They had to meet in Canada because American hotels in Niagara Falls were segregated. Under the leadership of the Harvard-educated scholar, the great W.E.B. DuBois, the group would later be known as the National Negro Committee before finally adopting the name by which it has been known for the last 98 years—the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, or NAACP—at its second conference in 1910.

The first official meeting was held in 1909 exactly 98 years ago today: February 12, the centennial of the birth of President Abraham Lincoln. The mission of the association was clearly delineated in its charter:

To promote equality of rights and to eradicate caste or race prejudice among the citizens of the United States; to advance the interest of colored citizens; to secure for them impartial suffrage; and to increase their opportunities for securing justice in the courts, education for the children, employment according to their ability and complete equality before law.

For nearly a century, the NAACP has stayed true to its charter and championed the

cause of justice and equality in America. It has fought valiantly and tirelessly on behalf of African Americans and others to secure their civil rights and liberties and the full measure of justice and equality for all.

At a time when African Americans were treated as second-class citizens and the scourge of slavery was still rampant, the NAACP emerged to ensure that the rights, interests and voices of African Americans did not go unheard.

As Chair for the Congressional Children's Caucus, I am especially concerned with fair access to quality education for today's youth. I am personally grateful to the NAACP for its leadership in winning the greatest legal victory for civil rights in American history: the 1954 landmark decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), in which the Supreme Court struck down de jure segregation in elementary schools. NAACP General Counsel Thurgood Marshall, who would later become the first African American associate justice of the Supreme Court, forcefully argued and persuaded the Court to rule unanimously that in the field of public education, "separate but equal" was inherently unequal. That decision gave hope to millions of Americans that their children might enjoy the full promise of America that had been denied their forebears for more than three centuries.

The NAACP used the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown* to press for desegregation of schools and public facilities throughout the country. In 1955, Rosa Parks was arrested and fined for refusing to give up her seat to a white man in Montgomery, Alabama. Her act of civil disobedience triggered the Montgomery Bus Boycott, one of the largest and most successful mass movements against racial segregation in history and ignited the Civil Rights Movement. Daisy Bates spearheaded the campaign by the Little Rock Nine to integrate Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas.

The NAACP remains committed to achieving its goals through nonviolence, the legal process, and moral and political suasion, and through direct actions such as marches, demonstrations, and boycotts to give voice to the hopes and aspirations of African Americans and others who lack the power to make their voices heard.

There is still a need for justice and equal treatment for African Americans and other vulnerable populations in our country. Thankfully, the NAACP is alive, well, vital, and effective. I am grateful for the many fights for equality that the organization has won, and thankful that the NAACP will be there in the future to champion the cause of justice wherever and whenever it needs a spokesman.

Happy birthday, NAACP and thank you for all you have done to make our country better. I urge all Members to join me in supporting H. Con. Res. 44.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, 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. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Con. Res. 44.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BERMAN. 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.

RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 9066 AND SUPPORTING AND RECOGNIZING A NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 122) recognizing the significance of the 65th anniversary of the signing of Executive Order 9066 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and supporting the goals of the Japanese American, German American, and Italian American communities in recognizing a National Day of Remembrance to increase public awareness of the events surrounding the restriction, exclusion, and internment of individuals and families during World War II.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 122

Whereas President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942, which authorized the exclusion of 120,000 Japanese Americans and legal resident aliens from the West coast of the United States and the internment of United States citizens and legal permanent residents of Japanese ancestry in internment camps during World War II;

Whereas the freedom of Italian Americans and German Americans was also restricted during World War II by measures that branded them enemy aliens and included required identification cards, travel restrictions, seizure of personal property, and internment;

Whereas President Gerald Ford formally rescinded Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1976, in his speech, "An American Promise";

Whereas Congress adopted legislation which was signed by President Jimmy Carter on July 31, 1980, establishing the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians to investigate the claim that the incarceration of Japanese Americans and legal resident aliens during World War II was justified by military necessity;

Whereas the Commission held 20 days of hearings and heard from over 750 witnesses on this matter and published its findings in a report entitled "Personal Justice Denied";

Whereas the conclusion of the commission was that the promulgation of Executive Order 9066 was not justified by military necessity, and that the decision to issue the order was shaped by "race prejudice, war hysteria, and a failure of political leadership";

Whereas Congress enacted the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, in which it apologized on behalf of the Nation for "fundamental violations of the basic civil liberties and constitutional rights of these individuals of Japanese ancestry";

Whereas President Ronald Reagan signed the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 into law on August 10, 1988, proclaiming that day to be a "great day for America";

Whereas the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 established the Civil Liberties Public Education Fund, the purpose of which is "to

sponsor research and public educational activities and to publish and distribute the hearings, findings, and recommendations of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians so that the events surrounding the exclusion, forced removal, and internment of civilians and permanent resident aliens of Japanese ancestry will be remembered, and so that the causes and circumstances of this and similar events may be illuminated and understood";

Whereas Congress adopted the Wartime Violation of Italian Americans Civil Liberties Act, which was signed by President Bill Clinton on November 7, 2000, and which resulted in a report containing detailed information on the types of violations that occurred, as well as lists of individuals of Italian ancestry that were arrested, detained, and interned;

Whereas the Japanese American community recognizes a National Day of Remembrance on February 19th of each year to educate the public about the lessons learned from the internment to ensure that it never happens again;

Whereas H.R. 1492 (Public Law 109-441) was passed by Congress and signed into law in 2006, to allow the government to identify and acquire sites used to confine Japanese Americans during World War II, in order to preserve and maintain these historic locations for posterity and inspire new generations of Americans to work for justice while demonstrating the Nation's commitment to equal and fair treatment for all; and

Whereas the Day of Remembrance provides an opportunity for all people to reflect on the importance of political leadership and vigilance and on the values of justice and civil rights during times of uncertainty and emergency; Now, therefore, be it:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the historical significance of February 19, 1942, the date Executive Order 9066 was signed by President Roosevelt, restricting the freedom of Japanese Americans, German Americans, and Italian Americans, and legal resident aliens through required identification cards, travel restrictions, seizure of personal property, and internment; and

(2) supports the goals of the Japanese American, German American, and Italian American communities in recognizing a National Day of Remembrance to increase public awareness of these events.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 122.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, but no more than 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in favor of House Resolution 122. Sixty-five years ago, President Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, leading to the detention of approximately 120,000 Japanese Americans. They were forced to live in isolated camps, to sell or lease their

property, often at huge losses, and to give up their businesses and livelihoods. The freedom and civil liberties of Italian and German Americans were also violated during World War II by measures that branded them enemy aliens and went as far as restricting their movement and seizing their personal property. Thirty years passed before Executive Order 9066 was formally rescinded in 1976.

House Resolution 122 recognizes the devastating impact of that executive order. The resolution also supports and commends the efforts of the Japanese, Italian and German American communities in recognizing a National Day of Remembrance for their history of restriction, exclusion and internment during World War II. The failure of our political and judicial system to prevent the injustices against them still reverberates today.

The decision to intern Japanese Americans was based not on evidence, but rather on fear and panic. In 1980, Congress established a Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians. That commission, after conducting 20 days of hearings and receiving testimony from over 750 witnesses, concluded that Executive Order 9066 was not justified by military necessity, but resulted from "race prejudice, war hysteria, and a failure of political leadership."

In 1988, Congress enacted, and I was proud to be here and a part of that fight, the Civil Liberties Act to formally acknowledge and apologize for violations of fundamental civil liberties and constitutional rights of these Japanese Americans.

□ 1515

In 2000, President Clinton signed the Wartime Violation of Italian Americans Civil Liberties Act, which formally acknowledged civil liberty violations against Italian Americans.

The most honorable and principled way to show respect to those Americans who suffered injustices during World War II is to dedicate ourselves to fighting for the fundamental American principles of liberty of which their mistreatment remains to this day a glaring reminder.

Once again, I want to join with my colleagues in recognizing the very important work of the Japanese American, the German American and the Italian American communities in raising awareness of the National Day of Remembrance, and to particularly commend Representative HONDA for his efforts in bringing this resolution to the floor.

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

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

I rise in support of H. Res. 122 which recognizes the tragic significance of Executive Order 9066 signed by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt to authorize the internment of Japanese Americans at the beginning of World

War II. The resolution also highlights the injustices forced on Italian Americans and German Americans during this same period.

In 1942, President Roosevelt authorized the Army to evacuate more than 100,000 Japanese Americans from the Pacific Coast States, including Washington, Oregon, and my home State, California, and also Arizona. This grossly blunderbuss approach to maintaining America's security serves, especially today, as a continuing reminder that the civil rights of American citizens should never be lost in the midst of the chaos of war, not even in a war on terror.

President Roosevelt authorized the mass expulsion and incarceration of Japanese Americans, and these are American citizens, by signing Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942. A few minutes ago, I spoke about the prodding of this body, the prodding about the Presidency and the prodding of the courts. This ill-fated action unfortunately was supported by this body, the one on the other side of the Dome and, yes, the U.S. Supreme Court. Had any of us recognized our burden of freedom and democracy and taken it to heart, this could not and would not have happened.

The tragic misuse of this power was met with an equally powerful response, but unfortunately, it was too late.

In 1976, President Gerald Ford issued Proclamation 4417, in which he said, "Learning from our mistakes is not pleasant, but as a great philosopher once admonished, we must do so if we want to avoid repeating them." We recently put to rest President Gerald Ford, but there was no action that Gerald Ford ever did as President more significant than this one. President Ford, in apologizing and taking back the misconduct perpetrated on American citizens so long ago, has set a high standard for it ever happening again.

Today, we have just those threats among us and amidst us, so I am happy to support this to join with the ACLU and all the other organizations that daily fight this and recognizing that this should never happen again.

Last but not least, we are joined with our colleague, the widow of Bob Matsui, and I might note that as a freshman it was Bob Matsui who was on the Democrat side speaking about this issue firsthand. I am sorry that he is not with us today. I look forward to the statements of my colleague and his widow, because I believe that, in fact, this is something we must do every year so that it never, never, never happens again in my America.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7½ minutes to the sponsor of the resolution, the chief sponsor of the resolution, the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise today in support of H. Res. 122. I also want to thank the House

leadership on both sides, as well as Chairman CONYERS, for their leadership in steering this measure to the floor today. While the resolution addresses events from our past, there is much that we can learn from our history, as has been stated by our friend Mr. ISSA.

This is a resolution recognizing the 65th anniversary of the Day of Remembrance and supporting the goals of the Japanese American community in recognizing a National Day of Remembrance to increase public awareness of the events surrounding the restriction, exclusion and internment of all persons of Japanese ancestry during World War II.

The resolution also recognizes that many in the German and Italian communities experienced deprivations during this time as well.

This year marks the 65th anniversary of President Roosevelt's signing of Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942, and the 19th anniversary of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, which was signed into law by President Reagan.

In 1942, some 120,000 people were rounded up in this country, primarily from the west coast, and incarcerated. Families were torn apart. Hardworking people had to sell their businesses for pennies on the dollar and their personal properties. Everything these people worked so hard for evaporated overnight.

I spent part of my childhood in a camp in southeast Colorado, an internment camp called Amache. H. Res. 122 also recognizes that many in the German and the Italian communities experienced deprivation during this period as well: public humiliation, detention and, at times, deportation.

In 1942, on the domestic front, our political leaders failed. Therefore, today we must work to educate the public about the internment of Americans in order to prevent similar injustices to be forced upon anyone in this country. Our civil liberties have not been in as much risk since World War II, and this time we, as political leaders, cannot fail.

True to the democratic process, our Nation has been able to look back and admit errors from its past. I can think of no greater evidence to show why the United States, with all its flaws, still is looked to worldwide as the Nation with the strongest and the fairest form of government.

By admitting that the government did wrong in its treatment of its citizens and legal residents who were aliens during World War II, Congress and the President reaffirmed our Nation's commitment to the principles founded in the Constitution.

However, we must always be vigilant in the protection of our civil liberties, and in this time of tension as we wage a war against terrorism, we must again reaffirm our commitment to the principles in the Constitution.

While national security is always a paramount concern for those of us making the laws, as well as executing

and interpreting the laws, we see that there are those in government who continue to pursue policies once again that target our civil liberties.

The whole point of the Day of Remembrance resolution is about learning. It is about being persistent about the lessons that we have learned from the American of Japanese ancestry, experience that is really an American lesson on the Constitution and is also a lesson of the American character where, upon reconciliation, there is a healing.

There is a healing among not only those who were incarcerated, but there is also healing among those who were affected but maybe not necessarily incarcerated. So victims are both those who were directly victimized and those who were indirectly victimized by the misdeeds of our government.

Also, the further learning, when we talk about the Day of Remembrance, is that other communities get to reflect upon their own experience at that time and project into the future when this kind of thing should happen again.

As a teacher, I want to reemphasize the necessity for this type of resolution as it continues to teach us the old maxim that those of us who do not learn from the mistakes of our past are doomed to repeat them.

In today's current light, I want to underscore that national security is my highest priority. It is our government's highest priority, and I support efforts to fight our war against terrorism. But we must also understand that in doing so, we do not again have a failure among our political leadership. We must not give in to war hysteria. We must not fall back to racial prejudice, discrimination and unlawful profiling.

It is critical and important, more than ever, to speak up against possible unjust policies that may come before this body. It is critical that we educate all Americans of the Japanese American experience during World War II, as well as the experience of other Americans, like the Japanese Latin Americans.

These people were extricated from Latin America, brought over here, had their documents taken away from them, thus becoming individuals without a country, to be used as pawns in exchange for POWs in the Pacific theater. As this resolution does, we must also remember the experiences of our comrades of the German and Italian Americans who were also victimized.

In order to learn the important lessons from our own history, I introduced H. Res. 122, the Day of Remembrance resolution, here in this body. I cannot emphasize enough that the lessons of those dark days are more important than ever. Remembering Executive Order 9066, signed on February 19, 1942, rescinded on February 19, 1976, and the reconciliation brought by the redress legislation signed on August 10, 1988, are still instructive to us today.

There is a maturity in this country that I am very proud of. This maturity

says that we can learn from our mistakes of the past and we can also teach to other of our lessons that we have learned. We have learned that the Executive Order 9066 was not signed out of military necessity. It was not signed out of national security. It was not signed out of personal safety and security of the Japanese Americans, but, as the Commission on Wartime Internment and Relocation of Civilians concluded, that it was a result of racial prejudice, war hysteria and the failure of political leadership.

The experiences from 1942, applied to our situation in this post-9/11, show us that the Constitution of this country is never tested in times of tranquility. Rather, our Constitution is always tested in times of trauma, tragedy, terrorism and tension, that the very principles of our Constitution continuously need to be taught until it is ingrained in our own character, so that every decision we make as a citizen, as adults, as children, as students, and as policymakers, that we will always be true to the principles of our Constitution.

The foundation of these ingrained principles is the light that draws people from around this world to overcome any obstacle to come to this country and be part of this society. The word is out around the world that this Nation will protect individual rights against even the most powerful in its government. The protection of our Constitution is what our forefathers and our veterans have shed their blood and sacrificed their limbs and lives for, in order that our Constitution may live and really be reflected in every action that we have, not only in this body but by every action of every citizen of this great country, so as to, or stated in the Preamble of the Constitution, in order to form a more perfect union.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I would like to thank Congressman HONDA. Mike and I came into this Congress together. We came in at a time of peace. We came in at a time in which remembering 59 years earlier the history of the Japanese internment was a little abstract and yet necessary. I think that it is no longer abstract, and I thank the gentleman from California, because Mr. HONDA made it very clear that we have a clear and present danger in the same way.

It is easy to blame the Muslim community. It is easy to look at Arab Americans and say can we trust them.

I might point out something that is not in the body of the resolution but I know that Mr. HONDA and I have talked about in the past. During the time in which we were incarcerating women and children and old men of Japanese ancestry, the young Japanese Americans were in Europe fighting and dying in record numbers, defending our country in the most decorated way of any unit of World War II. That is a separate remembrance but it cannot be separated from the fact that today Arabs and Muslims are fighting in the war on

terror in Afghanistan, in Iraq and around the world.

□ 1530

They are in fact doing exactly the same thing. And I link the two because I believe that you don't respect history the way we are trying to today, if you don't link it to the present and the future, and you don't say we will learn from this terrible mistake. We can't undo what was done to the Japanese, Italian, and German Americans, but we can dedicate ourselves to ensure that this shall not happen again in this great Union.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Before yielding to our next speaker, I just want to associate myself with the comments of Mr. HONDA and Mr. ISSA. For one who remembers some of the key figures in this terrible tragedy, President Roosevelt; Justice William Douglas, who is an icon and a symbol of respect for civil liberties generally, you learn what war hysteria and a tendency to extrapolate the notion of an enemy into sweeping generalizations which are not justified by the evidence is something that we should be careful of.

At this point, I am very pleased to yield to my dear friend, whose late husband I worked with very much on the 1988 legislation who was one of the great spark plugs in passing that legislation and now his widow and our colleague, Congresswoman DORIS MATSUI, for 3 minutes.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from California (Mr. BERMAN) for yielding me time; and I would like to thank my good friend from California (Mr. HONDA) for his leadership on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today is a reminder that from great injustice can come great awakening.

We take up this resolution to mark the 65th anniversary of Executive Order 9066. The resolution is a reminder that each of us has a responsibility to ensure that something like Executive Order 9066 never happens again.

In a time of war, thousands of innocent American citizens were rounded up, forcibly removed from their homes, and shipped to internment camps. Sadly, this was an avoidable consequence of racial prejudice and wartime hysteria. The government at all levels was blinded by war. It is imperative that we learn the lesson this moment in history has taught us. That is why I applauded the creation of a grant program to preserve the internment camps and related historical sites where Japanese Americans were detained during World War II. We must preserve these camps as a physical, tangible representation of our government's failure to protect the constitutional right of every American, and also as a symbol of our Nation's ability to acknowledge our mistakes. Further, these designations will ensure that fu-

ture generations will be able to visit the internment camps to gain a better understanding of the previous generation's experience.

Mr. Speaker, we may have won World War II; however, we were not victorious because of our treatment of Japanese, Italian, and German Americans, but in spite of it.

Now, 65 years later, we are once again engaged in armed conflict overseas, and once again the undertones of suspicion and mistrust toward particular groups of people lurk beneath the surface of our society, which is why it is more important than ever to recall our past, so we do not repeat our mistakes.

I hope every American will take this day to reaffirm their commitment to our Constitution and the rights and protections it guarantees to all of us. The resolution before us today recognizes the past injustices and points the way toward a future where such wrongs are no longer perpetuated in this country. Each Member of this Congress as a servant of the people is duty bound to apply these lessons of the past to the challenges we now face. In doing so, we show our continued efforts toward ensuring that our country avoids similarly misguided policies now and in the future.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman from California, a friend and one of the champions on these issues, Mr. BERMAN, for his time. And I also thank Mr. ISSA, a gentleman from California and a friend, for his support and leadership on these issues as well.

Mr. Speaker, I think we rise here because this is what America is about. We often make mistakes, but one of the beauties of this country and the reason so many people wish to come here is because we have a way of healing and making amends, and there is such power in redemption. And for that reason I hope all of my colleagues will support House Resolution 122, authored by a champion of this cause, Congressman Mike Honda from California, because he has been at this for quite some time.

We talk about the healing that has to take place. I want to make sure I mention the strength and loyalty and commitment of the Japanese Americans, the Italian Americans, and the German Americans who never lost hope and faith in our country's values, what our Founding Fathers really meant this country to mean to the rest of the world. They are lights for the rest of us, because even in the darkest times they held out hope. And today, so many years later, 65 years later we are here to say it is a day that we will remember not because it was great but because we know how to do great things from things we did wrong.

So I stand here proudly to say to Mr. HONDA, thank you so much for your

leadership in this cause. Let us continue forward. Let us not forget those who have not yet seen justice. There are about 2,300 Japanese Latin Americans who were in essence kidnapped by our U.S. Government in the 1940s, brought to this country, held here, and in many cases used as exchange for American prisoners who were caught by the Japanese during World War II. They never received any justice. And I hope that we will continue to turn the page toward more full justice for all of us here in this country.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, to live up to the principles on which this great nation was founded, we must stand for freedom for all Americans, in wartime and in times of peace.

On February 19, 1942, Executive Order 9066 was signed, ushering in one of the darkest periods in our nation's history. During World War II, more than 120,000 Americans of Japanese descent were removed from their homes and placed in internment camps. Under baseless fears of Japanese Americans disloyalty, families were ripped apart and entire communities uprooted.

History has shown that this action, as well as restrictions on Americans of German and Italian ancestry, was not only wrong, but also indefensible. The National Day of Remembrance is an opportunity to learn from the lessons of our past as we work for a better future. I join Representatives HONDA, BECERRA, WU, SCOTT, ABERCROMBIE, MATSUI, BORDALLO, HIRONO, and many of our colleagues for a National Day of Remembrance on February 19.

In these difficult times of war, as we face the threat of terrorism, the lessons of that dark chapter are especially relevant today. As we protect and defend the American people, we must protect and defend the Constitution and the civil liberties that define our democracy.

I join my colleagues, especially the Members of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, who fight for justice and equality every day, to ensure that history is never repeated again.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 122, which lends support to the goals of the Japanese American, German American, and Italian American communities in recognizing a National Day of Remembrance to increase public awareness of the restriction, exclusion, and internment that these communities suffered during World War II.

In 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, requiring 120,000 people of Japanese ancestry to be removed forcibly from their homes and placed in internment camps—two-thirds of these were American citizens, none of which had ever shown disloyalty to the American cause. Forced to live under harsh conditions, the last internment camp closed four long years later.

A little known fact of this shameful history is that Americans of German, Italian, Hungarian, Bulgarian, and Romanian descent were interned as well. Further, those that escaped internment often suffered from discrimination and prejudice at the hands of legislators and their fellow citizens.

These innocent Americans were treated unjustly by their own government during a time of war, simply because of their national origins. Such maltreatment must not go unremembered. It is absolutely essential to re-

member the past mistakes of our government in an effort to avoid future ones.

In times of war it may be easy to get carried away and put labels on those around us, assuming what their political ideals are based solely on their national origin or religious background. But as we have seen in World War II, such assumptions are unjust and can lead to disastrous consequences for a group of individuals.

By celebrating a National Day of Remembrance on February 19th, we renew our promise as a Nation to never let this happen again. We must ensure that all Americans are aware of these historical events, so that they may join us in an effort to prevent the repetition of such acts of prejudice. I commend my colleague from California, Mr. HONDA, for introducing H. Res. 122 to support these goals.

I also commend the efforts of other Americans who recognize the significance of these events and create awareness within our communities, especially among our youth. The Public Broadcasting Service has made efforts to do just that, by providing a classroom resource online to teach middle and high school students about these events and to help them think critically about their impact. During the week of February 19, 2007, this year's National Day of Remembrance, I encourage our Nation's educators to teach their youth about these events in our Nation's history.

In honor of the Japanese American, German American, and Italian American communities within our Nation, let us never allow such unjust practices occur in this great Nation again. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 122.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, February 9th marks the 65th anniversary of the signing of Executive Order 9066 by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, which authorized the forcible removal of 120,000 Japanese Americans—two-thirds of whom were United States citizens and the remainder of whom were permanent residents—living in the western United States to internment camps throughout the country. Today I rise in strong support of House Resolution 122, which recognizes February 19th as the National Day of Remembrance of these acts of injustice committed against Japanese Americans and of the curtailing of the rights of Italian and German Americans in the United States. I urge my colleagues' support for this resolution.

Nearly 3 months after the Imperial Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor precipitated the United States' entrance into World War II, this executive order led to the incarceration and relocation of loyal Americans of Japanese descent. I stand here today to acknowledge the pain and suffering that they, along with many Italian Americans and German Americans, endured.

The first of over 100,000 Japanese Americans stripped of their rights as Americans by the authorities of Executive Order 9066 were those that resided on Bainbridge Island in the State of Washington. They were given only 6 days to sell their belongings, close their businesses, and pack-up their lives before they were resettled in internment camps elsewhere in the United States. And on the morning of March 30, 1942, these Americans were congregated at Eagle Dale Ferry Dock under armed guard before being transported to an internment camp. Friends and neighbors converged as a symbolic gesture of unity and support for these Japanese Americans who

were involuntarily removed from their community. They left behind all of their belongings and possessions that they could not carry or wear. Relegated to internment camps and living in barracks that were hastily built and unprotected from the elements, they tried to create stability for the families in a time of turmoil. Their children attended school and participated in extracurricular activities, all while being surrounded by barbed wire and under the watchful eyes of armed guards. Japanese Americans remained interned in these sites for the duration of the war.

Italian Americans and German Americans also were branded as enemy aliens and forced to acquiesce to provisions that included required identification cards, travel restrictions, seizure of personal property, and imprisonment during this time. Their wrongful treatment also deserves our attention and consideration to ensure that similar actions are never again repeated, experienced or relived.

This National Day of Remembrance is an opportunity for us to educate ourselves and others and to increase public awareness surrounding these harmful wartime decisions made by the United States Government. We take this time to recognize the Japanese American, Italian American, and German American communities that continue to plan events surrounding this anniversary, further ensuring that future generations never forget the mistakes of our past. These communities continue the legacy of honoring their elders, whose patriotism and courage during World War II are a testament to the enduring loyalty of ethnic minority Americans throughout this country.

We also acknowledge through passage of House Resolution 122 the occurrence of an egregious infringement of American citizenship rights. Passage of this resolution would provide an official record of our hope and determination that an act similar to this one is never repeated in the future. The National Day of Remembrance marks the beginning of the forced exodus of an entire ethnic minority from the western United States and today we hope to transform it into a means of educating future generations of the importance of civil liberties, especially in times of war.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California and our Chairman of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, Mr. HONDA, for his leadership in commemorating the National Day of Remembrance on the occasion of the 65th anniversary of the signing of Executive Order 9066 and for sponsoring this resolution.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, 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. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 122.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BERMAN. 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.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mrs. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

RECOGNIZING THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PINEDALE ASSEMBLY CENTER

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 109) recognizing the historical significance of the Pinedale Assembly Center, the reporting site for 4,823 Japanese Americans who were unjustly interned during World War II.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 109

Whereas on February 19, 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, which authorized the forced internment of both United States citizens and legal resident aliens of Japanese ancestry during World War II;

Whereas in the largest single relocation of individuals in the United States in U.S. history, approximately 120,000 of these Japanese Americans were forced into internment camps by the United States Government in violation of their fundamental Constitutional rights;

Whereas due to this unjust internment, these Japanese Americans faced tremendous hardships, such as the loss of their homes, businesses, jobs, and dignity;

Whereas following Executive Order 9066, Japanese Americans in parts of Washington, Oregon, California, and southern Arizona were ordered to report to assembly centers before being removed to more permanent war relocation centers;

Whereas the Pinedale Assembly Center, located in Fresno, California, was the reporting site for 4,823 Japanese Americans;

Whereas February 19th, the anniversary of Executive Order 9066, is known as the Day of Remembrance;

Whereas the Pinedale Assembly Center Memorial Project Committee is charged with the task of establishing a memorial to recognize the historic tragedy that took place at the Pinedale Assembly Center; and

Whereas the ground-breaking ceremony for the memorial at the Pinedale Assembly Center will take place on February 19, 2007, the 65th anniversary of Executive Order 9066: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes the historical significance of the Pinedale Assembly Center to the Nation and the importance of an appropriate memorial at that site to serve as a place for remembering the hardships endured by Japanese Americans, so that the United States will be reminded of the need to remain vigilant in protecting our Nation's core values of equality, due process of law, and fundamental fairness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 109. We have been discussing in the previous resolution Executive Order 9066. When President Roosevelt signed that order, approximately 120,000 Japanese Americans were forced into internment camps, leading to the loss of their livelihoods, homes, and jobs. This action was the largest relocation of Americans in our history. Before being deported to permanent camps in desolate areas and behind barbed wires, thousands of Japanese Americans were temporarily held at assembly centers. Close to 5,000 Japanese Americans reported to the Pinedale Assembly Center in Fresno, California.

The Pinedale Assembly Center Memorial Project Committee will establish a memorial at that site, marking the tragedy that occurred there. The groundbreaking ceremony for the memorial will take place in just a few days, on February 19, 2007, 65 years after the signing of Executive Order 9066 and a day that the Japanese American community most appropriately recognizes as a national day of remembrance.

H. Res. 109 recognizes the historical significance of the site. The site is a symbol of the injustices suffered by Japanese Americans during World War II and a reminder of how fragile our civil liberties are in the face of fear, prejudice, and paranoia. I particularly want to commend my colleague, Representative COSTA of California, for introducing this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 109, recognizing the historical significance of the Pinedale Assembly Center, the reporting site for over 4,823 Americans of Japanese ancestry who were unjustly interned during World War II.

The Pinedale Assembly Center is located 8 miles north of downtown Fresno, California, on vacant land. It is a stark place, as was the policy that was supported by Executive Order 9066 signed by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt to authorize the tragic internment of Japanese Americans at the beginning of World War II.

The assembly center was encircled by a high chain-link fence, topped with three rows of barbed wire, and it caged American citizens whose only crime was their ancestry. Soldiers gave orders to citizens who should have been free; livelihoods were put on hold; uncertainty and fear punctuated each day. Thousands of law-abiding citizens who loved America and contributed to its strength had been trapped in endless rows of drab cell blocks.

The center serves as a symbol of America's stumbling. But our country has regained its footing. It has appro-

priately apologized for the tragic mistake of President Roosevelt's Executive Order 9066, and it is reaffirming its commitment, through this resolution before us today, to never forget its mistakes lest they be repeated.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. BERMAN for his leadership.

I rise today in support of H. Res. 109, which recognizes the historical significance of the Pinedale Assembly Center, and I want to thank House leadership for bringing two resolutions on the floor today recognizing the important historical aspects of the Japanese American internment. I also want to thank Congressman COSTA for his leadership in introducing this very important resolution.

Executive Order 9066 authorized the exclusion and internment of all Japanese Americans living on the west coast during World War II. As we recognize the Pinedale Assembly Center, I want us to place the internment period into a broader historical context rather than just focus on the plight of the Japanese Americans during World War II.

□ 1545

Our Nation has always battled the dueling sentiments of openness and freedom on the one hand and apprehension and fear of perceived outsiders on the other. Due to apprehension and fear when our economy took a downturn in the 1880s, the Asian community became the target of politicians looking for someone to blame.

In 1882 the Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act to keep out people of all Chinese origin. During World War II, Japanese Americans were the well-known target of the government's submission to apprehension and fear.

During this time, 10,000 Italian Americans were forced to relocate; 3,278 were incarcerated, while nearly 11,000 German Americans were incarcerated. German and Italian Americans were restricted during World War II by measures that branded them enemy aliens and required identification cards, travel restrictions, seizure of personal property as well.

Our Federal Government has made amends for the fundamental violations of the basic rights of those of Japanese ancestry that took place pursuant to Executive Order 9066, but we must continue to learn from these events. In the post-9/11 world, we need to protect our Nation and our civil liberties more than ever.

As political leaders we must not fail to uphold constitutional principles.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would like to associate myself with the comments of Mr. HONDA. I think it is very clear that you can't remember 65 years ago with the resolution and

not have a permanent, physical site for people to go to every day and realize what internment meant. So I join with my colleagues in supporting this resolution, urge its passage and recognize that this pairing of resolutions means a great deal, because it is only with something that the public can visit 365 days a year that we will, in fact, prevent this from happening again.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize our new colleague, the gentlelady from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) for 5 minutes.

Ms. HIRONO. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of House Resolution 109. Today we will be taking action on two related measures, House Resolution 122, earlier debated, and this resolution.

One of the lowest points in American history occurred 65 years ago when the Constitution and civil rights of 120,000 persons of Japanese ancestry were trampled upon by their own government. Under the cloud of war, hysteria, false rumors and racial bigotry fueled official misconduct that led to the uprooting of innocent aliens and citizens alike in one of the worst wholesale infringements of constitutional rights in the 20th century.

As a consequence, thousands of persons of Japanese ancestry were forced by their own government to dispose of their property, businesses, farms and possessions for pennies on the dollar, if anything at all. Families were split up and sent to different relocation camps. Educations were disrupted, and careers abruptly terminated on only a few days' notice. Wholesale violations of basic constitutional rights were committed in the name of national security. Yet not a single act of sedition or espionage by any of the evacuees was ever proven in any court of law.

To the contrary, the historic exploits of AJA in the 100th Battalion and 442nd Regimental Combat Team in Europe and the MIS in the Pacific and Asia proved that patriotism was not skin deep. The psychological and emotional pain of this experience was so deep that many evacuees never talked about their experiences for decades.

Many who were directly affected by the order live and work among us still. A member of my own congressional staff, my deputy chief of staff, Susan Kodani, was born in the Manzanar Relocation Camp. Her family was then relocated to Michigan, ironically to permit her college-educated father to assist in the war effort.

Many more, of course, suffered personal losses and tragedies more traumatic and devastating. By recognizing the historic significance of the Pinedale Assembly Center and by observing the Day of Remembrance as called for in earlier House Resolution 122, we say to the Nation and our fellow citizens that America can never forget this horrible tragedy. While it directly

affected one segment of our population, the ramifications to all Americans are profound and no less relevant today as we wage war in Iraq.

The constitutional rights of all Americans are in jeopardy if any group of citizens can be persecuted without legal justification. We must all stand vigilant and alert for any attempt by any group, whether a small power clique or the majority of Americans, to overstep the bounds of the law for momentary expediency or even for claims of national security during war. The protection of our constitutional rights of all of our citizens require continued vigilance from all of us.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 109, to recognize the historical significance of the Pinedale Assembly Center in Fresno, California, the reporting site for 4,823 Japanese Americans who were unjustly interned during World War II.

It is fitting that a memorial will be established at this historical location, especially on this year's National Day of Remembrance. On that same day in 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, requiring 120,000 people of Japanese ancestry to be removed forcibly from their homes and placed in internment camps—two-thirds of these were American citizens, none of which had ever shown disloyalty to the American cause. Forced to live under harsh conditions, the last internment camp closed four long years later.

These innocent Americans were treated unjustly by their own government during a time of war, simply because of their national origins, and such an injustice must not go unremembered. It is absolutely essential to remember the past mistakes of our government in an effort to avoid future ones.

In times of war it may be easy to get carried away and put labels on those around us, imputing disloyalty to persons of different national origins or religious backgrounds. But as we saw in World War II, such assumptions are frequently wrong, unjust, and can lead to disastrous consequences for a group of individuals.

I thank my colleague, Representative COSTA, for introducing this important legislation. We must never let such unjust practices occur in this great Nation again. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 109.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, 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. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 109.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LINO PEREZ, JR. POST OFFICE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 437) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service lo-

cated at 500 West Eisenhower Street in Rio Grande City, Texas, as the "Lino Perez, Jr. Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 437

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

SECTION 1. LINO PEREZ, JR. POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 West Eisenhower Street in Rio Grande City, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "Lino Perez, Jr. Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Lino Perez, Jr. Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 437, legislation naming a postal facility in Rio Grande City, Texas, after the former postmaster of Rio Grande City, Lino Perez, Jr.

Lino Perez, Jr., was the 18-year-old son of the mayor of the City of Rio Grande, Texas, where he witnessed how a breakdown in a government service could disrupt the lives of nearly all of its beneficiaries.

The City of Rio Grande, with a population of over 2,000, was disincorporated in 1933 at the height of the Great Depression over local businesses' refusal to pay taxes, causing young Perez's high school to lose its accredited status.

Thereafter, unable to complete in school in town, Mr. Perez persevered with his education, attending classes 100 miles away in Brownsville and eventually receiving his diploma from a school in Austin. Mr. Perez's father, Lino Perez, Sr., had served for 4 years as the Democratic mayor of the now disbanded town of Rio Grande. Some might have feared that a town which had financially defaulted and disbanded its government would suffer the fate of so many ghost towns in the western States, slowly fading from the map.

However, Mr. Perez, Sr., continued to look after his community, volunteering for the office of postmaster to his unincorporated neighbors. Mr. Perez, Sr., put his son, Lino Perez, Jr., to work delivering letters that same year.

Mr. Speaker, Lino Perez, Jr., succeeded his father as postmaster of Rio

Grande on New Year's Eve, 1957. During his first term, Mr. Perez improved service to the growing downtown district and the surrounding rural areas of Starr County. Mr. Perez strove to further serve the city by winning approval for a new post office building.

The Perez family, senior, and then junior, ran that post office in Rio Grande from 1934 to 1975. Together, they watched the town heal from economic stagnancy and grow in population throughout the century.

When Lino Perez, Jr., retired from the postal service, he continued his public service as State warden, State secretary and finally State treasurer of Texas. Lino Perez, Jr., learned from his father and, in turn, showed his town the strength of a community to weather difficulty as one, and the power of letter carriers to knit the lives of their fellow citizens together, to make all of the neighbors' stories into one story.

Many local officials support naming this post office after Lino Perez, Jr., including the city mayor, the county judge, and the area's State Representative.

Mr. Speaker, together with my colleagues, we urge the swift passage of this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is not uncommon in this body to name post offices after former Members of Congress, national figures, Presidents and the like. But it is incredibly appropriate today to name a post office after two generations of hard work on behalf of that very post office.

As a member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, I have managed many bills for post offices, and in my 6 years I have not seen a more befitting naming of a post office. Because, in fact, it is this group of tireless workers for the Federal Government, often the butt of jokes, the postmasters and the postmen and postwomen, that make sure that our bills, our letters, our correspondence, and, yes, our junk mail, are delivered to us.

I think this is among the most appropriate pieces of legislation that I have had the opportunity to help manage. I urge the passage of this. I urge the people of this Congress to take note that we are, in fact, naming a post office after a postman this one time.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield for as much time as he may consume to my esteemed colleague from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his kind words, and the gentleman also from California for the kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 437, a bill to name the postal facility of Rio Grande City, Texas, after Lino Perez, Jr.

Mr. Lino Perez, Jr., is a role model and a leader in south Texas, who helped ingrain a rich tradition of public service in his community. Mr. Perez was born in Rio Grande City, Texas, in 1914. He attended high school in south Texas, as well as in Austin, and then returned home to Rio Grande City shortly after graduation to begin his post office career.

He first started with the United States Post Office in 1934 under the guidance of his father, who was then the postmaster of Rio Grande City. Lino Perez, Jr., worked through the ranks of the Rio Grande City Post Office; and after two decades, 20 years, he was named postmaster for Rio Grande City.

Under his leadership, the Rio Grande Post Office was upgraded to a second-class post office. Mr. Perez also established the city's first mail delivery, created several rural routes in Starr County, and helped lay that foundation for his community's further progress.

In addition, Mr. Perez served several terms on the Starr County Hospital Board of Directors, was actively involved in the Knights of Columbus, including being Texas State deputy, the highest Knights of Columbus position in Texas. After 41 years of loyal service, Lino Perez retired from the Rio Grande Post Office. Forty-one years of great service.

Mr. Perez still resides in the region, is warmly remembered by his family, friends and community as a community leader. Lino Perez, Jr.'s service to our country shall be remembered and celebrated through this small tribute, and I urge swift passage of this bill.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Massachusetts.

□ 1600

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, we are indeed very proud that this post office is being named after a postal employee, a very proud family.

On behalf of all the workers of the United States Postal Service, we want to urge swift passage of this bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 437.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. LYNCH. 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.

MIGUEL ANGEL GARCIA MENDEZ POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 414) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 60 Calle McKinley, West in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, as the "Miguel Angel Garcia Mendez Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 414

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

SECTION 1. MIGUEL ANGEL GARCÍA MÉNDEZ POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 60 Calle McKinley, West in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, shall be known and designated as the "Miguel Angel Garcia Méndez Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Miguel Angel Garcia Méndez Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in this House in the consideration of H.R. 414, legislation naming a postal facility in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico after the local politician, Miguel Angel Garcia Mendez.

Mr. Garcia Mendez proudly served the territory of Puerto Rico as the youngest Speaker of Puerto Rico's House of Representatives, serving between 1932 and 1940. He later was elected senator and founded the newspaper, *El Imparcial*.

Born in the town of Aguadilla on November 17, 1902, Mr. Garcia Mendez became an attorney and successful businessman. During his political career, he helped start the Republican Statehood Party, which was the predecessor of today's New Progressive Party, in 1948.

Up until his death, he advocated for Puerto Rico statehood in the hope that they would gain the right as American citizens to vote for President and to have a counted vote in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. Garcia Mendez passed away in November of 1998, and his dedication to service for all Puerto Ricans should be remembered and celebrated with this small tribute.

Mr. Speaker, together with my colleagues in the House, I urge the swift passage of this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 414. It is an appropriate naming of a post office on behalf of a gentleman who for 96 years was a champion of statehood for Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico is not just a territory, Puerto Rico is in fact the largest of all the territories, having a population that would give it at least four Members of Congress if it were to become a State.

Although he never succeeded in bringing statehood to Puerto Rico, he kept the hope alive and the belief alive by the Puerto Rican people that in fact they were Americans, and that as Americans one of their options would be statehood.

As a prominent businessman, he founded the Western Bank and was the owner of a very prominent newspaper in Puerto Rico.

He was born on November 17, 1902, and throughout his career he championed many activities beyond statehood. He was one of the founders of the New Progressive Party. He served in the Puerto Rico House of Representatives from 1932 to 1940, where he became the youngest Speaker and later was elected to the Senate.

We remember Mr. Mendez here today, and name this post office on behalf of him at the request of our Delegate from Puerto Rico, LUIS FORTUÑO, who unfortunately could not be here today, but who in fact found this to be the most appropriate person to name the post office after because of his long years of service to the territory of Puerto Rico and to the aspirations of the Puerto Rican people.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 414.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUSH HUDSON LIMBAUGH, SR., UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 342) to designate the United States courthouse located at 555 Independence Street, Cape Girardeau, Missouri, as the "Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr., United States Courthouse," as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 342

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

SECTION 1. RUSH HUDSON LIMBAUGH, SR. UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The United States courthouse located at 555 Independence Street in Cape Girardeau, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the "Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr. United States Courthouse".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr. United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 342.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 342, to designate the U.S. courthouse at 555 Independence Street, Cape Girardeau, Missouri, as the Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr., U.S. Courthouse.

Judge Limbaugh was a leading figure in the legal profession, not only in Missouri, not just in the United States, but worldwide. He practiced law for over eight decades. At the age of 104, at the time of his death, he was still practicing law and was in fact the oldest practicing attorney in the United States.

He argued over 60 cases before the Missouri Supreme Court, tried cases before the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Labor Board and the Internal Revenue Appellate Division. He was city attorney for Cape Girardeau from 1917 to 1919. In 1923, he started a law firm that bears his name to this day.

From 1942 through 1946, he was Missouri counsel for the War Emergency Pipelines, which transported gasoline from Texas and Louisiana to the east coast as part of our war effort.

He was president of the Missouri Bar from 1955 through 1956, and served on a committee that drafted the Missouri Probate Court. In the early days of the independence of India, the State Department sent Judge Limbaugh to that country to be an Ambassador for the U.S. legal system.

He was active in civic aspects of life; elected to the Missouri State legislature in 1932 and 1933, where he advocated for the formation of the Missouri State Highway Patrol. He was presi-

dent of the State Historical Society for Missouri from 1956-1959. He was a Sunday school teacher; active in the Boy Scouts of America, his Centenary United Methodist Church, and the Salvation Army. He died at his home on April 8, 1996.

Judge Limbaugh will be remembered as a brilliant attorney and a great American. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. OBERSTAR, for moving this legislation so expeditiously to the floor. H.R. 342 was introduced by our colleague, Representative JO ANN EMERSON of Missouri, and it designates the United States courthouse located in Cape Girardeau, Missouri as the Rush H. Limbaugh, Sr., United States Courthouse.

I also want to commend Mrs. EMERSON's commitment to this legislation. She recognized Rush Limbaugh, Sr.'s tremendous record of public service and has provided a fitting tribute for one of the most remarkable figures in Missouri history.

This bill honors Rush Limbaugh, Sr., a remarkable lawyer whose awards and accomplishments over a legal career that spanned eight decades are too numerous to count.

Mr. Limbaugh was born in 1891. He attended school at a one-room schoolhouse and excelled academically from the start. He attended the University of Missouri at Columbia and the University of Missouri School of Law, paying his way through school by doing carpentry work, working on a farm, waiting tables and firing furnaces.

After passing the bar in 1916, he was admitted into the practice of law in Missouri and immediately opened a law office in Cape Girardeau.

Limbaugh was known for being extremely hardworking and ethical; he was also known for his fiery advocacy and ability to craft creative solutions.

President Reagan once remarked that Limbaugh, Sr.'s contributions read like a virtual who's who of accomplishment. His resume accurately depicts the image of an extraordinary man, superb lawyer and model citizen.

During his career, he tried more than 60 cases before the Supreme Court of Missouri and acted as city attorney and general counsel of Cape Girardeau. He was also a member of the advisory committee for the drafting of the Probate Code of Missouri, president of the Missouri Bar, and president of the State Historical Society. In his free time, he also taught Sunday school and served as a Boy Scout leader.

Limbaugh, Sr. rose to national prominence when he served as a representative of the United States on a 6-week lecture tour to the newly independent India on constitutional government and the United States judicial system.

Limbaugh, Sr. called Cape Girardeau home. It is only fitting that we name the new United States courthouse in his honor and recognize his accomplishments and dedication to his community.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

I would indicate to my good friend, the chairman of the full committee, that I have no additional speakers. If he is prepared to yield back, I would yield back my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for his comments; he added several items of which I was not aware about Judge Limbaugh's distinguished career.

I, too, do join in expressing our appreciation in the committee to Representative JO ANN EMERSON for her steadfast advocacy for this naming of the courthouse, and also to Representative RUSS CARNAHAN and Representative LACY CLAY, who also expressed their strong support for the legislation.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, later this year, Cape Girardeau, Missouri, will open a new United States Federal Courthouse. Over the past many months, I have watched this structure rise, due to the diligent efforts of hundreds of skilled men and women working tirelessly to give justice a new home in our region. I am certainly thankful for their beautiful accomplishment, in the form of our new Courthouse.

At the same time, we should reflect on the people who dedicated their lives to the construction of a strong, vibrant and enduring rule of law in our region and our Nation.

Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr. perfectly embodies our respect for the law and love for our communities. His practice of law for more than 80 years, from 1916 to 1996, is the stuff of legends. At the age of his death, the 104-year-old resident of Cape Girardeau was still going in to his office twice a week. He was the Nation's oldest practicing attorney.

The litany of legal accomplishments of Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr. cloud our memory of the man. He helped construct the Missouri Probate Code and begin the Missouri Highway Patrol. He was sent to India to help shape the new legal code in that fledgling democracy. He advocated for the reach of the federal judiciary to extend outside American urban centers and into the rural parts of our great Nation.

Yet he was more than an attorney—Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr. was also devoted to his family, his faith, and his community. He taught Sunday School. He worked to help Cape Girardeau expand its commerce of goods as well as ideas. He devoted countless hours of his time to the Boy Scouts of America. We remember him as a good citizen as well as a good lawyer.

It is safe to say that, of the many hours of Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr.'s life, none of them were wasted. As we devote one hour of the United States House of Representatives to remember him, we are ensuring that Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr.'s legacy and example endure in the community he loved, on a building that carries on the work to which he was dedicated: the American promises of liberty and law, fundamental principles of fairness,

and a system of jurisprudence for all Americans that is the envy of the world.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 342, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "To designate the United States courthouse located at 555 Independence Street in Cape Girardeau, Missouri, as the 'Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr. United States Courthouse'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

—————

DIRECTING ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES TO INSTALL A PHOTOVOLTAIC SYSTEM FOR THE HEADQUARTERS BUILDING OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 798) to direct the Administrator of General Services to install a photovoltaic system for the headquarters building of the Department of Energy.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 798

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

SECTION 1. INSTALLATION OF PHOTOVOLTAIC SYSTEM AT DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY HEADQUARTERS BUILDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of General Services shall install a photovoltaic system, as set forth in the Sun Wall Design Project, for the headquarters building of the Department of Energy located at 1000 Independence Avenue, Southwest, Washington, D.C., commonly known as the Forrestal Building.

(b) FUNDING.—There shall be available from the Federal Buildings Fund established by section 592 of title 40, United States Code, \$30,000,000 to carry out this section. Such sums shall be derived from the unobligated balance of amounts made available from the Fund for fiscal year 2007, and prior fiscal years, for repairs and alterations and other activities (excluding amounts made available for the energy program). Such sums shall remain available until expended.

(c) OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available pursuant to subsection (b) may be obligated prior to September 30, 2007.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 798.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1615

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

Over 30 years ago, Mr. Speaker, as a second-term Member of the House and serving on the Public Works Committee, as it was called then, and the Subcommittee of Public Buildings and Grounds, I heard an extraordinary presentation about the use of photovoltaics in public buildings and how, as a result of this study, energy could be saved, burning of fossil fuels could be avoided, and the Federal Government could save enormous amounts of energy costs by using a then-new technology known as photovoltaics.

I was so enthralled by the idea, I drafted legislation which I shared with my then-colleague in the Senate from the State of Minnesota, Senator Hubert Humphrey, who introduced the companion bill in the other body; and together we got the legislation enacted, signed by President Carter, funding for the first 3 years of a 3-year investment by the Federal Government in converting Federal civilian office space to photovoltaic energy. Unfortunately, President Carter lost the election. President Reagan came in and decided that the alternative energy program was an unnecessary investment of the Federal Government, and the entire alternative energy budget was deleted.

Years passed. Interest in photovoltaic cells continued. Research and development and testing and application in the private marketplace, as well as by government agencies, continued and the cost of photovoltaics dropped from \$1.75 a kilowatt hour in 1977 to about 25 cents a kilowatt hour today, compared to 7 cents produced by conventional fossil fuel power centers.

Well, I thought the time was ripe again for us to make another effort at having the Federal Government lead the way and being the template, being the exemplar in the marketplace for alternative energy use and deployment and reducing its cost.

So the bill that is before us today, it was reported, we had a hearing and markup in the subcommittee and markup in the full committee to use the Department of Energy headquarters as the exemplary facility for the Nation in use of photovoltaics. The Department of Energy building, just down the street from the Capitol, on Independence Avenue and what is also known as the Forrestal Building.

In 1999, our then-Secretary of Energy, Bill Richardson, conducted a national competition to get the best architectural firms to develop a conceptual design for a photovoltaic system

to be installed on the south wall of the Department of Energy. Solarnet, the winning design, will transform that south wall, which was deliberately built in a solid face with no windows and no doors. It will transform that rather ugly, nondescript wall into this very attractive piece that is depicted in the panels before us in the well of the House. But that solar wall will generate 460,000 kilowatts of energy. It is 300 feet long, 130 feet high, will contain 24,750 square feet of power-generating panels.

The Federal Government is the largest single consumer of energy in the country. We are in a unique position to show the rest of the Nation how to conserve energy, how to be efficient in doing it, and to do so with our trust of management of Federal civilian office space.

The Department of Energy estimated in 2005 that the cost of energy consumption of all forms by Federal agencies was \$14.5 billion; \$5.5 billion of that was spent on buildings and facilities, meaning electricity.

GSA, General Services Administration, manages 387.7 million square feet of non-military, non-postal civilian office space. It ought to set the stage, it ought to set the standard for the Nation in being energy efficient and reducing the cost to the taxpayer of operating these Federal buildings.

We ought to, also, change our management of Federal office space both in the construction and in the leasing of those office facilities to life-cycle cost considerations, not just the lowest initial cost of construction; but we are going to be the tenant, we are going to be the owner of those facilities, tenant in the leased operations and owner in those that are outright owned by the Federal Government for as long as we are in there, and we ought to do the best that we can for the taxpayer, and we ought to set the stage and help create a marketplace for production of photovoltaics that will, in volume production, reduce their cost.

Photovoltaics are very simple devices. The sun strikes a panel that has lines of filament that create resistance, transmit that resistance across a grid and collectively produce direct current electricity that is then converted into alternating current electricity. It can run all the lights, the elevators, the escalators, everything, computers, everything that uses electricity in the Department of Energy building, and have excess power at the end of the day to turn back into the Potomac Electric Power Company grid so that the electric meter will run backwards at the Department of Energy at the end of the day. That is what we ought to be doing. We can do that.

It is within our authority of this committee to set the stage for advances in technology. Already some 25 buildings of the Federal Government nationwide use photovoltaics in one way or another. The Department of Ag-

riculture does, also just down the street, Independence Avenue. The Park Service, the Forest Service, NOAA, on their weather buoys, the space program all use photovoltaics to gather information, transmit. The Highway Departments, on traffic monitoring signs, use photovoltaics, gathering electricity during the day, storing it in batteries and run those signs at night off solar power.

We are only addressing one project today, but that could be multiples in the future. And we are here doing what we can within our ability. It is not going to solve all of the problems of global climate change, but we have an obligation to do our part and to do what we can within this committee.

Toward that end, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) for his participation through the subcommittee and then to the full committee.

I thank our full committee ranking member, Mr. MICA, for his support and initiative on this matter and moving us to this point where we could pass this bill in the House.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate, again, the chairman of our full committee, Mr. OBERSTAR, for not only being the author of this legislation, but for bringing it to the floor in such an expeditious manner.

H.R. 798, introduced by Chairman OBERSTAR, directs the administrator of GSA to install a photovoltaic system at the headquarters building for the Department of Energy and authorizes appropriations to carry out the project. I know, when the chairman speaks of his passion, of what he speaks; and I know he has been committed for over 30 years to adding a solar energy component to the DOE headquarters building.

The photovoltaic system authorized by this bill to be installed at the Department of Energy building was chosen through a competitive process. In 1999 the U.S. Department of Energy National Renewable Energy Laboratory, in cooperation with the American Institute of Architects and the Architectural Engineering Institute, sponsored a design competition to select the winning sun wall design for the south wall of the new headquarters for the Department of Energy. The winning design, called the Solarnet, was selected from 151 entries. The winning design, as the chairman has mentioned, is 300 feet long, 130 feet high and incorporates 24,750 square feet of power generating panels. The DOE building was designed and constructed to include a solar energy system on the south wall, which was never constructed. Currently, the south wall is just a big expanse of concrete. H.R. 798 will complete what was left unfinished.

This project was previously authorized in the 109th Congress. Similar lan-

guage directing the administrator of GSA to install a photovoltaic system for the headquarters building was incorporated into the energy policy act of 2005.

Mr. Speaker, one of the first things you learn as a new Member of the Congress, and I believe the current occupant of the chair is a new Member of Congress, is that some of our colleagues know a little bit about a lot. Some know a lot about a little.

When you join the Transportation Committee, what you know about our chairman is he knows a lot about a lot. And it is not a surprise, nor is it ever a surprise when I go to a markup or a hearing and hear Chairman OBERSTAR talk about the history of steel or the history of transportation, or the transcontinental railroad. One of my favorites is always his focusing on 1956 and the opening of the Wellend Canal and what that meant to those of us in the Great Lakes.

But what I didn't know until I had the pleasure of chairing this subcommittee two or three Congresses ago was that he was such an expert on photovoltaic electricity. And one of the most pleasant hearings that I can recall having in that subcommittee was a hearing on this subject matter and listening to the gentleman from Minnesota expound on his 30-year quest.

And what I came away with from that hearing, and again being the beneficiary of his great knowledge, was the fact that if we had made the investment that the gentleman is talking about in this bill today 30 years ago, we would be talking about comparable rates of electricity generation. We wouldn't be talking about 25 cents a kilowatt hour. Perhaps we would be down in the 3 to 7 cent range, and the opportunity that has been wasted by not, in fact, making that investment back when the gentleman first came forward with Senator Humphrey to make this a reality.

And so I hope that this becomes the first of many pieces of legislation that the gentleman offers. And I will tell him that I will be supportive, not only of his present endeavor, but his future endeavors as well.

Again, I congratulate the gentleman for his 30-year pursuit of this goal, and I urge all of our colleagues to be supportive.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I am very deeply touched by the gentleman's comments, Mr. Speaker. And I thank the gentleman for his thoughtfulness and for his very much appreciated comments about my service on the committee and my work over the many years.

I do recall the hearing that the gentleman chaired. He opened the hearing to the subject of photovoltaics. I remember that the gentleman did an enormous amount of homework, and he came to the hearing and surprised me

with a recitation of the evolution of photovoltaic cells and the different types of materials that go into the production of photovoltaic cells and their application in a wide diversity of uses.

The gentleman deserves enormous credit in his own right for his studious and thoughtful leadership on the committee and the several responsibilities that he has held, economic development and railroads and in the public buildings and grounds arena.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to our next speaker, I just yield myself such time as I might consume. And I would just tell the chairman of the committee that I learned 12 years ago that if I was going to be in the same room with the gentleman, I had to do my homework, and so it was something that I knew I had to do.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR for bringing this legislation through committee and to the floor in a very expeditious way.

I rise today in support of the commonsense piece of legislation which I hope will serve as an example of working hard and smart toward energy independence in America.

I have long been a proponent of this kind of affordable alternative lighting method, and energy production method, and have voted before for increases in using solar panels which produce no air pollution or a single ounce of hazardous waste.

As the leader in securing our energy independence and promoting safe and effective energy alternatives, I fully support the Department of Energy's retrofitting of solar panels to reduce energy consumption and, in fact, retrofitting in other areas, Federal buildings with more such that we can get more efficient energy technology in place. I am confident that through the Department of Energy's leadership in utilizing this lighting technology, the United States, as a whole, can make significant progress towards greater energy efficiency and independence.

All of us in this room have said our Nation needs to be more energy independent.

□ 1630

There is no magic wand which will make it so. It takes many steps to get to the end of the path we are traveling, and it will take many people to make this goal a reality.

Today we have the opportunity to take another step down that path. I urge my colleagues to give us the means to take this step by passing H.R. 798.

I also want to commend Chairman OBERSTAR. Many years ago there was a country western song by Barbara Mandrell that said she was country be-

fore country was cool, through her song, and I would say that you are very much a proponent of this legislation, a proponent of these things when it wasn't cool. And as Mr. LATOURETTE said, perhaps if we had done some of those things many years ago, as you were insisting then, we would be in much better shape from an energy standpoint in our Nation today.

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

Again I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his thoughtfulness. And I recall our very pleasant visit to his district on transportation and economic development issues many years ago when we saw so much of the progress that has been done through the Economic Development Administration, the need for highway investments, for which the gentleman has been a strong advocate. And I also remember a very special feeling, the presentation by the Fort Smith Chamber of Commerce of a unique award: a noose. I don't know what happened to it. I never did take possession of it to bring back with me, but someday I will make a return visit to Fort Smith. There is a long story we need not describe in this setting about Fort Smith and its role in the early days of territories and frontiers.

The sun wall design, as these posters describe it, will be a very attractive facility aesthetically but attractive energywise and more than a statement, a demonstration by the Federal Government, the leadership role that it can play and it should play in moving the Nation toward energy independence.

The Department of Energy conducted an analysis some time ago of the potential for photovoltaics and demonstrated that in a 100-mile by 100-mile square area of the Arizona desert, all the energy needs of the United States could be produced by photovoltaics. Well, we are making a start on that commitment with this legislation, moving in the right direction. It is long overdue, but we are making that step in the right direction.

I thank my colleagues on the committee, Chairman MICA for his willingness to move ahead with this legislation; and the gentleman from Ohio for his thoughtful and studious advocacy of the legislation; and Ms. NORTON, the Chair of our Public Buildings and Economic Development Subcommittee, for their participation in bringing the bill to this point.

If there are no further speakers, if the gentleman yields back, we will yield back our time.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, if I could just yield myself a moment to close before yielding back my time.

When the chairman was talking about Arkansas, I too had the pleasure of being in Arkansas, I think, before Mr. BOOZMAN was elected to the Congress, when one of the Hutchinsons was in that seat, and I had the pleasure of meeting John Paul Hammerschmidt, whom I know that the gentleman

knows and was fond of working with for so many years. Just to show how we all come from different places, I noticed that all the wildlife in Arkansas was nervous when we were down there, particularly the raccoons. And another one of our colleagues, MARION BERRY, was with us on that trip for the opening of a new airport, and he indicated that his largest fundraiser was a raccoon roast. And I had not experienced that until he I had gone down to the gentleman's district as well.

I urge passage of the bill, and I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I hope no raccoons will be caught in the energy wall because that is the sort of place that raccoons like to frequent.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their participation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 798.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPORTS TO CHINA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-14)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 1512 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105-261), I hereby certify that the export to the People's Republic of China of the following items is not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry, and that the material and equipment, including any indirect technical benefit that could be derived from such exports, will not measurably improve the missile or space launch capabilities of the People's Republic of China:

Twenty Honeywell model QA 750 accelerometers to be incorporated into railway geometry measurement systems for China's Ministry of Railways.

Equipment and technology associated with the production and testing of composite components for Boeing commercial aircraft.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 11, 2007.

ECONOMIC REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-2)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Joint Economic Committee and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Economic growth in the United States has been above the historic average and faster than any other major industrialized economy in the world. January was the 41st month of uninterrupted job growth produced by this economy, in an expansion that has thus far added more than 7.4 million new jobs. Unemployment is low, inflation is moderate, and real wages are rising. Our economy is on the move and we can keep it that way by continuing to pursue sound economic policy based on free-market principles.

Sound economic policy begins with low taxes. We should work together to spend the taxpayers' money wisely and to tackle unfunded liabilities inherent in entitlement programs such as Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. I have laid out a detailed plan in my budget to restrain spending, cut earmarks in half by the end of this session, and balance the budget by 2012 without raising taxes. The tax relief of the past few years has been a key ingredient in growing our economy, and it should be made permanent.

Our growing economy is dynamic. The rise of new technologies, new competition, and new markets abroad is changing how we do business. We need to take action in four key areas to keep America's economy flexible and dynamic.

First, we must break down barriers to trade so our workers can sell more goods and services to the 95 percent of the world's customers who live outside of our borders. Global trade talks like the Doha Round at the World Trade Organization have the potential to level the playing field so that we can compete on fair terms in foreign markets, while helping lift millions of people out of poverty around the world.

The only way we can complete the Doha Round and make headway on other trade agreements is to extend Trade Promotion Authority, which is set to expire on July 1st. This authority is essential to completing good trade agreements. The Congress must renew it if we are to improve our competitiveness in the global economy.

Second, we must work to make private health insurance more affordable and to give patients more choices and control over their health care. One of the most promising ways to do this is by reforming the tax code. We must end the unfair bias against individuals who buy insurance on their own. I propose creating a standard deduction for

every American who buys health insurance, whether they get it through their jobs or on their own. In a changing economy, we need a health care system that is flexible and consumer-oriented. With this reform, more than 100 million Americans who are now covered by employer-provided insurance will benefit from lower tax bills. Those who now purchase health insurance on their own would save money on their taxes. Millions of others who now have no health insurance at all would find basic private coverage within their reach. My proposal also taps the innovation of States in making basic, affordable insurance available to all by creating Affordable Choices grants to help ensure the poor and the sick have access to private health insurance.

Third, we must continue to diversify our energy supply to benefit our economy, national security, and environment. In my State of the Union Message, I set an ambitious goal of reducing gasoline usage in the United States by 20 percent over the next 10 years. Meeting this goal will require significant changes in supply and demand, but we should let the market decide the best mix of technologies and fuels to most efficiently attain it. On the supply side, I propose a higher and reformed fuel standard that would include renewable and other alternative fuels. We should also allow environmentally friendly exploration of oil and natural gas. On the demand side, I propose enhancing Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards for cars and extending the current rule for light trucks, so that we can reduce the amount of gasoline that our passenger vehicles consume, and do so in a more efficient way.

Fourth, a strong and vibrant education system is vital to maintaining our Nation's competitive edge in the world and extending economic opportunity to every citizen here at home. Five years ago, we rose above partisan differences to enact the No Child Left Behind Act, preserving local control, raising standards, holding schools accountable for results, and providing more choice. This year, we must reauthorize and strengthen this good law while preserving its core principles.

Strong productivity growth underlies much of the good economic news from the past few years and the policies discussed above. Productivity growth helps to increase our standards of living and improve our international competitiveness. To maintain this progress, we must pursue a variety of pro-growth policies, including those contained in the American Competitiveness Initiative and comprehensive immigration reform.

These and other issues are discussed in the 2007 Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers. The Council has prepared this Report to put into broader context the economic issues that underlie my Administration's policy decisions. I commend it to you.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 2007.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

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. 134, by the yeas and nays;
- H. Con. Res 44, by the yeas and nays.

Votes on motions to suspend the rules with respect to H. Res 122 and H.R. 437 will be taken on a later date.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

RECOGNIZING AND HONORING THE EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 134.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 134, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]

YEAS—412

Abercrombie	Berman	Brady (TX)
Ackerman	Berry	Braley (IA)
Aderholt	Biggert	Brown (SC)
Akin	Bilbray	Brown, Corrine
Alexander	Bilirakis	Brown-Waite,
Allen	Bishop (GA)	Ginny
Altmire	Bishop (NY)	Buchanan
Andrews	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Arcuri	Blackburn	Burton (IN)
Baca	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Bachmann	Blunt	Buyer
Bachus	Boehner	Calvert
Baird	Bonner	Camp (MI)
Baker	Bono	Campbell (CA)
Baldwin	Boozman	Cannon
Barrett (SC)	Boren	Cantor
Barrow	Boswell	Capito
Bartlett (MD)	Boucher	Capps
Barton (TX)	Boustany	Capuano
Bean	Boyd (FL)	Cardoza
Becerra	Boyd (KS)	Carnahan
Berkley	Brady (PA)	Carney

Carson	Hill	Miller (NC)	Souder	Towns	Weiner	Castor	Hodes	Mollohan
Carter	Hinojosa	Miller, Gary	Space	Turner	Welch (VT)	Chabot	Holden	Moore (KS)
Castle	Hirono	Miller, George	Spratt	Udall (CO)	Weldon (FL)	Chandler	Holt	Moore (WI)
Castor	Hobson	Mitchell	Stark	Udall (NM)	Weller	Clarke	Honda	Moran (KS)
Chabot	Hodes	Mollohan	Stearns	Upton	Westmoreland	Clay	Hookey	Moran (VA)
Chandler	Holden	Moore (KS)	Stupak	Van Hollen	Wexler	Cleaver	Hoyer	Murphy (CT)
Clarke	Holt	Moore (WI)	Sullivan	Velázquez	Whitfield	Clyburn	Hulshof	Murphy, Patrick
Clay	Honda	Moran (KS)	Sutton	Visclosky	Wicker	Coble	Hunter	Murphy, Tim
Cleaver	Hookey	Moran (VA)	Tancredo	Walberg	Wilson (NM)	Cohen	Inglis (SC)	Musgrave
Clyburn	Hoyer	Murphy (CT)	Tanner	Walden (OR)	Wilson (OH)	Cole (OK)	Inslee	Myrick
Coble	Hulshof	Murphy, Patrick	Tauscher	Walsh (NY)	Wilson (SC)	Conaway	Israel	Nadler
Cohen	Hunter	Murphy, Tim	Taylor	Walz (MN)	Wolf	Conyers	Issa	Napolitano
Cole (OK)	Inglis (SC)	Murtha	Terry	Wamp	Woolsey	Cooper	Jackson (IL)	Neugebauer
Conaway	Inslee	Musgrave	Thompson (CA)	Wasserman	Wu	Costa	Jackson-Lee	Nunes
Conyers	Israel	Myrick	Thompson (MS)	Schultz	Wynn	Costello	(TX)	Oberstar
Cooper	Issa	Nadler	Thornberry	Waters	Yarmuth	Courtney	Jefferson	Obey
Costa	Jackson (IL)	Napolitano	Tiahrt	Watson	Young (AK)	Crenshaw	Jindal	Olver
Costello	Jackson-Lee	Neugebauer	Tiberi	Watt	Young (FL)	Crowley	Johnson (GA)	Ortiz
Courtney	(TX)	Nunes	Tierney	Waxman		Cubin	Johnson, Sam	Pallone
Crenshaw	Jefferson	Oberstar				Cuellar	Jones (NC)	Pascarell
Crowley	Jindal	Obey				Culberson	Jones (OH)	Pastor
Cubin	Johnson (GA)	Olver	Cramer	Herger	Neal (MA)	Cummings	Jordan	Paul
Cuellar	Johnson, Sam	Ortiz	Davis, Jo Ann	Hinchee	Norwood	Davis (AL)	Kanjorski	Payne
Culberson	Jones (NC)	Pallone	Doolittle	Hoekstra	Peterson (PA)	Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Pearce
Cummings	Jones (OH)	Pascarell	Edwards	Johnson (IL)	Rush	Davis (IL)	Keller	Pence
Davis (AL)	Jordan	Pastor	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.	Scott (GA)	Davis (KY)	Kennedy	Perlmutter
Davis (CA)	Kanjorski	Paul	Ferguson	Kagen	Shimkus	Davis, Lincoln	Kildee	Peterson (MN)
Davis (IL)	Kaptur	Payne	Gutierrez	McKeon		Davis, Tom	Kilpatrick	Petri
Davis (KY)	Keller	Pearce	Hastert	Meeks (NY)		Deal (GA)	Kind	Pickering
Davis, David	Kennedy	Pence				DeFazio	King (IA)	Pitts
Davis, Lincoln	Kildee	Perlmutter				DeGette	King (NY)	Platts
Davis, Tom	Kilpatrick	Peterson (MN)				Delahunt	Kingston	Poe
Deal (GA)	Kind	Petri				DeLauro	Kirk	Pomeroy
DeFazio	King (IA)	Pickering				Dent	Klein (FL)	Porter
DeGette	King (NY)	Pitts				Diaz-Balart, L.	Kline (MN)	Price (GA)
Delahunt	Kingston	Platts				Diaz-Balart, M.	Knollenberg	Price (NC)
DeLauro	Kirk	Poe				Dicks	Kucinich	Pryce (OH)
Dent	Klein (FL)	Pomeroy				Dingell	Kuhl (NY)	Putnam
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kline (MN)	Porter				Doggett	LaHood	Radanovich
Diaz-Balart, M.	Knollenberg	Price (GA)				Donnelly	Lamborn	Rahall
Dicks	Kucinich	Price (NC)				Doyle	Lampson	Ramstad
Dingell	Kuhl (NY)	Pryce (OH)				Drake	Langevin	Rangel
Doggett	LaHood	Putnam				Dreier	Lantos	Regula
Donnelly	Lamborn	Radanovich				Duncan	Larsen (WA)	Rehberg
Doyle	Lampson	Rahall				Ehlers	Larson (CT)	Reichert
Drake	Langevin	Ramstad				Ellsworth	Latham	Renzi
Dreier	Lantos	Rangel				Emanuel	LaTourette	Reyes
Duncan	Larsen (WA)	Regula				Emerson	Lee	Reynolds
Ehlers	Larson (CT)	Rehberg				Engel	Levin	Rodriguez
Ellsworth	Latham	Reichert				English (PA)	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (AL)
Emanuel	LaTourette	Renzi				Eshoo	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Emerson	Lee	Reyes				Etheridge	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (MI)
Engel	Levin	Reynolds				Everett	Linder	Rohrabacher
English (PA)	Lewis (CA)	Rodriguez				Fallin	Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen
Eshoo	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (AL)				Farr	LoBiondo	Roskam
Etheridge	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (KY)				Fattah	Loeb sack	Ross
Everett	Linder	Rogers (MI)				Feeney	Lofgren, Zoe	Rothman
Fallin	Lipinski	Rohrabacher				Filner	Lowey	Roybal-Allard
Farr	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen				Flake	Lucas	Royce
Fattah	Loeb sack	Roskam				Forbes	Lungren, Daniel	Ruppersberger
Feeney	Lofgren, Zoe	Ross				Fortenberry	E.	Ryan (OH)
Filner	Lowey	Rothman				Fossella	Lynch	Ryan (WI)
Flake	Lucas	Roybal-Allard				Fox	Mack	Salazar
Forbes	Lungren, Daniel	Royce				Frank (MA)	Mahoney (FL)	Sali
Fortenberry	E.	Ruppersberger				Franks (AZ)	Maloney (NY)	Sánchez, Linda
Fossella	Lynch	Ryan (OH)				Frelinghuysen	Manzullo	T.
Fox	Mack	Ryan (WI)				Galgely	Marchant	Sanchez, Loretta
Frank (MA)	Mahoney (FL)	Salazar				Garrett (NJ)	Markey	Sarbanes
Franks (AZ)	Maloney (NY)	Sali				Gerlach	Marshall	Saxton
Frelinghuysen	Manzullo	Sánchez, Linda				Giffords	Matheson	Schakowsky
Galgely	Marchant	T.				Gilchrest	Matsui	Schiff
Garrett (NJ)	Markey	Sanchez, Loretta				Gillibrand	McCarthy (CA)	Schmidt
Gerlach	Marshall	Sarbanes				Gillmor	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz
Giffords	Matheson	Saxton				Gingrey	McCaul (TX)	Scott (VA)
Gilchrest	Matsui	Schakowsky				Gohmert	McCollum (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Gillibrand	McCarthy (CA)	Schiff				Gonzalez	McCotter	Serrano
Gillmor	McCarthy (NY)	Schmidt	Abercrombie	Berry	Brown (SC)	Goode	McCrery	Sessions
Gingrey	McCaul (TX)	Schwartz	Ackerman	Biggart	Brown, Corrine	Goodlatte	McDermott	Sestak
Gohmert	McColum (MN)	Scott (VA)	Aderholt	Bilbray	Brown-Waite,	Gordon	McGovern	Shadegg
Gonzalez	McCotter	Sensenbrenner	Akin	Bilirakis	Ginny	Granger	McHenry	Shays
Goode	McCrery	Serrano	Alexander	Bishop (GA)	Buchanan	Graves	McHugh	Shea-Porter
Goodlatte	McDermott	Sessions	Allen	Bishop (NY)	Burgess	Green, Al	McIntyre	Sherman
Gordon	McGovern	Sestak	Altmire	Bishop (UT)	Burton (IN)	Green, Gene	McMorris	Shuler
Granger	McHenry	Shadegg	Andrews	Blackburn	Butterfield	Grijalva	Rodgers	Shuster
Graves	McHugh	Shays	Arcuri	Blumenauer	Buyer	Hall (NY)	McNerney	Simpson
Green, Al	McIntyre	Shea-Porter	Baca	Blunt	Calvert	Hall (TX)	McNulty	Sires
Green, Gene	McMorris	Sherman	Bachmann	Boehner	Camp (MI)	Hare	Meehan	Skelton
Grijalva	Rodgers	Shuler	Bachus	Bonner	Campbell (CA)	Harman	Meek (FL)	Slaughter
Hall (NY)	McNerney	Shuster	Baird	Bono	Cannon	Hastings (FL)	Melancon	Smith (NE)
Hall (TX)	McNulty	Simpson	Baker	Boozman	Cantor	Hastings (WA)	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Hare	Meehan	Sires	Baldwin	Boren	Capito	Hayes	Michaud	Smith (TX)
Harman	Meek (FL)	Skelton	Barrett (SC)	Boswell	Capps	Heller	Millender-	Smith (WA)
Hastings (FL)	Melancon	Slaughter	Barrow	Boucher	Capuano	Hensarling	McDonald	Snyder
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Smith (NE)	Barlett (MD)	Boustany	Cardoza	Herseth	Miller (FL)	Solis
Hayes	Michaud	Smith (NJ)	Bartlett (TX)	Boyd (FL)	Carnahan	Higgins	Miller (MI)	Souder
Heller	Millender-	Smith (TX)	Bean	Boyd (KS)	Carney	Hill	Miller (NC)	Space
Hensarling	McDonald	Smith (WA)	Beccerra	Brady (PA)	Carson	Hinojosa	Miller, Gary	Spratt
Herseth	Miller (FL)	Snyder	Berkley	Brady (TX)	Carter	Hirono	Miller, George	Stark
Higgins	Miller (MI)	Solis	Berman	Brale (IA)	Castle	Hobson	Mitchell	Stearns

NOT VOTING—22

□ 1855

Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. BERRY changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds 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.

HONORING AND PRAISING THE NAACP ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 98TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 44.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 44, 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 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

YEAS—410

Abercrombie	Berry	Brown (SC)
Ackerman	Biggart	Brown, Corrine
Aderholt	Bilbray	Brown-Waite,
Akin	Bilirakis	Ginny
Alexander	Bishop (GA)	Buchanan
Allen	Bishop (NY)	Burgess
Altmire	Bishop (UT)	Burton (IN)
Andrews	Blackburn	Butterfield
Arcuri	Blumenauer	Buyer
Baca	Blunt	Calvert
Bachmann	Boehner	Camp (MI)
Bachus	Bonner	Campbell (CA)
Baird	Bono	Cannon
Baker	Boozman	Cantor
Baldwin	Boren	Capito
Barrett (SC)	Boswell	Capps
Barrow	Boucher	Capuano
Barlett (MD)	Boustany	Cardoza
Bartlett (TX)	Boyd (FL)	Carnahan
Bean	Boyd (KS)	Carney
Beccerra	Brady (PA)	Carson
Berkley	Brady (TX)	Carter
Berman	Brale (IA)	Castle

Stupak	Udall (NM)	Welch (VT)
Sullivan	Upton	Weldon (FL)
Sutton	Van Hollen	Weller
Tancredo	Velázquez	Westmoreland
Tanner	Visclosky	Wexler
Tauscher	Walberg	Whitfield
Taylor	Walden (OR)	Wicker
Terry	Walsh (NY)	Wilson (NM)
Thompson (CA)	Walz (MN)	Wilson (OH)
Thompson (MS)	Wamp	Wilson (SC)
Thornberry	Wasserman	Wolf
Tiahrt	Schultz	Woolsey
Tiberi	Waters	Wu
Tierney	Watson	Wynn
Towns	Watt	Yarmuth
Turner	Waxman	Young (AK)
Udall (CO)	Weiner	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—24

Cramer	Hastert	Meeks (NY)
Davis, David	Herger	Murtha
Davis, Jo Ann	Hinchev	Neal (MA)
Doolittle	Hoekstra	Norwood
Edwards	Johnson (IL)	Peterson (PA)
Ellison	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Ferguson	Kagen	Scott (GA)
Gutierrez	McKeon	Shimkus

□ 1905

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent 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 93 and 94.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 93 and 94, for travel reasons I was unable to be present for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both.

ELECTION OF MINORITY MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution H. Res. 153) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 153

Resolved, That the following named members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT.—Mr. Bonner, Mr. Barrett of South Carolina, Mr. Kline, and Mr. McCaul of Texas.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ZEBULON, NORTH CAROLINA

(Mr. MILLER of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to pay tribute to "The Town of Friendly People,"

Zebulon, North Carolina, which celebrates its 100th birthday this year.

Zebulon was founded on February 16, 1907, and was named to honor Zebulon Baird Vance, North Carolina's Governor during the Civil War. Governor Vance insisted, even in the midst of confusion and destruction of the Civil War, on maintaining the rule of law. North Carolina courts continued to function throughout the war, and North Carolina was the only State that never suspended the writ of habeas corpus.

Some of the early businesses in the town of Zebulon belonged to African American residents, like Surratt Dillard, who owned the town's first restaurant. The Wakelon School Building was built in 1909, telephones came to the town in 1911, and the first electric light system was installed in 1916. Today, some of the Nation's leading companies have chosen Zebulon as the place to do business.

In the past 100 years, the town size has grown by nearly 10 times, and nearly 5,000 folks now call Zebulon home.

I join the residents of Zebulon in their centennial celebration and I continue to work on the town's behalf.

CONGRESSIONAL INACTION JEOPARDIZES ILLEGAL DRUG ENFORCEMENT IN WHEELER COUNTY

(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, Congress still has not passed the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act reauthorization. So what does that mean? For Wheeler County, Oregon, it means the sheriff's department will lay off a quarter of their workforce. Now, the force is only four deputies, four deputies including the sheriff, but they are responsible for patrolling 1,833 square miles. That is an area 30 times the size of the District of Columbia.

Last year, a deputy found 6,000 marijuana plants worth over \$19 million spread over a quarter of a mile of Federal land. This operation was financed by Mexican drug cartels and cultivated by illegal aliens.

When my office inquired further, we found out that the deputy of Wheeler County who was out patrolling was doing so on horseback on your Federal lands. That is where he is protecting America from drug cartels and those that push this on our kids.

The sheriff says, "Cutting these funds will increase criminal activity on our Federal lands."

The county judge says, "County payments has been our savior." And this Congress, this Congress and the last one, have failed to reauthorize county payments.

It is time you pass H.R. 17.

IN MEMORY OF U.S. ARMY SPECIALIST CARLA JANE STEWART

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of my constituent, Army Specialist Carla Jane Stewart of the 250th Transportation Company based in El Monte, California. Specialist Stewart was killed in action on January 28, 2007 in Tallil, Iraq, when her military convoy vehicle overturned.

Carla was born in La Canada Flintridge, California to an Armenian American family. Her father, Edmond Aprahamian, a former Marine, and her mother, Emmy Aprahamian, are proud parents who will cherish the memory of their daughter who chose to enlist in the U.S. Army at the age of 35. After completing her basic training at Fort Jackson, South Carolina, she told her family and friends that if her unit was not deployed to Iraq, that she would volunteer to go. As it turned out, the 250th was deployed to Iraq last year and is due to return home in March.

Carla learned mechanical drafting alongside her father. Her family and friends have spoken with reverence of her distinctive commitment to duty, her dedication to her unit, her love of country and family. According to her father, Carla always had a smile. She was a small woman; her unit called her Stewart Little, but she was gutsy and in every other way giant.

It takes a special commitment to volunteer for military service in a time of war, and even greater devotion to country to do so at the age of 35, a time when most of us have put aside thoughts of abandoning the comfort of home to take up arms in the fight for liberty and freedom. Specialist Carla Jane Stewart did both, and on behalf of the United States House of Representatives, we honor her memory.

RECOGNIZING STAX RECORDS FOR ENRICHING THE NATION'S CULTURAL LIFE WITH "50 YEARS OF SOUL"

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a resolution honoring Stax Records.

Soul music is a uniquely American art form that has enriched the Nation's cultural life. Indeed, its profound influences over popular music continues to be heard on today's music.

Stax Records, founded in Memphis 50 years ago, played a crucial role in soul music's rise to prominence. As such, it is an icon of the American recording industry. In fact, its iconic status was recognized by NARAS last night during the Grammys, when Stax legends Booker T. and the M.G.'s and their Green Onions, and Stax co-founder Estelle Axton were honored.

Isaac Hayes, Otis Redding, the Staple Singers, Wilson Pickett, Luther Ingram, Albert King, the Bar-Kays, Johnnie Taylor, and Rufus and Carla Thomas are just a few of the many singers and musicians who started at Stax.

This year, the Memphis Convention and Visitors Bureau, Concord Music Group, Stax Records, and the Soulful Foundation will be celebrating both Memphis soul music, American soul music, and the 50th anniversary of Stax's founding. Therefore, I am introducing this resolution today to recognize Stax's and soul music's enormous contribution to America's cultural fabric, and ask my colleagues, including Congressman MILLER, to recognize Memphis and soul music.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). 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.

UNITED STATES BORDER PATROL AGENTS CAMPION AND RAMOS

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. Mr. Speaker, tonight I won't take nearly the 5 minutes that I have allotted, but I and many Members of the House have been trying to help two border agents, Border Agent Campion, and Border Agent Ramos, who are now serving 1 to 11 years in Federal prison, the other for 12 years in Federal prison for shooting a drug smuggler.

What makes this so sad, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, is these men have had a wonderful record of serving the American people on the borders of this country, trying to help defend America from those who want to come to this country illegally, and especially those who have drugs or may be terrorists, quite frankly.

But these two men were found guilty in a Federal court, and I am afraid that all the information that could have been used to help these two men not go to prison was under seal. That is a legal issue, and I won't speak to that, but I will say that I want the people to know tonight, my colleagues here in the House, that the drug smuggler who had a record of smuggling drugs from Mexico to America was the one that they shot when he was trying to escape after his van crashed with 743 pounds of marijuana. These men thought they were doing their duty for this country, and therefore they shot at this drug smuggler as he was leaving. The bullet actually went through the buttocks and went out, and according to the medical examiner that meant that he was turned like he was going to face them and possibly, if he had a weapon,

fire at them. They thought he had a weapon.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, the sad thing is that Agent Ramos 2 weeks ago was beaten in a Federal prison. These men, their lives are at stake, and we call upon the White House to look seriously at this case.

We think there are legal questions as to the indictment and to the process itself. We would like for the White House and the Attorney General's office to look seriously at whether these men should at least be given some type of pardon while their hearings are being heard. But we are calling on the White House to please look seriously at giving these two men an opportunity for pardon, because I do not know how we can say to the American people that our law enforcement, who are trying to protect this country from those who are invading this country, whether they be from Canada and Mexico, and yet with our border agents do the best job they can under very, very difficult situations, then they end up spending 11 and 12 years in Federal prison.

Again, in closing, and I will be closing, we are asking the administration to look carefully at the possibility of a pardon. There are many Members of the House, both Republican and Democrat, that are concerned about this case.

In fact, today, Senator FEINSTEIN from California, a Democrat, called upon Mr. LEAHY, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, to look into this case.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I will close by asking the President to please show the families of Mr. Compean and Mr. Ramos that justice does prevail in America if you are trying to defend the Constitution and defend the people of America.

OPIUM TRAFFICKING IN AFGHANISTAN

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, as this body plans to debate tomorrow the ongoing war in Iraq, I come to the floor this evening to discuss what I feel is the forgotten war, the United States' war on terror in Afghanistan.

I have stressed on numerous occasions the importance of the United States not losing sight of the real front in the war on terror in Afghanistan. Too often, the Bush administration has placed all of its efforts into fighting the war in Iraq while the Taliban and al Qaeda increased their presence in Afghanistan and western Pakistan.

It was promising to see Secretary of State Robert Gates visit Pakistan this weekend to meet with Pakistani President Musharraf. Unfortunately, Secretary Gates stated that the meeting was, and I quote, not aimed at securing

the assurance of action from Pakistan. As I have stated before, assurances of action are exactly what the United States must demand from Pakistan at this time.

President Musharraf has acknowledged that his country's Frontier Guards have allowed insurgents to pass freely at the border shared by Afghanistan and Pakistan. If the Pakistani President is fully aware of Taliban insurgents crossing the border, why is he not taking the necessary steps to bring an end to these violations?

Mr. Speaker, in Afghanistan the Taliban seems to be ramping up its efforts and possibly planning a spring offensive. Last week in a speech on the House floor, I mentioned a town in southern Afghanistan, Musa Qala, which has been overrun by forces despite a peace deal brokered between local leaders and NATO-led forces. This deal called for the local leaders to take control of the town and ensure that Taliban fighters not create a stronghold in the area.

Unfortunately, these deals failed, and this week it has been reported that roughly 1,500 families have fled Musa Qala and, as an anonymous Taliban commander has claimed, there are thousands of Taliban in the region preparing for a possible attack by United States or NATO forces.

Now, it is extremely important for the United States to step up its efforts in this deteriorating country. Of particular significance is the alarming rate at which the opium trade is growing in Afghanistan. According to the U.N. Office on Drugs and Crime, opium poppy production reached a record 6,100 metric tons last year, and this is 49 percent greater than the total in 2005.

Corruption is rampant within the opium trade, and the Taliban not only profit by selling and trading the opium, but also through providing protection to opium farmers and traders. Corruption is so pervasive that police chief posts in poppy-growing districts are auctioned off for as much as \$100,000 for a 6-month appointment.

While these police chiefs will only make \$60 a month, they know the kickbacks they will receive from working with the opium farmers and the Taliban will be extremely financially rewarding. Now, some claim that the U.S. and NATO should simply fly over Afghanistan and spray chemicals over all the opium fields to destroy the crops; but not only will this cause environmental and health damage, but it will also raise the price of opium and drive farmers towards the Taliban insurgents.

What the U.S. should do instead is use the additional aid that it plans to send to Afghanistan this year to bolster rural development in poppy-growing areas. This money must also be used to create new rural industries so the farmers will have options other than growing poppy and participating in the illicit opium trade.

The main goal of U.S. efforts to eradicate the illicit opium trade should

be to target illegal drug traffickers and corrupt officials such as police chiefs. Our government must couple this with aid to the rural poor in Afghanistan in order to provide financial alternatives to the illicit opium trade.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues and I debate the merits of the President's plan to escalate the war in Iraq, which I oppose, it is important for us not to forget where the real war on terror continues today in Afghanistan. The United States must intensify its redevelopment efforts in Afghanistan as an alternative to the opium trade, which is only providing further financial backing for the Taliban-led insurgency.

A LITTLE GIRL'S DAY IN COURT

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, 9-year-old Jessica Lunsford was a bright, talented and energetic little girl. She lived with her father, Mark, who was a single parent, trying to raise three children. He also lived with her grandparents, Mark's parents, who loved her as much. Jessica was a great kid. Everybody thought the world of her, and she took care of the family just like they took care of her.

Mark even moved to Florida to protect his children, thinking they would be safer in south Florida than they were where they lived. That is when the tragedy began. Almost 2 years ago, on the evening of February 23, 2005, the Lunsfords lives were changed forever.

Among the shadows of a warm Florida night, there was a perpetrator running loose. He was stalking the Lunsford home, and he was watching 9-year-old Jessica Lunsford for several days. He waited till everyone in the house was asleep, and the outlaw in the middle of the night snuck into the Lunsford home, crept down a darkened hallway, and kidnapped Jessica Lunsford from the safety of her open home in the middle of the night.

The search for Jessica, 9-year-old happy girl, went on for several weeks. Hundreds of volunteers were involved. Finally, a neighbor, and repeat sex offender, John Couey, was arrested for her murder.

Couey was a registered sex offender, but, of course, he was on the lam. He had run. He had disappeared. Couey confirmed what the police had already suspected against him, and he had kidnapped Jessica. He sexually assaulted her numerous times, and he held her captive for several days.

Mr. Speaker, when he was not abusing this little girl, he stuffed her in a closet. Then when he was ready to abuse her again, he would pull her out and have his way with her.

When he realized that the sheriff's department was out to get him, knew that he was the culprit, he decided he had to remove the evidence, this little girl. So he tied Jessica Lunsford's

hands and feet together with stereo wire. He went out into the yard, he dug a hole, he came back into the house, his own home, put two trash bags over Jessica Lunsford, picked her up and threw her in the hole. Yes, he buried that 9-year-old girl alive.

When she was found several days later, she had poked her fingers through the plastic bags seeking the air of freedom, freedom that never came. Couey admitted everything that I just told you to the police, in every detail.

But while he was confessing to these horrors he inflicted on Jessica, he asked for a lawyer. Unfortunately, the police ignored his request, and this would cause Couey's confession to be inadmissible as evidence against him. You see, when a defendant asks for a lawyer, he must be given one right away or the statements he makes will not be admissible in court.

However, even without this confession, there is a lot of evidence against Couey to prove his guilt. After 2 years and several delays, Couey is standing trial for his evil deeds. Today, John Couey is sitting in a Miami courthouse as jury selection begins. Twelve men and women are being asked to decide his guilt in his crime against this little girl.

Jessica has been needing justice for 2 years. Her family has been waiting for 2 years for this justice. As a father of three girls and three granddaughters, I know how important little girls are to a father like Mark Lunsford, and he has lost his little girl.

You know, as a society, as a culture, as a Nation, we are never going to be judged by the way we treat the rich, the famous, the powerful, the important folks. We will be judged by the way we treat the weak, the innocent, the elderly, and, yes, the children, the Jessicas of the world.

So the State of Florida and this jury need to give John Couey, sex offender, child killer, his day in court. When the evidence is in, hopefully the words of this country song will ring true when it says: "A man had to answer for the wicked that he done," because "justice is the one thing you should always find. You got to draw a hard line" in the sand. "We got too many gangsters doing dirty deeds. We've got too much corruption, too much crime in the streets. It's time the long arm of the law put a few more in the ground," because justice is the one thing you should always find.

And that's just the way it is.

BRING OUR TROOPS HOME

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow this House will begin a debate on Iraq. This is the first of a series of debates that we must have on the House floor. It is a resolution. It reflects

President Bush's plan to escalate the occupation of Iraq, and it will be a clean up or down vote.

I commend the Democratic leadership for providing a time for every single Member of this body to come to the floor and have their say. If you support escalation, you vote "yes." If not, you vote "no." I will support the legislation as a very important first step in this debate.

But after that, Congress must go on record in opposition of the war in general. First we have to go on record in opposition of escalation, and then we must change our course and lay out a plan to bring our troops home. There have been many, many ideas, both inside and outside of Congress, to plan for an end to this occupation of Iraq.

Few are as comprehensive as H.R. 508, the Bring the Troops Home and Iraq Sovereignty Act. I introduced this bill last month and have 34, 35 cosponsors today, with more interest expressed every single day.

H.R. 508 will end the occupation of Iraq within 6 months of passage. It will accelerate the training and equipping of Iraqi military and security forces while preparing to bring our troops and contractors out of Iraq safely.

It will commit to working with the international community to assist the Iraqis in rebuilding and in reconciliation if they agree and want us to be there. H.R. 508 will fully fund the health care commitment to our returning veterans. Additionally, the bill revokes the President's Iraq war powers, prevents the establishment of permanent bases in Iraq, and returns the oil rights to the Iraqi people.

We owe it to our brave men and brave women in uniform and to the Iraqi people to bring our troops home now. Let us be honest, the Iraqis don't want us there. They view us as an occupying force. They want to be strengthening their security forces, and they want to establish a reliable and dependable infrastructure and provide for their most basic needs like sanitation, health care, and education.

We can assist them; but in the end, Iraq must belong to the Iraqi people. Having learned from our past, we will never turn our backs on the returning troops, those who have been put in an unimaginable position. They have seen death; they have seen destruction up close, in a way many of us will never understand. They are returning with scars, both visible and invisible. The least we can do is fulfill our commitment to them by fully funding the medical services they have been promised. This is not a gift we are giving them. This is a right, this is an entitlement.

So I rise tonight, and I will rise again during the three days of debate to signal my support for the upcoming resolution as a very important first step: my support for the troops and their promised benefits, my support for the American people, who want our troops home.

□ 1930

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

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

EVEN THE SOLDIERS WILL TELL YOU THAT NOTHING IS GOING TO HELP

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, as the previous speaker just mentioned, tomorrow we will begin debating the Iraq war surge resolution. George Will, the conservative columnist wrote in opposition to this surge and said it would take a miracle for the surge to succeed.

Dick Arney, our former majority leader, in an interview with a major newspaper chain said just a few days ago that he deeply regretted voting to go to war in Iraq, and said, "Had I been more true to myself and the principles I believed in at the time, I would have openly opposed the whole adventure vocally and aggressively."

William F. Buckley, Jr., often called the godfather of conservatism, wrote in 2004 that if he had known in 2002 what he knew in 2004 he would have opposed the war. Chris Matthews on Election Night said, "The decision to go to war in Iraq was not a conservative decision historically," and he said it asked Republicans, "to behave like a different people than they intrinsically are."

And that confirmed what I have said many times on this floor, that the war in Iraq went against every traditional conservative position I have ever known. I would like to read into the RECORD at this time a column that I wrote for the Nashville Tennessean, Tennessee's largest circulation daily.

I wrote this. "I voted against going to war in Iraq when Congress voted on this in October of 2002. And I am opposed to sending more U.S. troops there now. President Bush has said repeatedly that he is going to listen mainly to his commanders. I wish he would listen to Specialist Don Roberts, 22, of Paonia, Colorado, now in his second tour in Iraq, who told the Associated Press: "What could more guys do? We cannot pick sides. It is like we have to watch them kill each other then ask questions."

Sergeant Josh Keim, of Canton, Ohio, also on his second term said, "nothing is going to help. It is a religious war and we are caught in the middle of it."

Saddam Hussein was an evil man, but he had a total military budget only a little over two-tenths of 1 percent of ours, most of which he spent protecting himself and his family and building castles.

He was no threat to us at all. As the conservative columnist Charley Reese has written several times, Iraq did not threaten us with war. They did not attack us, and were not even capable of attacking us.

But even before the war started, Fortune Magazine had an article saying that an American occupation of Iraq would be "prolonged and expensive" and would make U.S. soldiers "sitting ducks for Islamic terrorists."

Now we have had more than 3,000 Americans killed, many thousands more wounded horribly, and have spent \$400 billion, and the Pentagon wants \$170 billion more.

Most of what we have spent has been purely foreign aid in nature: rebuilding Iraq's infrastructure, giving free medical care, training police, giving jobs to several hundred thousand Iraqis and on and on. Our Constitution does not give us the authority to run another country as we have in reality been doing in Iraq.

With a national debt of almost \$9 trillion, we cannot afford it. To me our misadventure in Iraq is both unconstitutional and unaffordable. Some have said it was a mistake to start this war but that now that we are there we have to finish the job, and we cannot cut and run. Well, if you find out you are going the wrong way down the interstate, you do not keep going, you get off at the next exit.

Very few pushed as hard for us to go to war in Iraq as did syndicated columnist Charles Krauthammer. Last week he wrote that the Maliki government we have installed there cares only about making sure the Shiites dominate the Sunnis. We should not be surging troops in defense of such a government, Krauthammer wrote. Maliki should be made to know that if he insists on having this sectarian war, he can well have it without us.

There is no way we can keep all of our promises to our own people on Social Security, veterans benefits, and many other things in the years ahead if we keep trying to run the whole world. As another columnist, Georgie Anne Geyer, wrote more than 3 years ago, Americans "will inevitably come to a point where they will see they have to have a government that provides services at home or one that seeks empire across the globe."

We should help other countries during humanitarian crises and have trade and tourism and cultural and educational exchanges. But conservatives have traditionally been the strongest opponents to interventionist foreign policies that create so much resentment for us around the world.

We need to return to the more humble foreign policy President Bush advocated when he campaigned in 2000.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we need to tell all of these defense contractors that the time for this Iraq gravy train with its obscene profits is over. It is time, Mr. Speaker, to bring our troops home.

NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF PRESIDENT BUSH'S BUDGET ON NEW YORK

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the negative impact of President Bush's proposed budget on New York State. New York is consistently faced with a funding imbalance. We receive far less funding than we pay out in taxes. This imbalance has held back projects in key areas. Key programs have been constantly underfunded, and this year's proposed budget again makes the wrong choices for New York's families. Gang violence is a growing problem on Long Island. Our police departments and community groups are doing all they can with this small budget.

Unfortunately, these budgets will be further reduced if the President has his way. His budget request attempts to eliminate two of New York's local crime fighting tools: the Community Oriented Policing Service, or the COPS Program, and the Justice Assistance Grants Program. These two programs allow law enforcement agencies to hire police officers and support crime prevention.

It is a lot cheaper to prevent crime than it is to send someone to prison. Police departments rely on this money to purchase new technology and equipment, to educate their members on how to best combat issues such as gun violence.

In the year 2006, New York received more than \$27 million in COPS and JAG funding. If this money is not available, our law enforcement will not have the tools they need to keep our families and communities safe. But it is not just our communities that are put at risk by the President's budget.

College assistance programs to help New York students will be slashed if the President has his way. The education of our Nation's students is one of the most important issues facing us today. I have traveled to China and India and have seen the attention those countries are giving to education for their students.

We need to do a better job at funding our educational programs to give our students the tools they need to compete in a global economy. However, under the President's budget, key programs such as work study and supplemental educational opportunity grants will be frozen.

Tuition in New York State schools have increased over 20 percent over the last few years. These new cuts in student aid will put college further out of reach of so many of the New York students. This is the wrong message to be sending to our students who work hard in high school and dream of going to college. We can do a better job, but we need adequate funding to truly help our students achieve their dreams.

As you know, our health care system needs attention also. Over 40 million

Americans are without health insurance. In New York 2.5 million are uninsured. In his State of the Union address, President Bush vaguely outlined a proposal to deal with this very issue. I applaud the President for bringing this issue to the forefront of the debate.

However, I do not agree with the President's plan. I am afraid his proposal will raise health care costs for New York's working class, while doing very little to help the 2.5 million uninsured. The money President Bush requested for his plan can be better used to lower premiums and truly make health care affordable for all Americans.

Since the start of the 110th Congress the House has done the people's work. We have raised the minimum wage, cut student loan interest rates, and helped Medicare beneficiaries. We have changed the focus of our Nation to help all Americans.

The President's budget request misses the mark and will harm already underfunded programs. We in Congress must devote more attention and funding to our Nation's education and health care. These issues have been long underfunded for too long.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to refocus our priorities and fully fund our educational and health care programs. I know in the next 3 days we are going to be debating Iraq, which I think is probably one of the most important issues facing this Nation.

But even with that, we as Democrats will continue doing the work of the American people and finally getting some work done that is going to help all Americans. That is what we as Democrats will do. That is what we pledged and we will follow through with that.

SUPPORT THE DRIVE ACT

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak about House Resolution or House bill 670, which is a bill called the DRIVE Act; that is, the Dependency Reduction through Innovative Vehicle and Energy Policy.

It is a bill that ELIOT ENGEL and I have cosponsored. It has almost an equal number of Democrats and Republican cosponsors, up to about 60. And its goal is to reduce your oil consumption by 20 percent in 20 years. What we did is sat down and said, how could we achieve that goal and do something for national security, something for the environment, and something for mom and dad back home and their pocket-book?

So we set out to try to stay true to those goals. We put fourth four things in it. To change consumer habits, we have doubled the tax credit for purchase of hybrids, flex fuel vehicles, and

biodiesel, anything that would drive on something besides gasoline.

Secondly, we have sent a message to Detroit that we would like to see 80 percent of the cars made in 10 years be at least flex fuel so that Wall Street will also follow suit and invest in flex fuel vehicles and hybrids and ethanol, things like that. If Wall Street knows that the government is behind it and the market is going to be there, then the investment dollars will follow.

Too often what happens when the price of gasoline goes up, everyone rushes out and looks at alternatives; then when the price of gasoline goes down, everybody forgets all about it. We want to have a permanent investment stream from Wall Street. That is why it is a good method when you follow what we did with air bags, the air bag model.

Thirdly, we require the government to start scoring based on energy consumption. When the government goes out and buys fleets of vehicles, we want to know, are you buying innovative vehicles, flex fuels, hybrids and so forth. We believe it is important for the Federal Government to have a goal.

One thing I point out, which is not in the bill; but we deliver on Saturday, mail which is 30 percent of the volume that you have Monday through Friday, but we use 100 percent of the fuel. So it would make sense if you are in the business place to quit delivering mail on Saturday.

I understand that has some political ramifications, and thinking with our political minds instead of our business minds. I just say that is an example. Finally, we believe that a lot more research has to be done. But I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that Toyota is already on their fourth-generation hybrid.

Unfortunately, many of the Detroit American motor companies are not that far along. But there is a lot coming down the pike. The University of Georgia, for example is making ethanol out of sweet potatoes, left-over Coca Cola and watermelon. There are all kinds of ways to make ethanol in addition to using corn.

These are the things that our bill does. You know, in Washington it is actually easy to agree to disagree. My friend, Mr. MILLER and I, we have no problem disagreeing agreeably. But what we need to do is agree to agree, which is much harder. Because when Republicans and Democrats agree to agree, we make progress, and sometimes the interest groups that surround us from both parties really do not want that, because they are not as empowered as they are when we are fighting.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 742. An act to amend the Antitrust Modernization Commission Act of 2002, to extend the term of the Antitrust Modernization Commission and to make a technical correction.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94-304, as amended by Public Law 99-7, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) as Co-Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the 110th Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94-304, as amended by Public Law 99-7, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senators as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the 110th Congress:

The Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD);

The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD);

The Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON);

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY); and

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

IRAQ RESOLUTION

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as already has been noted this evening, tomorrow the House will begin a 3-day debate on the question of whether or not we support the escalation of the war in Iraq by supporting the President's policy to send over 21,000 additional troops to Baghdad, what is called the surge, but is in fact an escalation of the war and of the exposure of our American troops in Iraq.

It is an important debate, and it will be an important vote. It will be a very simple proposition: Either you support the escalation or you do not. This is the vote that the American people have been asking for now for many, many months. They certainly expressed it in the election. They have expressed it since the election where we see time and again they are telling the country, they are telling those of us who are in the Congress of the United States that they do not support this policy; they want an exit plan; they want our young men and women brought home from Iraq; and they want the Iraqis to take responsibility for the political decisions that must be made if Iraq is in fact going to be a unified country, if Iraq in fact can proceed along a road to building democratic institutions and hopefully finally building a democracy.

□ 1945

But none of that, none of that will be done by the troops from America. None of that can be done by the troops from America. The fact of the matter is that that must be done by the Iraqi people.

But there will be those in this debate who will be defending the President's failed strategy in Iraq by attacking the President's critics. They ask, what message would America send to its troops in combat if Congress votes to repudiate the President's plan? What message, indeed?

Mr. Speaker, the question really is, what message did Congress send to our troops from the very beginning of this miserable war?

What message did Congress send to the troops in the beginning of this miserable war when they voted to go to war based upon the lack of proper evidence, false evidence, manipulated evidence and, in fact, outright lies to the American people and to the world about the situation in Iraq, and certainly a war that was not vital to the interest of the United States?

What message did Congress send when it allowed the President to go to war without enough troops to secure the peace?

What message did the Congress send when it allowed our troops to go into combat without proper armored vehicles?

What message did Congress send when it allowed our troops to go into combat without proper protective body armor?

And what message did the Congress send when it allowed the President to continue a failed course in Iraq with no adjustments in strategy?

What message did Congress send when it allowed the President to effectively draft American volunteers by continuing their tours of duty over and over again?

And what message did the Congress send to our troops, indeed?

But there is a new Congress now and there is a new message for our troops. By raising objections to the President's failed strategy, and by demanding a new course in Iraq and the immediate and responsible redeployment of our forces, we will send a new and clear message to our troops. Our message to the American forces in combat is that we will not let you fight and die forever in Iraq with no plan to get you out, with no exit plan. Our message is that we will insist that the Iraqis take responsibility for their country and the building of a democracy, and that soon American forces will be brought home or redeployed to fight the real war on terror.

Our message is that the American forces will not be used to fight Iraq's civil war. Our message to the President's few remaining supporters in the House and Senate is, do not exploit our brave troops in combat in a desperate and vain effort to bolster a weak President. Do not use our brave men and women serving in Iraq to cling to a misguided policy that is dangerous for America's interests and for its troops as well.

Join us in opposing the escalation of the war in Iraq, and when we see that history is now repeating itself, where

once again the administration is prepared to send our soldiers into Iraq without proper equipment and without proper training, demand, instead, a new strategy to get America out of Iraq's civil war, to get Iraq to take responsibility for its own future, and to use our troops for the proper mission, to defend America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman 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.)

H. RES. 109, PINEDALE ASSEMBLY CENTER RESOLUTION

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 109, recognizing the historical significance of the Pinedale Assembly Center located in Fresno, California.

The history of this internment center is a reflection of the 65th anniversary of Executive Order 9066, which reminds us of a dark chapter in U.S. history.

On February 19, 1942, President Franklin Roosevelt signed the order authorizing the forced internment of over 120,000 Japanese Americans, placing tremendous hardship on the innocent that, in many cases, resulted in a loss of jobs, businesses, property and ultimately, in some cases, their dignity.

Further, the internment was a violation of their constitutional rights. Internees were denied their liberty, their civil rights, the right to due process, and equal protection under the law. Yet, no Japanese American, before or after their internment, was ever accused or convicted of espionage or sabotage.

In fact, over 14,000 Japanese Americans served valiantly and on a voluntary basis in our Armed Forces during World War II with great distinction. One could only imagine what went through their minds, the members of our military, as they defended our Nation's freedoms, while their own families were languishing back in American internment camps.

Pinedale, then, following the order, was a relocation center, and the Japanese Americans throughout the West were asked to report to these relocation centers. This relocation center handled over 4,823 individuals.

Numbers are just numbers, ladies and gentlemen. But let me tell you some of the stories that passed through this camp.

A dear friend of mine, and a beloved Member of this body, the late Congressman Bob Matsui, arrived at the Pinedale Assembly Center at age two.

Congressman Matsui fought against all odds, as did all of those, and despite the prejudice and the hardships, rose to be a great leader of our Nation.

Another story, James Hirabayashi, interned there at age 17. And he wrote, and you can imagine hearing the words: "My parents and three siblings and myself occupied a single barrack at the Pinedale detention camp. However, we were soon to be split further apart and never regained the unified family life during the war."

Later, James received his Ph.D. at Harvard, became a professor of anthropology at San Francisco State and now chairs the Asian Studies program.

Another story: Jack Hata was evacuated to Pinedale on his 21st birthday. He recalled: "The assembly center was made up of rows of tarpapered black barracks enclosed by barbed wire fencing with armed guard towers. The most vivid recollection of the Pinedale experience had to be that of a strong, hot wind picking up every mid-afternoon blowing dust over the entire camp and making seeing and breathing very difficult."

Today, ladies and gentlemen, much has changed. Pinedale is a part of our history, a place of loss, of hatred and fear. But now it will be transformed into a place of remembrance for healing and hope.

The Pinedale Assembly Center Memorial Project Committee cosponsored by the Central California District of Japanese American Citizens and the California Nikkei Foundation is establishing a memorial. The memorial would not have been possible without the dedication and diligence of all those who have supported this effort, including Judge Dale Ikeda, chairman of the memorial project.

I am one of those that serves on the Project Advisory Committee. But Dale says it best: "By preserving the Pinedale Assembly Center story, we hope to teach a lesson in history, that it takes people to ensure 'justice for all.' And rather, it is the duty of each generation to strive to form a more perfect union for ourselves and for the sake of our children."

The memorial groundbreaking will take place next week, February 19, on the 65th anniversary of the executive order.

Today, over 5,000 Japanese Americans, many former World War II internees and their families, live in Fresno County, and the Pinedale Memorial will honor these and those who suffered during that period.

The memorial sends a message that we are committed to healing historical wounds and replacing the prejudice and fear with the American values of equality and justice.

It has been said that those who cannot learn from history are doomed to repeat it. Let's make sure this memorial helps us learn.

Allow me to close by reading the parts of the memorial plaque inscription that will be dedicated next week:

“This Memorial is dedicated to over 4,800 Americans of Japanese ancestry who were confined at the Pinedale Assembly Center. This was an early phase of a mass incarceration of over 120,000 Japanese Americans. They were detained without charges, trial or establishment of guilt. May such injustices and suffering never recur.”

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

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

THE COUNTDOWN CREW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, we return again for the fifth consecutive leadership hour with the Countdown Crew.

I would like to welcome all of you here tonight who are watching from home. We have been surprised at the tremendous amount of response that we have received talking about the reality of tax policy, of small business policy and the impact that it has on the lives of ordinary citizens in this Nation.

In fact, the feedback has gotten so great that we have received hundreds and hundreds of calls, e-mails from around the country.

What we would like to do is invite you to become part of the Countdown Crew, as we are only 1,416 days from one of the largest tax increases in American history. We have a Web site. We would encourage you to e-mail with questions, with comments, your perspective on ways to make life better for working families to create jobs and to strengthen small business, which creates 88 percent of the jobs in the United States.

If you look behind me, our e-mail address is here. It is countdowncrew@mail.house.gov. And we would invite your comments and your feedback, and also invite you to share your stories of why the tax cuts of the last several years have made a difference for you, why a more relaxed and more structured regulatory process that focuses on sound science versus on politics allows businesses to work to create jobs, to create opportunity to create a future for our children and our grandchildren.

And there is a reason for this. In the election on November 7, so much of the emotion and so much of the focus had to do with issues related to the national security policy in the Middle East. But one thing that was forgotten in that time was something else that was voted for by the American people.

All of the tax cuts that have created 7 million jobs, that have created record revenues to the U.S. Treasury actually are on time lines. And they have to be extended by the House, and they sunset at the end of 2010. And without a President to advocate those policies, without a House of Representatives and a Senate that is going to pass those policies, all of the tax cuts that have created millions of jobs, that have created these record revenues in time of war are going to end. And that means that in 1,416 days, the average working family in the United States of America will experience a tax increase of \$2,098. And that translates across every sector of America.

And the one thing I think that often gets lost, and I will speak as a former small business owner myself, is the fact that small businesses create 88 percent of all new jobs. Those are companies with under 500 employees. These are companies that pay health benefits, that do research and development, that open new doors.

The tax revenues that are generated from those businesses and those employees are what fund the infrastructure of our communities. They pay for our teachers; they pay for our public safety. They contribute to our national defense.

And one saying, I think, that is important for all of us to remember is, the focus that we need to have is not to raise taxes but it is to create taxpayers. And the way that we can create taxpayers is give those who create the jobs more resources to invest in the economy, allow working families to keep more of what they own so they can save it and build a nest egg for the future that will ultimately lead to the growth that we have experienced.

We have got several distinguished gentlemen tonight. Before the gentleman from Oklahoma begins, I would like to recognize the leadership of Congressman BILL SHUSTER from Pennsylvania who has been the principal architect of the Countdown Crew.

Remember, if you would like to contact us, that is countdowncrew@mail.house.gov if you have a question for any of the Members participating tonight or would like to share your own story of how being allowed to keep more your own money, more of your own resources has helped to create a future for you.

But before I share some stories about some friends back in Kentucky who started and created jobs that are affecting not only our region and our economy, but also the defense of this Nation, I would like to recognize Congressman SULLIVAN, the gentleman from Oklahoma, to share his perspective on this.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thank you, Congressman DAVIS. And I want to thank you for doing this tonight.

I also want to thank Congressman BILL SHUSTER from Pennsylvania for the Countdown Crew. Tax relief is very important to the American people, the

American families, American business. And we are about ready to embark on the largest tax increase in the history of this country, and it is going to be very detrimental to our economy.

And I can remember when I got to Congress just a short time ago, almost 5 years ago. Congressman SHUSTER came in a little bit before me. And since that time, with some of the tax relief measures that have been put in place, we have seen just 167,000 jobs were created in December alone. Payroll, nonfarm payroll employment increased.

Since August 2003, more than 7.2 million jobs have been created. Workers are finding jobs faster.

I remember when I came to Congress back in 2002, one of the votes that I had to make, along with others, was to extend unemployment benefits. And we don't have to do that now, in large part, because of the tax relief measures that have been put in place.

A lot of people think that we need to keep taxing and taxing and taxing our way to prosperity. And that is wrong.

And my friends on the left, the liberals on the left, think that this money belongs to them, it belongs here in Washington with the politicians. And that is not where it belongs.

□ 2000

It belongs to the people who earn the money in the first place, working families, small business people. And how does that apply to somebody, let us say, that lives in Oklahoma, a small businessman or woman? Well, I will tell you how it applies to them. When I go around my district, one of the biggest things I hear about are complaints from small- to medium-sized business people, and small- to medium-sized business people employ 85 percent of the people in our economy. They either work for, own, or operate small- to medium-sized businesses. And if we allow a small business to keep more of their money, what are they going to do with it? Well, they are going to hire more people to work. It is going to create jobs, which it has done. They are going to buy equipment to expand their business, and that money is going to bounce around the economy, that dynamic economic effect of that money bouncing around the economy, and it is going to find its way back to Washington anyway, but we get to do things with it before it does.

One of the things too, Congressman DAVIS, that I hear about a lot is small business people are really complaining right now about providing health insurance for their employees. Either they have to go to their employees and say, hey, I can't cover you anymore or they have to lessen the benefit to the employee or they have to make the employee pay more of their health care cost. Now, if we provide tax relief to them, they are able to use that money to provide health insurance for their employees. The Democrats, if they allow this tax increase to take place,

we are going to have more uninsured people in this country.

Tax relief has been used many, many times. I remember last week or the week before that, Congressman SHUSTER talked about how tax relief was used when John F. Kennedy was President, a member of the other side of the aisle. And it works. He used tax relief, reducing all marginal rates. Also Ronald Reagan proposed tax relief, and it was wildly successful. We had a roaring economy. Tax relief is used by other countries in economic slow times to get out of that. It is one of the economic tools that are used.

We have to realize too that Washington is getting too big. Government is too big. It is unaccountable. There is runaway spending here in Washington. There is no accountability, no light of day on the budgetary process. People talk about the budget like it is a complicated thing here in Washington. Well, heck, a chimpanzee could do the budget here in Washington. You get what you spent last year; you try to get more money. You want \$10 million, you ask for \$1 billion and you get \$10 million more, and you spend that and that goes to your baseline for the next year.

Instead of throwing money at all these supposed problems around here, we need to find the problems first and scrutinize the spending here in Washington, D.C. And we certainly don't need to free up more money for the politicians in Washington, D.C. to spend by allowing massive tax increases to occur.

So I really commend you for doing this countdown, the Countdown Crew. I want to commend Congressman SHUSTER for all he has done, Congressman DAVIS, JACK KINGSTON from Georgia. This is very important. And when I go around my district, even in Oklahoma, we are hearing a lot of things about what you guys are doing on this Countdown Crew. People do not want to see these tax increases occur. I talked to someone the other day that said, I am afraid that our child tax credit will go away, from \$1,000 to \$600. That will be critical. I have four kids. It is going to affect me. It is going to affect a lot of people. And that is what we are dealing with, people. And we want them to keep the money that they worked so hard to earn in their pockets, not here in Washington.

And, again, I want to thank you for having me here.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Thank you very much, Congressman SULLIVAN.

I think it is so important what he highlighted here when he mentioned four children. My wife Pat and I have six children. For families what this translates into, just the loss of the child tax credit alone for a family of four is \$2,000. That could be a semester of college tuition. It could be an investment in savings. There is an opportunity cost that comes with that that has real effects. And when that money is in the economy, it is creating jobs.

And I would like to take a moment and share one small business story that is close to home about an environment that creates opportunity. You may have heard me say this before: The role of government is not to create jobs. Government doesn't create jobs by itself. What government does should be to create a framework that empowers people to create jobs, to create opportunity, and to protect that opportunity we pass to future generations.

We have seen tremendous change that has taken place in our region, the Fourth District of Kentucky. And specifically in the northern part of that district, right across the river from Cincinnati or, as we like to say, the greater northern Kentucky area, we are seeing economic explosions in great numbers in a variety of industries. In particular, a group of far-seeing businessmen wanted to change the view of our community, joined with community leaders. And they worked with Northern Kentucky University, first with President Jim Votruba, and talked about the need for bringing high-technology jobs and creating a climate for high-technology jobs. Dr. Votruba recruited an information technology professional named Bob Farrel, who is an entrepreneur, a great success in the business world, but also a teacher and a mentor. They collaborated in turn with the chamber of commerce, with local government, with State government, and created a zone in downtown Covington, Kentucky, on Madison Street, called the Madison E Zone. And into that came some friends of mine to build on the foundation that was given to them, those boundaries in which they could create opportunity.

Three men, Kevin Moore, Norm Desmairis, and Greg Harmeyer, I know all three of them. I have watched what they have done professionally with their business. I have watched how they have grown from a very small company to create many, many jobs; how they left one facility and had to move down the street to an even larger facility. And they are the true ideal of the American entrepreneur, a small business person who starts with a vision, pursues that vision, and wants to bring about change. And what Kevin and Norm and Greg have all done with their business that is remarkable in information technology is they have provided needed services in the preservation of knowledge and improving the efficiency of systems, helping the employees of other job-creating companies to be more effective and more competitive in this global economy. And where it comes home full circle is the idea of working with the university in conjunction with the Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force to help preserve knowledge and help strengthen the information technology systems of our Armed Forces, of our national security establishment.

What is exciting about this is tier one with Greg and Norm and Kevin represent hundreds of small businesses

that are creating thousands and thousands of jobs around the country. And what they shared with me, and Kevin shared with me tonight, is that these tax increases are going to hurt their ability to provide for health care, as Congressman SULLIVAN pointed out. It is going to hurt their ability to make needed investments in equipment. It is going to hurt their ability to compete effectively. And I believe it is better to let them keep more of what they have earned because that is going to be recycled into the economy to create more jobs.

And the model we are following, as Solomon said in the Bible, there is nothing new under the sun, was the same model that birthed Silicon Valley. There were intellectual partnerships and entrepreneurial partnerships with Stanford University that led to the greatest explosion of technology and research in the history of modern man. It changed the life of virtually every citizen in this Nation, provided us with technologies and tools and improved a way of life that had never been known before. And now we stand with an opportunity to build that type of a future right in Kentucky. As my colleague, Congressman HAL ROGERS down in the Fifth District, likes to say, representing eastern Kentucky, we may not have Silicon Valley but if we have the right economic policy and the right focus on research and the right focus on developing our young people and especially the right focus on creating an environment to stimulate small business, we may not have Silicon Valley but we can have Silicon Hollow. We can make a difference that provides not only for the next generation that follows us but to keep this Nation competitive in the long run.

And we stand at a crossroads right now. As we mentioned before, in 1,419 days, the average working family in this country is going to see a tax increase of \$2,098. Money that has created 7 million jobs will be taken out of the economy. And what we need to do is look at policies that are proactive, that make a difference.

One colleague who is here with us tonight who also came out of the small business world, who has been in Congress for a long time, who understands both the political side, but most important to me is that he has created jobs, has made a payroll, and he has helped other people deal with these benefits and understand this importance, and that is my friend Congressman JACK KINGSTON from Savannah, Georgia, and I would like him to share some of his perspective.

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

First of all, I want the record to show that Mr. SULLIVAN has four kids and you commented that you have six kids. Are you saying that he does not have a commitment? Is that what is going on here? The rest of us are getting by with one or two kids. Actually, I have

four. But I wanted to say you two families are doing your share for the economy.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I would have to say, Congressman KINGSTON, that based on these tax increases that are coming and these regressive policies that will begin to take effect in 1,419 days, I would say that my six children will become my retirement plan.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, I will tell you what. Also, you and I know people across America will lose that family tax deduction for the children, which is very important.

But I wanted to get into the perspective of a business person, but the way I explain tax increases to school kids, it seems that maybe it should apply to some of these bureaucrats here in Washington, D.C. But yesterday I was speaking to a group called the People to People Exchange, a student ambassador program. And I asked for a volunteer. A young lady who had a job, a young girl who was, I guess, in about the ninth grade named Tracy, she works at Holton's Restaurant in Midway, Georgia. Tracy makes \$5.50 an hour. So I got her up in front of the class, and this was an extracurricular thing. They were actually meeting on a Sunday afternoon. And I said, Okay, Tracy, so you work for 2 hours, \$5.50 an hour. After those 2 hours, you bring home \$11. And she looked at me like, You really are stupid in Washington, you know I don't do that.

I said, How much do you bring home?

She said, Well, it is about nine something.

So I said, Okay. Let us just say for 2 hours' work you bring home \$9 and you send \$2 to me in Washington. Now, what do I do with that tax money?

And, of course, these students know you pay for schools, you pay for roads, you pay for our military. And, Mr. DAVIS, you know Midway. You probably have eaten at Holton's Restaurant. It is right down from Fort Stewart, where you were stationed. Have you eaten there?

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I have been in Midway many times going between Fort Rutger and the Hunter Army Airfield.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, they have a good fish and shrimp platter that is waiting just for you. It has got your name on it.

Anyway, I said to Tracy, Okay, for the \$2 that we get from you that goes to the soldiers at Fort Stewart, goes to the schools, to the building, to the teachers, goes to the roads, goes to the police officers, you are okay with those things because we all agree we need them?

And she says, Yes, sir.

And I said, Okay. Now, if you know I could do it for \$1.50, would you want that extra 50 cents or would you let me have it? Because, you know, if I had that extra 50 cents from you, I could spend money. I could go out and maybe improve some health care and take care of some farm programs. And who

knows? I might even get a little bit more of the Federal Government dollars down to our part of the State.

She didn't like that idea. She felt like she could manage her 50 cents better than we could in Washington, D.C. And I serve on the Appropriations Committee, and I have to say for a high school girl, she is certainly accurate. She can manage her money better than we can manage her money. And yet we have this attitude in Washington that if something is going to happen, government has to be the one to initiate it. So we want the whole \$2.

And the interesting thing that you have already underscored night after night is that if we let her keep that extra 50 cents, taking less of her \$2 in taxes, what is she going to do? She and all the other millions of Tracys and millions of other people like the six Davis kids who will one day be working, they would go out and they might buy more hamburgers, more shoes, more clothes, more tires, more dryers, more washing machines, go out to eat more. And when they do, small businesses react by expanding. They increase their inventory. Then they have to have more people to sell their inventory; so they hire more people. Less people are on welfare. More people are paying taxes. And so the money comes into Washington, D.C. Small businesses win. People who are working win. And the government, at the end of the day, gets more revenue. That has been the case now with George Bush, Ronald Reagan, and John F. Kennedy.

Tax cuts, giving the people the right to keep more of their own hard-earned money actually brings in more revenue. Therefore, to let these tax breaks end and increase taxes on small businesses and on families across America is an absurd policy. And we have got to get folks motivated to realize that this is something that is going to happen unless people back home start raising Cain about it.

So I am glad you are doing what you are doing. And I wanted to yield back because I know we have some other speakers here, but I thank you for your leadership on it.

□ 2015

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I appreciate that, Congressman KINGSTON. It just highlights all the more what you point out, that in 1,419 days, that every working family in America is going to have a \$2,000 tax increase. We think about where that money could go and what it is doing in the economy.

Just for those who might be joining us tonight, we are the Countdown Crew. We meet the first night of every vote and talk about issues that make a difference to creating jobs, that make a difference to our pocketbook, for working families, for small business owners that create the preponderance of our jobs.

We would like for you to join with us, to communicate your stories, to share your experiences. You can contact us

at countdowncrew@mail.house.gov. We are standing by to hear those stories right now. And I just want to thank again BILL SHUSTER's vision to want to execute this program.

As we get ever nearer to those tax increases, we have had Members that are coming to the floor that haven't been politicians their whole life, that have had what I would like to say are real jobs, who have been out there, who know what it is like to have to make a profit.

I know what it is like to make that decision to go without a paycheck to make sure that employee health benefits are paid. And I am not saying that to impress anybody, simply to point out to you, that is a common decision that many small business owners face, making sure that our employees are taken care of. And when taxes are raised, that takes away even more of that flexibility to meet employee and family needs, but also it takes dollars out of the economy or dollars out of the potential of those businesses to create jobs.

One Member who is joining us here tonight who I think has lived a great success story in small business with her husband is Congresswoman THELMA DRAKE from Peninsula, Virginia. She represents the Norfolk area.

The thing that is very exciting about her story that is very consistent with other small business owners who have gotten to taste that piece of the American Dream and all the families that have worked with them or have been benefited by them, is her story coming up as a Realtor, seeing many, many facets of the economy and the impact of these income tax policies, of regressive policies against small business, and yet at the same time the positive impact by allowing people to keep more of what they earn. It has created record revenues, as Congressman KINGSTON mentioned.

Among all the doom and gloom stories, one thing that I would share is that many times when we talk about our global economy, there is a great fear of competing on that global stage. If we compete on a level playing field, the American worker, the American entrepreneurial and creative genius is going to win. But when we talk about competing with countries like China, an emerging superpower, one thing that I would point out is that just in less than 3 years, the U.S. has added to its economy, the increase in our economic output has been \$2.2 trillion. That is bigger than the entire economy of China.

Folks, if we create taxpayers instead of raising taxes, that growth will continue and our children and grandchildren will have the opportunity to compete.

I would like to recognize the gentlewoman from Virginia to share her perspective on this.

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for that and thank him for his commitment to

telling America how important it is that we keep our tax cuts that are in place and the very positive results that have taken place from the tax cuts of 2001 and 2003. Those are real savings that are helping Americans today. At the end of 2006, that tax relief that Americans got to keep in their pockets was valued at \$1.1 trillion. That is a lot of money for families, for small businesses.

You mentioned my experience as a Realtor. I want to tell you, when I was new in the real estate business, I couldn't figure out how to put more time in the day, how do I do all the things that I needed to do. It took me just a while to realize there is no more time in the day, and there are only seven days in the week, and the only answer for me was to hire other people to do the things that I didn't have the time to do.

What that meant for me in my little real estate business was I became an employer. All of a sudden I was paying payroll taxes on employees, as well as paying double for myself as a self-employed individual in the real estate industry. At the end of each year, when I would look at a really good year and sell a lot of real estate, I would say, I am really not making any money for as hard as I am working because so much is going to the Federal Treasury in the way of taxes. So I appreciate that in 2001, when the tax cuts were put into place that we reduced those income tax rates to Americans.

I think a lot of people don't realize that today we have a 10 percent tax rate for our lowest payers, down from 15 percent. That is slated to expire in 2011 if we don't act then and keep that in place. Our other rates dropped by 3 to 4 points, not the full 5 points for our lowest-income Americans.

I have heard you talking in here tonight about your children. I have two children and I have four grandchildren. When I was ran for office, because it was something I felt I needed to do, but not something that had always been a goal of mine, the way I made myself do that every day is I took a picture of my granddaughter, who was then under 2 years old, taped it to the dash of my car, and every time I got in the car I said, Caity, I am doing this for you.

I stand here today now as a Member of Congress and say Caity, and the other three, because there are three more now, I am doing this for you. Because if we want to leave our children the America that we have enjoyed, we have got to make sure that our tax policy supports our economy, that it grows our revenues and it allows Americans to be the ones to decide how they are spending their money.

One of the big changes in growing revenues for our country, of course, is the capital gains tax, which has been reduced from 25 percent to 15 percent. As a Realtor, before coming to Congress, I can't tell you how many times I would hear from people, I can't sell that rental property because I can't

pay that capital gains tax. But in 2003, when that was dropped by 10 percent, that made a lot of difference for people, and people were allowed to take assets and free them up and not be looking at such an overburden of taxes in order to do that.

We have talked about it. Congressman KINGSTON has mentioned President Kennedy. I wrote a quote of his down that I thought I would share tonight with America. This is from President Kennedy. He said: "An economy hampered by restrictive tax rates will never produce enough revenue to balance our budget, just as it will never produce enough jobs or enough profits."

That is the from the 1960s. Here we are in 2007 still having the same discussion and still trying to point out to America that when you keep your own money, that you spend it, you save it, you create jobs, you create wealth for yourself.

We have heard a lot about taxing the wealthy and how we should do more of that. But what people don't realize is by allowing people to grow their own wealth, we do raise taxes on the wealthy. They have actually risen 39 percent. Our income taxes are up 8.8 percent on personal income tax, while corporate income taxes are now up 22.2 percent. What better way is there to raise revenue than allowing people to be successful and spend their own money the way they see fit?

I am dismayed by two actions that were taken by this Congress in the very early days. There is a three-fifths majority that is needed to raise taxes. However, by a simple majority vote of this body, we now have a simple majority vote that is able to waive that. America needs to watch what this body does, and they need to hold us accountable.

The other thing that this Congress did in those early hours is pass something that is called PAYGO. It sounds very good, and Virginia is actually a pay-as-you-go State. We are not allowed to have a deficit in our budget. So it sounds good to everyone, until you stop and realize what it means.

What that means is when these taxes are ready to begin expiring, that in order to keep them in place, that other taxes either have to be raised or spending cuts have to take place to offset them. That doesn't take into consideration at all the positive impact we have seen of reducing taxes. It only looks at things on the surface.

It is like the philosophy that is out there that if we are bringing in a lot of money today with tax policy, let's raise it just a little bit and we will get more. It is actually the opposite that takes place. I believe our responsibility is to grow our economy. Our responsibility is to have a tax policy that grows revenues for us and makes sure that we have the economy and the future for our children and our grandchildren.

I thank you for letting me join you today.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I thank you, Congresswoman DRAKE, for being with us this evening. I think one thing I would like to recognize is that THELMA and her husband are real people who started and ran a real business that created real jobs and a real future for many others.

If you are just joining us, we are the Countdown Crew. We are counting down 1,419 days to one of the largest tax increases in American history if Congress does not take action to make sure that the tax cuts, the benefits that have made such a difference for so many in this country by allowing people to keep more of what they earn, are extended and hopefully made permanent.

I would just like to point out if you would like to communicate with us, we are the countdowncrew@ mail.house.gov. If you have questions or would like to share your story of how being able to keep more of your own money, of your hard-earned resources has benefited you, how it has helped you build a future, we would love to hear from you.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. DAVIS, if the gentleman will yield, I was wondering, I was listening to Mrs. DRAKE talk about something she went over. I think we need to maybe get a good explanation here in terms of Congress voting on a simple majority now. Maybe you could explain that, because under the Republicans it was required to have, was it a three-fifths majority?

Mrs. DRAKE. A three-fifths vote in order to raise taxes.

Mr. KINGSTON. That was in place for 10 or 12 years under Republican leadership. So now the Democrats on their first day changed it from three-fifths required to raise taxes on working people to what?

Mrs. DRAKE. What the rules that were changed were is that by a simple majority vote you can waive that three-fifths vote. I have not seen that written anywhere. Everyone that I have told about this back at home is shocked. Their eyes get big. I think they felt safe to think it would take a three-fifths supermajority vote to raise taxes in America, and they are very distressed to hear it. That is why I wanted to mention it tonight, because so few people know that that took place in the opening of this session in our House rules. I think that is unfair, and I think America should know it, and I think America should watch what we do.

Mr. KINGSTON. Thanks.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I appreciate you pointing that out. That was one of those surprises that I think affected a lot of people or that will affect a lot of people in the months and the years ahead. The reason for that 60 percent or three-fifths majority was to make sure that it was clearly the will of the American people to raise taxes instead of cutting spending, that people would be accountable.

In effect, what we were doing was something similar in line to the way

the Senate works, with their rules of cloture to end debate. They have to have a 60-vote supermajority. Certainly, over there that would be absolutely necessary for any type of a measure that would raise taxes or lower them. In the same vein, I think it was right for us to have that in this body, because in 1,419 days we will be raising taxes.

The one thing that we all believe in the Countdown Crew is that the goal of the government should not be to create new taxes, but to create taxpayers. We want to cut taxes, allow people to keep more of what they earn. And that is why we have had 7 million new jobs created and record revenues into the Federal Treasury, because the economy is working. Even in a time of war, it continues to grow, and it is incredible that we are able to compete so effectively in a global economy. We need to allow people to keep their resources to build that future for their children and grandchildren.

With that, I would like to recognize another real person who helped run a real business creating jobs out in the economy before he came to Congress, and that is our leader of the Countdown Crew, Congressman BILL SHUSTER from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky. I appreciate your leadership down there on the floor, and I appreciate everybody that has been here tonight. As always, with those of us down here on the Countdown Crew, we all come from business backgrounds, most of us, if not all of us, small business backgrounds. I ran a business that employed between 30 and 40 people. And many, many Americans, small business owners, know just how difficult it is to meet payroll every month, to pay your bills.

There are many people here in Congress that talk about the escalating costs of health care and how difficult it is. But there aren't that many, there are few that are in Congress that have experienced that, like Mr. DAVIS has, I know Mr. KINGSTON or THELMA DRAKE or myself. We saw it happen year after year, and it is something that we are all concerned about. It is something that we all want to make sure we find an answer to, seeing that health care costs don't continue to climb.

But the answer is not to raise taxes. That works just the opposite. And I am very, very concerned that the American people are not aware, that was one of the reasons that getting together with Mr. DAVIS and Mr. KINGSTON and Mrs. DRAKE and others, we came up with this idea to talk about the countdown to the tax increase, because we are concerned about it, and because the Democrat majority does not have to do anything.

□ 2030

They have to run out the clock, and if they run out the clock on 1419 days, there is going to be the largest tax increase in American history, over \$200

billion. That does not occur all at one shot. It is going to occur over the next 4 years.

In 2008, there are certain tax cuts will expire; in 2009, 2010; and then January 1, 2011, all the tax cuts put in place will have expired, and we will see our taxes go up considerably.

If you are at home thinking about what your tax liability is going to be in the future, you need to realize that the Democrat majority, as Mrs. DRAKE and Mr. KINGSTON pointed out and discussed about the difference between the three-fifths and the simple majority, the Democrats changed those rules in the very first days of the Congress so that they can raise your taxes.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from New York, said before the election that he did not know of any of the Bush tax cuts that he thought were worthy of continuing or extending.

So they have made it quite clear from their leadership, to the fact they changed the rules, that they intend to raise taxes. Why they keep talking about the deficits and deficit spending, and that is the answer to it, well, I believe just the opposite. It is not the answer to it.

If you look at the revenues in 2006 to the Federal Government, they increased by 9.7 percent in 2006. The deficit is down 50 percent of where we projected it to be in 2005. The 2006 deficit is down 50 percent as to where we project it to be, and why is that? That is because the revenues are coming into the Federal Government in significant numbers.

In 2005, there was an over 14 percent increase in revenues. That is because the economy is growing. That is because the Republican majority tried to hold the line on spending. We did not do enough. We need to do more, but the worst thing to do is to put a halt, put a hurdle on this economy, put a bump in the road to stop this economy from growing.

As many have said tonight, talked about the facts, the numbers, in December alone, there were 167,000 jobs created in this country; in January, 111,000 jobs. To date, over the last 4 years, there have been 7.3 million jobs created in America, and those are due to allowing the American people and small businesses to keep more of their hard-earned dollars in their own pockets so that they can go out and buy new things, whether it is a washer and dryer or whether it is a downpayment on a new car or saving money for college, putting that money away, \$2,000 at a clip; and that is what the average American with a family of four and making between \$40,000 and \$50,000 a year, if these tax cuts are not extended, they are going to be hit with about a \$2,000, \$2,200 tax increase. If you take that money, \$2,000 a year, and put it in a bank account at 5 percent interest over 10 years that grows to \$30,000. That is a nice downpayment on a house. That is a nice downpayment

on your kid's education. It is your money. It should not be sent to Washington. We want to keep it out there in the families of America and the small business of America.

As I said more of those numbers, we are at 4.6 percent unemployment, and it is the lowest rate on average over the last 4 decades. Cutting taxes drive this economy in a positive way. And others have said here tonight, and just to remind people that we are not the first to use tax cuts to move this economy forward, Ronald Reagan did it in the 1980s, and this economy grew by leaps and bounds. And President John F. Kennedy did it in the 1960s, cut taxes to spur this economy on, and that is what we need to do.

As I said, there are millions of Americans out there today that are depending on these tax rates to stay low. There are millions of small businesses which are the backbone of this economy that are counting on us keeping these tax cuts in place. There are millions of small businesses and farmers in this country hoping that we will extend the death tax so that they can plan for their future, so they can do the financial planning necessary because the alternative is it will expire at the end of 2010. The alternative is, if you cannot plan properly for expansion, for the future, you certainly do not want to die so that your family gets that tax, the tax break that we put in place.

So this is extremely important, as I said, to Americans across the spectrum, across this Nation from Arizona to Pennsylvania to Washington to Florida. I know millions of Americans, actually 10.6 Americans, low-income Americans, that are not paying taxes at all today because of the tax cuts we put into place in 2001 and 2003.

As we have been talking about for the last month this countdown to the tax increase, 1,419, dies, if Mr. DAVIS will put that chart back up, not the chart but our e-mail address. We have the CountdownCrew@mail.house.gov. We would love to hear from across this country how Americans have utilized these tax cuts, whether it is the child tax credit, whether it is the accelerated depreciation or any of the decreases in the marginal income tax rates. If you have utilized the Tax Code in a positive way, we want to hear about that. We want to be able to talk about that on the House floor.

One story that I have, back in central Pennsylvania, Dr. Greg Pyle is the president of Oil Surgery Associates. His practices are in Bedford County and Blair County, Pennsylvania, which are in the Ninth Congressional District of Pennsylvania. He has seen steady growth over the past 10 years, some of the most impressive growth being in small Bedford County. It is about 45,000. According to Dr. Pyle, medical practices usually plateau financially from 5 to 8 years. However, Dr. Pyle's medical partnership, which has been in business for 12 years, has seen some of

its greatest growth just in the past couple of years. He attributes that directly to the reduction in taxes and that people have more money in their pocket that they can come in and utilize his services that he provides to them in central Pennsylvania.

Again, we have many, many other stories, but I just want at this point to yield back to my good friend from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I thank you, Congressman SHUSTER. For those of you who are watching, if you would like to share your perspective, your view, join us via e-mail at CountdownCrew@mail.house.gov, and remember that in 1,419 days, there is a bill arriving.

I would put it to you in a question like this. If you knew or you suddenly went to the mailbox and opened the box up and there was a bill for \$2,100 and it was due immediately, that is what is coming if these tax cuts are not extended and made permanent.

Despite the fact of the economic improvement in this Nation, the Democratic Congress is committed to raise taxes. The last time they raised taxes was 25 days ago in the energy industry that has an effect on virtually every job in America, and now we are looking at a wide variety of taxes.

Facts are stubborn things. The success of Republican tax relief initiatives are undeniable. That is the reason that Congressman SHUSTER and I and the Countdown Crew like to say we want to create taxpayers, not raise taxes. We want to create taxpayers, not create new taxes because the job creators who are out there are real people, like Jack Kingston who was in the insurance industry; Thelma Drake from Virginia now who was a Realtor; Bill Shuster who worked in the automotive support industry. I worked in the manufacturing industry, and all of us saw firsthand the impact of government policies that were often well meant by folks that passed these laws, but they never worked out in that environment to understand the impact that it had on the pocketbook of working Americans.

As we stand here tonight for the seventh week since the Democrats took control of Congress, I am pleased to report one thing, though, is that the Democrats have come to the realization that some facts just cannot be ignored.

This week, the House will vote on H.R. 976, and that is the Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2007. This bipartisan legislation extends critical tax provisions for small business owners and paves the way for the House and the Senate to come to agreement on raising the minimum wage from \$5.15 cents to \$7.25.

I know you supported this measure, Mr. SHUSTER, and so did I, but we realize also how important this provision can be for young people just starting out, for working families, and I am glad that the Democrats have realized

how important some of the tax incentives are to keeping our businesses growing and creating new jobs, but we cannot stop here. We have got to make this and all the other tax relief provisions permanent that affect individual families, because real people who hold real jobs out in the real world, not here in the halls of Congress, are the ones that pay those taxes, that foot that bill like that \$2,098 bill that is going to be arriving in 2 years, in the very near future, if these tax policies are not extended, if they are not continued for the great benefit that they have brought forward.

I would like to highlight some tax provisions that need to be made permanent. First of all, the \$1,000 child tax credit reverts to \$500. For a family of four, that is \$2,000. In my case, my wife Pat and I have six children. That is \$3,000. It goes on and on, affecting people right in their pocketbook.

That \$500 difference is not \$500 that is going for a corporate jet or some rich and famous lifestyle for people who were seen in the tabloid shows on TV. That \$500 tax credit goes to real people who live in the real world. They are spending that on their children and investing that in their children's future. I believe we need to allow them to keep more of what they earned because they are going to spend it in a way that is going to benefit their children and their children's children.

Congresswoman DRAKE mentioned earlier the 10 percent tax bracket. Contrary to some of the spin in the media, the truth of the matter is that the tax burdens have been pushed upward. It is those with more that are paying more now with the structure of these cuts. Millions of people have been taken off the tax rolls, and in fact, the 10 percent bracket was created specifically as a transition for lower-income earners so their tax burden would not be that high, that they would be able to keep more of what they earn to be sure they meet their basic necessities. That 10 percent bracket will disappear when those tax cuts expire in 2010 without action from Congress and from the Senate and from the President of the United States.

I would mention in a light moment that Kentucky is the home of Kentucky Fried Chicken. We were meeting with KFC franchisees from all around the country that came into Washington last week to give their small business ownership perspective, what they do in the food service industry, and they talked unceasingly about the benefits of tax policies that help working families, that help them as small business owners that made sure that they could keep the dollars in their community, creating jobs in their community instead of sending it to bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

One thing that they brought up that was very important and really affects any capital-intensive business that they wished for was the continuation of the 15-year accelerated depreciation

for improvements on new construction of restaurant buildings. Under old law, we are looking at a 30-year depreciation schedule, and when you think about the food service industry, as competitive as it is with new fads and themes to be able to meet the needs of the consumer, 30 years is quite a long time, and I can think of a difference in my lifetime.

These business owners, these men and women who were creating thousands and thousands of jobs around the United States, asked to not have their tax burden eliminated, but simply to have it structured in such a way that they could compete more effectively.

They understand the importance of creating taxpayers versus taxes because those dollars, creating jobs, will come back into the economy, and as we have seen with record revenues to the Federal Government, by cutting taxes we have improved revenue.

The Republican-led Congress had acted and extended these important tax relief provisions to 2007, but we need to make them permanent.

I would like to defer now to my colleague from Pennsylvania to share some more of his perspective on this issue.

Mr. SHUSTER. I appreciate that. You made a very important point about the minimum wage. I think you and I both voted at the end of the last Congress to increase the minimum wage, but it failed in the Senate. It was not able to get through in the Senate.

What is happening here today is that our friends on the other side, they stand up on the House floor and claim that they have raised the minimum wage when, in fact, all they have done is pass it in the House. It is not law yet. It takes both bodies to pass it.

Thank goodness for the United States Senate. They are putting back in those tax cuts for small business. They are absolutely critical for small businesses.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Just as an aside, if the gentleman would yield, I am becoming a much bigger fan of the policies and rules of the U.S. Senate since November 8.

Mr. SHUSTER. I agree with you on that.

There is a small amusement park in my district, Lakelawn Park, and I was talking to the general manager of Lakelawn Park, and he told me the increase in the minimum wage is going to cost him between \$130,000 to \$150,000 to the bottom line, and what they employ are mainly high school kids in the summertime to run those rides. He said that kids starting out at minimum wage, if they had been there for a period of time they certainly make more than that.

□ 2045

But without any kind of tax decrease or other kind of tax benefit, that is going to cost them \$130,000. It is going to cause him to hire less kids to work in the summer because he is not going

to be able to afford that kind of hit to his bottom line. So we passed it here in the House, we know, and unfortunately the national news media, unlike in 1995 when the Republicans took control, I remember it well. The first 100 days, every time the Republicans would pass something the national news media was quick to point out, Well, they haven't done anything yet, they just passed the House.

And that is all that happened here in the first 100 hours, is we passed the House. Minimum wage has not gone up. It will go up with probably a lot of Republican votes if the Senate comes through with the tax measures that they proposed. And I know the House, Johnny-come-lately to the tax cut for small businesses, we are going to hopefully pass something here this week to offer some of those tax cuts, but not near enough what small businesses need. Our small business owners are out there every day creating jobs, meeting payrolls, working long hours, and giving back to the community.

The community I come from, when you look at who are the people that are contributing to the charities and the different civic organizations, it is the small business owner, giving back to its community to make it a better place to live. So I think it is so important that we put tax breaks in, we make the ones permanent that we passed in 2001 and 2003.

And I just have another story of a small business owner from my district, Greg Rothman with RSR Realty in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, which is Carlisle, Pennsylvania, near Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. He has seen a massive increase in his business due to the economic policies that were put in place over the last several years. The lower tax burden has trickled down, and houses are being sold and houses are being built, more attractive for the consumers to buy throughout Pennsylvania, and especially in central Pennsylvania in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, and employment rate is about 3.3, 3.4, 4 percent, one of the lowest in the State.

Reductions in capital gains tax have allowed many empty nesters to enter the housing market to buy homes, to improve what they are living in, or downsize into nicer places. It has helped his realty business grow. And since becoming a partner in RSR realty in 1999, Greg has seen it grow from 20 Realtors to 60, which is an increase of 40 jobs in about the past 7 or 8 years. And it is these economic policies that we have put in place that have caused this to happen; and Greg said that he has seen the highest sales volume since he has entered the industry.

And I think that is important to tell those kinds of stories. Those are real people; those are real jobs. And I want to remind people that we would like to hear those kinds of stories; we want to hear from all across America. At the countdowncrew@mail.house.gov, you can send us in that story, your success

story, and how you utilized those tax cuts that have been put in place in the early 2000s and why we need to keep them in place. So we would love to hear stories from business people, small, medium-sized, and large all around the country. We certainly would appreciate that.

At this time I will yield back to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman and point out that we in the Countdown Crew can be contacted at countdowncrew@mail.house.gov. The stories that we tell are about real people who are creating real jobs and live in the real world, and they understand the real effects of the policies that are generated here in Washington, that create value, that create a future, and those that create impediment and create barriers to growth.

I think of my friend George Hammond who runs Hammond Automotive. He started in Covington, Kentucky, years ago, and he invested in his business the great benefits that have come from the tax cuts that were passed by the Republican Congress, allowing the American people to keep more of what they own, have benefited him and his employees and family. His business has grown. In fact, he opened a new outlet, a new store in Burlington, Kentucky, to reach even more people and to create even more jobs.

It is like my friend Don Salyers who runs a river transport operation in Ashland, Kentucky, giving opportunity for creating more jobs and a future for that community that is in economic transition.

This week we are going to vote for a tax incentive package that will help to keep the American economy strong by extending tax policies that we passed in prior Congresses. We owe it to our families and this Nation, to our working families, to small business owners, and ultimately to the health of the economy to allow people to keep more of what they earn. We need to do more that creates that future and creates taxpayers, instead of raising taxes.

One thing that I would like to comment on here tonight is the extension of the work opportunity tax credit. Small business owners, especially those that have to take somebody and intensively train them to bring them into that workplace, into that small business to make them into a taxpayer need incentives and opportunities. For example, we have many people who have had some challenges in life, that may have lived life on the edge, may be going through a transition in life, and we want to give them that opportunity. But the way to do that is not to mandate that. The way to do that is not simply to set aside the taxpayers' dollars with no stewardship or oversight, but is to allow the market and the economy to work by providing accountability for those small business owners on the frontline, and also the opportunity and the incentive to make an investment. And what the work op-

portunity tax credit does is it incentivizes small business owners to hire higher-risk employees, and the goal again is creating taxpayers.

What are some examples of this? Dealing with high-risk youth. My wife, Pat, and I worked with Youth on the Edge for over 20 years before I came to Congress. And the one thing that I can say is there are many young people that need a vision; they need a new start to overcome mistakes that were made earlier, some wrong assumptions they had about their environment, oftentimes the consequences of poor decisions that they made.

On first blush, a business owner could be hard pressed to want to make that investment. But what this tax credit does is gives an offset to that business owner to make that investment, to reduce the risk, to give somebody a chance. That is the kind of framework, the kind of regulation that government should give that allows the market to work, to bring out the best in people, and ultimately strengthen our economy in the long term.

You know, as I close tonight before yielding to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his final words, our mission in the Countdown Crew is to do two things: first, it is to let the American people know that in 1,419 days, a \$2,100 bill is going to arrive in the mail to basically every taxpayer in the United States when the tax cuts that have produced so much will be repealed automatically, when they sunset. We need to allow people to keep more of what they earn. We have seen the great benefits that come to the economy from that.

The other thing that we do in the Countdown Crew is we want to highlight the positive impact of policies that allow people to control their own lives. The government doesn't create jobs; all it can do is create a framework and environment that either empowers people or restrains them and holds them back. And what we want to do is join with you and the Countdown Crew, and you can contact us at countdowncrew@mail.house.gov to get the American people's story here in the House of Representatives so that the Congress will know, and compel the Congress to act, to allow the small business owners who create the bulk of jobs in this country to keep more of what they earn, to invest it in their employees, to allow working families to keep more of what they earn and invest it in their employees; so that in 1,490 days we can continue creating opportunities rather than stopping something that has been a great benefit.

With that, I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to close.

Mr. SHUSTER. I appreciate that. And I think the point you made is worth repeating, because I know you and I believe this and many of our colleagues believe this, especially on this side of the aisle, that government doesn't create jobs. We can only create

an environment to give people the opportunity to create jobs, small entrepreneurs and business people across this country. And our fiscal problems in this country, our financial problems with the government, isn't that the government taxes too little. It is that we spend entirely too much. And I know the coming weeks, I know especially the new Members of Congress are going to be put to the test to stand up and be accounted for, because there are many people who say that America voted for a change in November, and they did.

But I know there is nobody in the Ninth Congressional District and nobody that I have come across as I travel this country that wanted to change from a lower tax system to higher taxes. Nobody wants to do that. And our goal is, in the Countdown Crew, to make the American people aware that the Democrats don't have to do anything; they can run out the clock, and on January 1, 2011, they will have the largest tax increase in American history, over \$200 billion. And I believe it is our duty to make sure that we are talking about it so that the American people know what the majority intends to do by changing the rules on their first couple of days of Congress from a three-fifths majority to a simple majority to raise taxes, they have made it a lot easier to raise taxes.

They put PAYGO into place which only deals with new spending, and it really does nothing to address the deficits we have today. So PAYGO really should be TAXGO, because that is what the American people are going to see.

So, again, we urge you to e-mail us at countdowncrew@mail.house.gov, because we want to hear your stories about how you have put those tax cuts into use to create jobs and make America a more prosperous place.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise their remarks on the subject of my Special Order this evening.

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

There was no objection.

THE SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome my colleagues from Oregon who are in the Chamber with me tonight. Congressman DEFAZIO and Congresswoman DARLENE HOOLEY are here with me, and I know we will be joined by other members of

the Northwest delegation to talk about a very, very important issue, the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act, H.R. 17, also known as County Payments, that in both this Congress and the last has been a strongly bipartisan issue. The DeFazio-Walden legislation, H.R. 17, a bill to reauthorize and fund the County Payments Program for 7 years to date enjoys the support of 114 cosponsors in this Congress. The exact same bill last Congress had 139 cosponsors.

As I have said in 13 of 18 one-minute floor speeches: the failure of Congress, either the last one or this one, to reauthorize the County Payments Program amounts to a breach of faith to more than 600 forested counties all across America and 4,400 school districts all across this country.

I would like to take a moment to highlight a few of the impacts of the rural forested counties and school districts in America without these funds: severe cuts in funding for jail beds; sheriffs' patrols are being cut sometimes in half; criminal prosecutions and the pursuit of meth cooks, all of that being reduced; rural school districts foregoing overdue repairs; may not be able to buy textbooks, or face significant challenges busing kids to schools. It also means libraries will close in places like Jackson County, Oregon.

I would like to draw your attention to this poster here to my left. It is from a young lady, a fifth grader named Alice from Ashland, Oregon, who utilizes one of the 15 Jackson County libraries where she lives, and they are all scheduled to close in just a couple of months, in April, if we don't reauthorize and fund the Secure County Schools legislation.

Alice has resolved to read all the "Hank the Cowdog" books, but she needs these libraries to stay open. She says: "Representative WALDEN, I live in Ashland and I go to Bellview School. I am in the fifth grade. I use our library a lot. We always use books on tape for car trips. My New Year's resolution is to read all the "Hank the Cowdog" books, and the library has them all. I need the library to stay open so I can finish my resolution. I also use a lot of books here for school reports. Please help to keep our library system open. Sincerely, Alice."

Alice is a fifth grader in Ashland, Oregon. She gets it. If Alice can get it, this Congress ought to be able to get it, and we ought to be able to keep the libraries open in Jackson County.

Many of you in this Chamber and Americans all across the land will remember the heart-wrenching service for the Kim family in southern Oregon this winter, lost in the national forest, and the mountain climbers who perished on Mount Hood just 45 minutes from my home in Hood River. Both of these counties, both of the search and rescue operations that took place used funds out of the program that Congressman DEFAZIO and others and I are

trying to reauthorize to help pay for the equipment and for the search and rescue operations, to go on Federal land using county resources to look for these people who were lost, some of whom perished.

These vital county services and rural school programs were once funded by timber receipts, but because of virtual elimination of the timber harvest on our Federal forests, Congress approved the county payments to develop forest health improvement projects on public lands and simultaneously stimulate job development in some of our rural communities.

□ 2100

This law has been a primary funding mechanism to provide rural schools with educational opportunities comparable to suburban and urban students. It has also restored programs for students in rural schools and prevented the closure of numerous isolated rural schools. It has allowed over 600 rural counties to address the severe road maintenance backlog.

Before I get into that, though, I would like to show you total Pacific Northwest timber receipts. As you can see here, it has fluctuated over the years, but it has never been as low as it is today. There were big years of timber harvest, this one up, very large; but generally it has been in this framework, and you can see, really, since the 1990s it has just gone way down.

The Federal Government has had a compact with these counties dating back to when Teddy Roosevelt was President and created the great forest reserves, setting aside huge swaths of land. Upwards to half of my district is under Federal management and control, and many of my colleagues and some of my counties it is upwards to 70, 75 percent.

The Federal Government believed in 1908 and again in 1938 that it had a responsibility to help these communities surrounded by Federal lands because these lands were not going to be on their tax base. That is what started this whole program. They used to share timber receipts. As you can see, timber harvests went down, the receipts went down.

You say, what happened to our wood products system? Well, here is what happened. See what happened on Federal forest lands. This is 1980 here, top level, about 11 billion board feet sold. Then it drops way down in the red. Where did we get the lumber? Imports. Soft wood lumber imports right there, the blue and the yellow.

So this came along, we said timber receipts are down, so we are going to replace it, 6 years ago, now almost 7. We authorized this Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act.

The country has 7,500 national forests and grasslands covering 192 million acres. That is the size of Texas, by the way. Our State of Oregon has 15 national forests. We are proud of them.

You need to know they cover 14 million acres, or nearly one-quarter of the State's land mass. There are forests in my district that cover nearly 12 million acres.

To put this in perspective, within the Forest Service regions 8 and 9, which cover 34 States, all States east of the Missouri River, Oklahoma and Texas, there are 52 national forests covering 25 million acres. My district alone has nearly half that amount of acreage. You can see those of us in the rural West are really impacted by what goes on in the Federal lands, whether it is search and rescue operations, forest fire operations. You name it, it is expensive.

When the Federal reserves were created, we set up this funding mechanism, again going back to 1908 and then coming forward. The problem now is promise to rural schools, the promise to rural communities, and the promise to rural roads has been broken. It broke last year, and it is up to us now in this Congress to keep the faith with the school kids of America and rural America, to keep faith with the resource advisory committees. They are bringing environmentalists and others together to improve forest health and habitat, great projects all over the country, to keep faith with basic county services that are being provided, funded by this program.

Folks, last checks went out the end of the year. What is happening now is the pink slips are going out. Road departments are being cut in half. County sheriffs' departments are being cut in half. School teachers getting pink slips, being told, we are not sure we will have the money to hire you back next year. This is now a crisis, and it is time for Congress to act.

I would at this point like to yield to my colleague from Oregon, my partner in this effort, H.R. 17, to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act, PETER DEFAZIO from southern Oregon, the Fourth District.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue and for bringing this both to the attention of the House and the American people. Obviously, we don't need to do much to communicate the level of concern with people at home and in our districts, or even in hundreds of counties scattered across America.

In fact, across America, over 4,400 rural schools in 40 States will lose funding if this legislation is not reauthorized. 4,400 rural school districts. You can bet most of those rural school districts are already hurting trying to provide the next generation of young Americans with a good education. In some counties all the rural schools will be closed due to a lack of funding if this legislation is not reauthorized.

My colleague from Oregon already talked earlier about the highly publicized search and rescue that went on back at the end of last year, the begin-

ning of this year, for the Kim family. You know, this is not, this was a difficult search and rescue mission, since we didn't know where that family was. They were difficult to locate until later they were found by high-tech tech means.

But the fact is that we will not even have the capability to begin those searches in many counties in southern Oregon and, indeed, across the West and some other parts of the country if this legislation is not reauthorized. Deputy sheriffs are already receiving layoff notices. Counties don't have the same fiscal year as they have here in Washington D.C.

For many counties, the money authorized last October is going to run out about 3 months into their next fiscal year, so we have to begin now to send out layoff notices. We will have hundreds of thousands of square miles of the western United States with no rural law enforcement. What a mecca for meth dealers, organized crime and other criminal elements, potentially even terrorists, if our counties cannot support basic rural law enforcement services; 780 rural counties will lose funding for roads, roads that provide the movement of the trees to the mills that provide the movement of Americans to recreate in their great public lands. Those funds would dramatically cut and in some cases almost eliminate it.

Yes, we are talking about a lot of money here, you are right. It is a lot of money where I come from. It is a lot of money for most Americans: \$400 million a year is invested in counties and rural schools across America, and the return is many times that.

Let me talk about an element of something we haven't talked about yet. It is not just critical services, not just schools, not just law enforcement, not just search and rescue. It is actually benefits to the public lands. Here on chart 1, I have before and after photos of hazardous fuels reduction near Eureka, California, in an at-risk community adjacent to public lands in northern California, obviously before, after. That will cut fire fighting costs, it will save lives, it will save resources.

Here we have another that depicts peeled logs that are being used for temporary utility poles, actually in the southeastern United States after the Katrina disaster. Again, these came out of a watershed improvement program, a fuel reduction program, funded by these payments.

Then finally I have here, yes, economic diversification, local economic development, small investments in peeling logs and creating posts here at the Hayfork South Highway Three Fuels Reduction Project in California.

So these investments benefit the resource. So we are not just talking about crucial public services. We are also talking about money that we have put back into the resources. We live there. We know how valuable these resources are. We want to save them and

improve them for future generations; but without these funds, some of that investment will be put at risk.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I would just like to follow up on something the gentleman said. You talked about law enforcement needs on these rural lands. Wheeler County, Oregon, population less than 2,000 people, has three deputies and a sheriff. Total of four are doing law enforcement. They will have to layoff a quarter of their force as a result of the loss of this program if we don't reauthorize it.

Now, I tell you that because they are responsible for patrolling 1,833 square miles. That is an area 30 times larger than the District of Columbia. You are going to have three officers, the sheriff and a couple of deputies, over 30 times the size of the district, you have got more than that probably standing right out behind us here.

Now, who are these deputies? One of them rides horseback. He is out riding horseback on Federal land, and what does he come across? I don't know if you can see this, but he comes across a \$19 million marijuana grove. These little vertical lines here, horizontal lines here, are a marijuana grove, a Mexican drug cartel with illegal nationals doing the cultivation.

It is amazing to me they got it to grow out there, but they did. It is a \$19 million growth spread over a quarter of a mile of Federal lands, and it was one of these sheriff deputies riding horseback that spotted this. These are on Federal lands. Why is the Federal Government doing this? Well, the Federal Government is helping to pay for some of this, but now it is breaking its promise.

I yield now to our colleague from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), who has been a real champion in helping us on this.

Ms. HOOLEY. I thank my colleague for yielding. I just want to talk a little bit about the commitment the Federal Government made. We made this commitment, as one of my colleagues said, almost 100 years ago, that we were going to help those counties that had a lot of timber. I used to be a county commissioner. Over 50 percent of the Clackamas County was in Federal forest land, which means we didn't get revenue from it.

When we first started this program, when we cut the timber, then we got revenue sharing. It was in lieu of taxes because this was land we couldn't tax, couldn't develop, couldn't tax. Then when the forest land came along, obviously those numbers were cut.

The rural counties had a double whammy. They lost good-paying jobs and they lost that revenue sharing. Almost 7 years ago, when we reauthorized this program to say we are going to help our rural communities, they are really important. I mean, rural communities, I think, are what keeps us the kind of country we are. I mean, that is where so many of our values were started.

We said we were going to help them, and we were going to help with roads,

and they have just the number of miles a rural county has, we are going to help with roads. We would help with those rural schools so that all of our children had a chance to go to school and have a good education. We said we would help with law enforcement, so we were trying to help those counties make sure they could keep going.

I want to tell you every county in my district is very frugal. I do not see programs that are wasteful. They spend every dollar they have as well as they can spend it.

If this, if we do not get the money for this program, let me talk a little bit about what is going to happen to some of my counties. One of my counties is Polk County. It is a small rural farming community. It is not as big as one of the counties you were talking about. It only has 740 square miles.

The county will essentially go down to five deputies from 18 now; six of those are paid by the Grand Ronde Tribe, and they can only patrol a small portion, but they will lose at least seven deputies. They have started a wonderful program to go after meth and drugs. They have been very successful. That program is going to be gone.

The county jail is going to lose two positions, and let me tell you something, they are already at the State minimum on county positions. I don't know what they are going to do when they lose two more. I don't know how they operate. They have a small district attorney's office. They are going to lose a secretary, and they are going to lose a DA, but this is just typical of what is happening in every county.

Now, I know you put up this chart, and I want to put it up one more time, because I think it is really important; and this is a chart that is what has happened to Federal timber receipts. All you have to do is look since 1994, you can see in 1990, it was the highest, or 1988, and then it has gone down and down and down. So the counties are no longer getting money from the timber receipts.

The only way we can keep these counties going is through this program that allows us to make sure that we can continue our rural communities and that we can continue our schools, that we can continue law enforcement. You talked a little bit about search and rescue. A couple of my counties have had huge cases this year where, and, again, you talked about loss of life with the climbers on Mount Hood, we talked about the Kim family.

Search and rescue, when you have a county that has a lot of wilderness, you get people that are lost. We all feel badly when someone is lost, and none of us will hesitate to go look for that person, but it means it takes resources, it takes money to make that happen. So the loss of money for these rural counties is just devastating to them. We made a promise, and I don't know about you guys, but I grew up in a family that said, if you make a promise,

you keep that promise. We need to keep our promises to our counties.

□ 2115

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. If I could follow up. You talked about Polk County. Klamath County has a total law enforcement operation of 35 officers to patrol 6,000 square miles. 6,000 square miles. They have to cut that by a third. Sheriff Tom Evinger says they may well end up having no law enforcement patrols at night, nor do the state police patrol at night.

That is an area 100 times larger than the District of Columbia. And when they do patrol they will have no back up. I mean, this is really serious stuff, folks. Search and rescue as you mentioned, the loss on Mt. Hood, but the loss down in southern Oregon, those are just the two that caught the media's attention, and the country and the world's attention.

Let me suggest, as we all know from the northwest, there are many, many more search and rescue operations going on all of the time.

Ms. HOOLEY. They go on almost daily. I just want to mention another county. Tillamook County, which is a small coastal community. It is county that has struggled. And they struggle with high-paying jobs. They have had a terrible year with floods and wind storms. About everything bad that can happen to a county has happened to Tillamook County especially in this year.

But they are having to layoff anywhere from 25 to 60 employees, they do not know yet. But literally they will reduce their county road fund by half. Again, it is a county that has struggled with floods. They have had a lot of repairs. I tried to get into Tillamook County to go look at the damage from floods.

I found out, well, actually I couldn't get in from the north, I couldn't get in from the east, you had to go clear around and come in going south to north to actually get to Tillamook County. So many of their roads were just wiped out, and yet they are going to lose a good percentage of their county road fund.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I would comment. And certainly the gentleman from southern Oregon too, that Lake County, this is 93 percent of their road budget. 93 percent of the road budget. I think you can probably put the State of New Hampshire inside Lake County and still have some room to graze cattle.

Ms. HOOLEY. I am sure you could

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. This is so serious to those counties. We have got to get this done.

Mr. DEFAZIO. We have been joined by a couple of other Members, I am sure we want to get to those. But just a quick thing. I came from Lane County, I was a commissioner in the early 1980s, when we had a drop off in timber revenues due to markets and not as catastrophic as this. And yet at that

time, in a county this size, and we have to relate this to our colleagues back here, they cannot understand how big our districts are, a county which is just one of my counties, the size of the State of Connecticut had no rural law enforcement patrols outside of contract deputies and a couple of small communities, a county the size of the State of Connecticut. And we are headed back to that point in many counties in the western United States.

Ms. HOOLEY. I just want to remind people too in trying to get our colleagues to understand, this is not an Oregon problem, it is not just a Washington problem, it is not just a northern California problem, this is a problem across the United States. We are hit specifically very hard because of the amount of Federal forests that we have in our State. But this cuts across, I think it is 4,400 different school districts benefit from this program. It is absolutely critical.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I do see we have been joined by a couple other of colleagues, CATHY MCMORRIS ROGERS from the great State of Washington, who has been very active on forest and forest health issues when I chaired that subcommittee last session.

I know MIKE THOMPSON from northern California has joined us as well. He has been active in helping us on this. Perhaps we could turn from our colleague from Washington State.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Thank you, Mr. WALDEN and Mr. DEFAZIO for your leadership on this issue, for organizing this time for all of us this evening.

I have the honor of representing a district in eastern Washington. We are known for our vast public forests in that area. We have over 2½ million acres of forest lands.

And these lands and this timber plays a very important role in our region's economy. Maintaining healthy forests is essential to those who make a living from the land, and for those who use it for other purposes.

Unfortunately there are a number of critical issues that impact the health and the economic stability of the forests in our region. As many have mentioned this evening, since 1908 the counties that host forest lands from which timber is cut receive a share from the Federal Government of the timber receipts, about 25 percent.

This is such important money for these counties and schools, used to fund road improvements, fire stations, police protection. And yet as the timber sales have declined, funding received by the counties and schools have also declined. It is because of that issue that we come before you tonight, and that the Secure Rural Schools Fund was originally established, and why it is so important that it continues to be established.

It is essential for the livelihood of rural communities in eastern Washington. The Federal Government owns the majority of the land in many of the counties I represent, like others have

mentioned tonight, for example Okanogan County, which is one of the largest counties in the country, it is 73 percent owned by the Government.

That means 27 percent of the remaining land that is under private ownership is the tax base for a county that is six times the size of Rhode Island. That is the funding from those lands that is used to support search and rescue. Last year they saved a woman's life. And this year they will be forced to cut the special training and equipment and the jobs of some of those who work on the team.

Without revenue from timber receipts, along with the inability to tax Federal land, these communities do not have enough money to provide essential community services and educational opportunities. I remain hopeful that we will be able to find the funding for the reauthorization of this program.

I am hopeful because we do not have another option. In Ferry County, the largest employer was Vaagen Brothers Lumber. I say was because they had to close in 2003. Ferry County has 18 percent private ownership of land. And they too are dependent upon these resources, and we need to keep the promise to our rural communities and schools.

In the State of Washington, half of the money from the secure rural schools goes to support schools. It means \$21 million for the State of Washington, and although I would prefer this money go to the schools that are actually timber-dependent schools, nevertheless it is important money to our schools.

For Newport, Washington it means a difference in music or art or maybe the difference in a foreign language teacher. Our timber-dependent schools simply do not have the capacity to make up this kind of funding cut. The purpose of this act is to stabilize payments to counties that help support roads and schools, provide projects that enhance forest ecosystem health, and provide employment opportunities among the Federal land management agencies.

I wanted to point out last year, just one example in my district, we had over 200,000 acres burn. Now this is in Okanogan County, this is a county that is nearly 75 percent owned by the Federal Government. And what we see here is the burn, the brown and the light yellow is where over 200,000 acres were burned.

The pink areas here 1½ percent of what burned is what is proposed to be salvaged. Hopefully soon, although it is in dispute too. This in my mind demonstrates part of the challenge that we have, because this is a recent example in a county that is desperate for support for community services, trees have been lost. In the past I would have preferred for us to be able to go in there, even like 10 years ago, and be able to harvest some of these trees, create some timber receipts for this county rather than facing this situa-

tion where we have had devastating burns, with now very little of that burn being able to be salvaged.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I have here a chart showing wildland acres burned over the last several years. The yellow indicates the year 2000, the green is 2005, the red is 2006, and the blue indicates a 10-year average.

As you can see, this all starts back in May and ends in November. But, again, over several periods of years, last year, we saw record amounts of fire on Federal lands. In fact, we spent a billion and a half dollars fighting fire. We burned more than 9 million acres. That is a record. And it just keeps getting worse and worse. So we have got a real problem out in the forest, and that affects our communities and our counties, because when you have these fires, what happens? Law enforcement has to go out and manage the roads and manage the flow of people, and they are doing around-the-clock vigil work on do we have to evacuate or not.

And of course the Forest Service is involved too, but a lot of that burden falls on that local community. I have had whole communities close for very important times in the summer, because of fires approaching. Sisters, Oregon comes to mind. So your comment about wildfires is very apropos tonight.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Like many of the counties in Oregon, I would say we face a similar situation in Washington State. And these are counties that do not want to be dependent on the Federal Government. They would prefer for the Forest Service to be managing these lands in such a way that would actually produce more timber receipts and result in a healthier forest so we do not continue to see these devastating fires every year, and they are getting worse every year.

But, unfortunately, that is not what is happening. In the meantime, we really do need to reauthorize the secure rural schools. That is so important to our local communities that are surrounded by these National forests.

It provided the funding for schools and roads, and right now is ensuring that our rural communities survive these difficult times. I thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. We thank you for coming out tonight to share your comments with our colleagues and others about the importance of trying to get this reauthorized. I would yield now to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the first district of California, MIKE THOMPSON, whose district receives more than \$6 million a year to help cover the costs of law enforcement, education, and other natural resource work that goes on there. So I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank all of you who have taken time to come to the floor tonight to talk about this very, very im-

portant issue, an issue that impacts all of our districts, and most important the people that live within our districts.

Mr. Speaker, and Members of this House, the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act was created to provide critical education and transportation funding for all of the counties that do not receive property tax from lands managed by the National Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

This program was enacted by this Congress to compensate local governments for the tax exempt status of these public lands. The law authorizing these payments, as you have heard tonight, expired at the end of fiscal year 2006.

And all of the counties that are touched by this issue received their last payment on December 2 of 2006. If we do not reauthorize this funding by the 15th of March, county school districts will have to fire teachers, and reduce critical education programs.

Counties will be forced to slash their transportation budgets. My Congressional district is heavily impacted by this issue, because of over 1.2 million acres that are managed by the National Forest Service.

The National Forest Service acreage in my district is twice the size of the State of Rhode Island, and every single acre is exempt from property tax. No county in my district will be hurt more than Del Norte County. I have a map of Del Norte County, not wanting to be outdone by my friends with their visuals, but no county will be hurt more in my district than Del Norte County, where nearly 80 percent of the county, 80 percent of all of the land within the county is owned by our Federal Government.

Jan Moorehouse, the Superintendent of the school district up in Del Norte, and she was I think very, very succinct in pointing out the problem. I will just tell you what she said. I cannot say it any better.

She said, the loss of funding is heart wrenching and carries an enormous impact on our ability to fund critical education programs for our youth. This is our future leaders. These are the people that will serve in Congress, serve in the State legislature, run the businesses, be on the city council, the people that will make the money to generate the greatness that our country is known for.

□ 2130

And we are taking money right out of their education, the things that will benefit them the most. Without this funding, the school district will have to increase their class size and lay off as many as 25 teachers. And that may not seem a lot to big city school districts, but up here it is nearly 10 percent of the entire teaching faculty. With more students and less teachers, this will dramatically reduce the student to teacher ratio and shortchange our kids.

In addition to the loss of faculty, Del Norte County School District will have to close their art and music programs, and some of the smaller schools in our county will have to close completely because they won't have the money to keep the doors open. Now, this is going to require that the school district bus students who live far from town travel over an hour each way to school on seasonably treacherous rural mountain roads.

Other county school districts in my district will also be hit hard and will have to eliminate teachers and staff for early literacy programs, special education and arts education. The Klamath-Trinity School District on the Hoopa Indian Reservation will have to lay off eight teachers, nearly 15 percent of their entire faculty.

And as I mentioned earlier, the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act also provides critical funding for county transportation needs. Again, this is because the counties do not receive property tax from land managed by the National Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. Humboldt County in my district has over 1,200 miles of county roads. The funding this program provides represents a large portion of that county's road maintenance budgets. Humboldt County has a maintenance backlog of over \$150 million. Many other rural counties have similar backlogs, and the loss of this funding is going to be devastating.

Back in Del Norte County, the transportation money from this program represents 20 percent of the county road budget. And to add insult to injury, 40 percent of the county roads in Del Norte County are within the national forest. So the county is responsible for maintaining the roads in the very areas that are exempt from property taxes.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I urge this Congress to reauthorize and to fund this very important program as soon as possible. It is unconscionable for the Federal Government to walk away from our obligation to help these rural counties. Rural counties depend on these funds. They have no other option. We made a commitment, and it is up to us to follow through on that commitment.

Again, I thank you for taking the time to put this Special Order together and help us convince all of our colleagues how necessary and how important this program is and how critically important these funds are to a large area within our great country.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Thank you, Congressman THOMPSON. We appreciate your vigilance in our efforts to try and get this reauthorized; and your comments tonight, I think, are very powerful in our efforts. You talk about roads. Morrow County road department has 19 employees to service 850 miles of county roads. They are going to be forced to lay off at least seven, perhaps as many as nine.

Wallowa County, 700 miles, county roads maintained by a staff of 14. Soon there will only be seven. That is possibly one person for every 100 miles of road or the same distance from here to Richmond, Virginia. You would have one road maintenance person. This story is repeated over and over in my district, Congresswoman HOOLEY's district, your district, Congressman DEFAZIO's district, Congresswoman MCMORRIS RODGERS' district. All over the rural West we are facing this enormous problem.

And people love to come out into their Federal forests. I love to get out into our Federal forests. I love to backpack and do all the things many of us do. It is a wonderful attraction. But people get lost, they get injured, and who is there to pick them up? The local county. The county sheriff, the local rescue patrol. And that is why this funding is so important so they will have the resources, they will have the people when you break a leg or you fall down an ice shaft somewhere. There is somebody to come get you. And that is just the rescue part and the police part. We have talked a lot about the schools as well.

I know my friend from Clackamas County, Congresswoman HOOLEY, did you want to comment?

Ms. HOOLEY. Well, this is a program that has worked well over the last 6 years. It has helped bridge that budget gap created due to the lack of timber harvested from our forest. And, again, I want to remind people this is distributed to over 42 States; 4,400 rural school districts receive funding.

If we want to support our rural communities, if we want to make sure that we have roads to drive on, if we believe law enforcement is important to every part of our State, then we have to figure out how to solve this problem.

And I thank you and Representative DEFAZIO for all the work that you have done. But we have a full blown crisis on our hands. That is what this is. This is a crisis. And it will take support from our colleagues from both sides of the aisle to help our rural communities that are, frankly, in dire straits. This is not just a little problem. This is a great big huge problem for our rural communities.

So I would urge my friends to join us in our effort to reauthorize this program and pass a 1-year extension to give us a chance to work through these difficult issues.

And, again, I thank you for all the work that you have done on it.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. And we appreciate your help on it too. And I think we have all signed a letter to the appropriators asking them that in the emergency supplemental they fund at least a 1-year extension while we work on a longer equitable solution to this problem.

My colleague from southern Oregon. Mr. DEFAZIO. My friend, Representative HOOLEY, mentioned reauthorization. I do want to thank the chairman

of the Resources Committee, Nick Rahall from West Virginia. And, yes, this touches West Virginia too. There are communities at risk there that are working hard to help us move the reauthorization bill for the longer-term funding in the Resources Committee, hopefully next month.

And obviously my colleague from southern Oregon, Representative WALDEN, when he was Chair of the Forest Subcommittee of Resources, he and I, quite quickly, and I think just about, almost 2 years ago—

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. March of 2005 we moved it out of subcommittee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Moved the authorization out, but it unfortunately got hung up in the process and never did become law although we certainly saw more action on this side of the Hill than we did in the Senate.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Would you yield just on one point?

Mr. DEFAZIO. Yes, sure.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Because you mentioned West Virginia. And Rita Griffith from Pocahontas County, she is a commissioner there. She says nine full-time teaching positions will be cut and funding for an after-school forestry education program will be lost. She is from Pocahontas County, West Virginia. I have got examples from Alaska and Arizona to California and West Virginia, so you are right.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DEFAZIO. And just since the gentleman from California had referenced Del Norte County, I just want to talk about the county immediately to the north of that which would be Curry County, Oregon.

Now, some people will say, look, why don't these counties just suck it up and take care of their own problems, raise the taxes? Well, in Oregon, our local property tax structure is dictated by the State because of a property tax initiative similar to the one that passed in California. The local commissioners do not have any options when it comes to that.

Now, if Curry County was going to grow its way out of this problem, a county that today has 12,000 houses valued at about \$250,000 each, they would have to add 35,000 houses valued at \$350,000 each, quadruple the size of the county. And, unfortunately, since they are constrained by public lands—

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. And the ocean.

Mr. DEFAZIO. And the Pacific Ocean, some of those would have to be house boats, I guess.

Ms. HOOLEY. It is hard to have a house boat in the ocean.

Mr. DEFAZIO. But it is very serious. And there they are looking at the lay-off of 16 of the 43 employees in the Curry County Sheriff's Office. And the sheriff would just then only be able to supervise the jail. There would no longer be a rural law enforcement, which obviously jeopardizes the traveling public and, again, raises the potential, as the gentleman from southern Oregon who represents also eastern

Oregon pointed out, of a vacuum into which some of these gangs that are highly organized in this country, some of which have come across the border from Mexico could infiltrate for methamphetamine production or even growing marijuana.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. And, in fact, you think about in our State and in Northern California how many meth labs have been found on Federal lands, found by county sheriffs deputies generally. They are the ones out there. Now, there are other law enforcement agencies, but a lot of it is that.

And I showed you the marijuana growing that that lone deputy, by himself, no backup, on horseback out riding in the Federal lands, found 6,000 plants in a Mexican cartel drug trafficking operation. This is going on out on Federal lands. And it is not like the Forest Service has a huge police force to go patrol their own lands. They don't. And so it is a severe problem.

Ms. HOOLEY. I just want to add to the whole, when you are talking about drug problems and meth problems, we were one of the States that had, the west coast was hit the hardest with meth. It has now moved east. But I was just going to say, it is the rural counties that are hit more by meth than are the urban counties because they can go out in the forest, they can make meth, cook meth out in the forestlands, grow marijuana. But we spend a lot of our time out there looking for drug problems, and it is a huge issue in all of our rural counties.

Mr. DEFAZIO. But of course it ends up in a lot of urban areas, so it is their problem, too.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Exactly. We have been joined by our colleague from Northern California, Wally Herger, who serves the adjoining area, at least to mine. And I don't know if he touches up against your district or not. But he does an extraordinarily able job representing Northern California and has been very active in forestry issues and forest health issues over the years. And we are delighted you could join us tonight to talk about the importance of reauthorizing H.R. 17.

Mr. HERGER. I thank the gentleman, my good friend from Oregon, Mr. WALDEN. And I thank the work that Mr. DEFAZIO is doing and the others in this incredibly, crucially important issue that affects those of us in rural areas of the West, particularly, and in these forested areas.

Like both of you, I have a heavily forested district and I understand the challenges that our rural communities face because of the large Federal presence in our area.

Many of our fellow citizens, and even some of the Members of this body, do not realize that the presence of Federal lands places a burden on nearby communities. I am so pleased to join you tonight in shining the light on that fact and reminding our colleagues that the Secure Rural Schools program has expired and is in need of reauthorization.

In my district of Northern California, school boards, county officials, and sheriff departments are currently in crisis mode. For example, Siskiyou County is looking at a 91 percent loss in school funding. In Tehama County, library hours, music, art, and physical education classes will be dramatically cut.

And this crisis extends well beyond education. County road safety programs will be decimated as well. Sheriff departments will also bear the brunt of these cuts. In total, eight of my 10 counties are experiencing drastic budget declines because Congress has not extended the Secure Rural Schools program.

It is important to point out to our friends who represent urban areas that this crisis is not the fault of rural counties. It is the fault of Federal policies that are out of their control, specifically the failure of Congress to address that burden by extending the Secure and Rural Schools program.

In my home State of California, close to half of the land area is owned by the Federal Government. And in my district that number is considerably larger. In one of my counties, nearly 90 percent of the land is under Federal ownership. This large Federal presence has placed the counties I represent at a severe economic disadvantage. Acreage that would normally be privately owned and, therefore, generating tax revenue to help fund essential local services, is, instead, locked away by the Federal Government.

President Teddy Roosevelt and our predecessors who served in the 60th Congress recognized this problem and addressed it with a promise which was enshrined in the law in 1908, that the Federal Government would pay its fair share of local costs by sending a percentage of national forest revenues to the counties that are home to Federal lands.

This promise acknowledged that the rural counties we represent would not be able to fund vital services like rural education, road maintenance and emergency care as long as enormous tracts of land within their boundaries were locked away under Federal control.

We need to be very clear about the nature of the promise that was struck between Congress and rural forested counties. These funds were not designed to be a handout, and they are not part of any federally sponsored rural development program. They are an obligation. They are part of a compact between the Federal Government and the people of rural America in recognition of the difficulties created by large Federal ownership. This compact must be honored by the 110th Congress that we are currently in.

□ 2145

The rural counties I represent, and I know this is true in other areas throughout the West, have sacrificed a great deal playing host to America's national forests. I don't think it is too

much to ask for this Congress to set aside a fraction of our \$2.9 trillion budget in order to keep our word to rural America. We need to act immediately to extend the Secure Rural Schools safety net so our rural counties can get out of crisis mode, and then we can all get back to working on a long-term solution to our forest health problems.

Again, I would like to thank my colleagues here tonight for your efforts to extend the Secure Rural Schools program. I am committed to working with each of you until we are successful, and I ask other Members of the House to recognize the incredible hardships that will result if this legislation is not renewed.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the Second District California.

We appreciate your great work on forest health issues and your support of this effort. You mentioned this was just a fraction of what we spend federally for the Federal Government to keep its word. As you recall, we tried to get an amendment on the floor during the debate over the continuing resolution a week or so ago and we would have paid for that by just taking a fraction of what is spent for the whole government. That fraction was .00086 percent of the Federal budget that would pay for this; but not just pay for it, it would keep the commitment of this government to the people out West and elsewhere where there are forests that have been there for up until now 100 years basically, 99 years. So it doesn't take a lot to keep your word, and we need to keep the promise regarding forest health and schools and roads and other things.

So we appreciate your work on this, Congressman HERGER. Thanks for your leadership.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, let me just mention two other counties. I have got a list here. I see another gentleman from Washington that we want to hear from him. But the most heavily impacted county in my district will be Josephine County, and their general fund revenues have dropped 69 percent. Again, a dramatic loss of public safety.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. That is a county we share.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Right. And road services. And then in Coos County, more than half the general fund. Layoff notices have already gone out to 100 out of a 430-person workforce. Again, the deepest cuts, because it is the largest proportion of the budget, public safety, again, the loss of patrol deputies. It is going to be a very, very difficult time when tourists from all across America come to southwest Oregon this summer. If they are in an accident or have other problems in rural areas across large swaths of our State, there will be no immediate help for them.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Most of the States this side of the Mississippi have less than 7 or 8 percent Federal ownership. In my district, much like like

yours, Deschutes County is 79 percent federally controlled. Lake is 78; Harney is 78; Malheur is 76; Hood River is 72; Grant is 61; Willowa is 58; and Baker is 53 percent of the land masses under Federal ownership and control. That is why this is so important that the Federal Government keep its word.

I would like now to yield to our good friend and colleague from the Fourth District of Washington, the Honorable Doc HASTINGS, whose district receives \$8.8 million a year to help with roads and schools in a very federally dominated area.

DOC, you have been a terrific leader in this effort, and we appreciate your coming down tonight.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And I want to thank you and I want to thank Mr. DEFAZIO, both, for your work on this not only in this Congress, but your yeomen's work at the end of the last Congress to try to get this problem resolved. And I apologize for coming down late. I wanted to participate more fully, but the Rules Committee is meeting, as we are speaking, on the Iraq issue. So I was up there and didn't have a chance to come down.

But let me make a couple of points here. This really is about keeping a commitment that was made by the Federal Government to the counties. And you just made the point there that States with counties in the western part of the United States have a lot of Federal ownership. I have two counties that I just want to talk about in my district where over 80 percent of their land is owned by the Federal Government. Now, by definition that means that 80 percent of the taxable land that the county commission would have is not subject to taxation.

The decision was made over 100 years ago for these national forestlands, which is principally in my area. I know you have some development lands in yours. But since they don't have taxation, they said okay. Deals were worked out many years ago that you can have the revenue from harvesting the timber, which worked out very, very well. So that is the Federal policy that was made. The Federal Government owns the land in these counties; so, therefore, they can't tax it. It is Federal policy. In the early 1990s, another Federal policy or interpretation, I should probably say, of a Federal policy has led to a decline in timber receipts, as you can see here by the chart.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. This chart here shows it very clearly.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. When President Clinton, to his credit, tried to come up with a forest plan, the current level at that time of timber harvest was 4½ billion board-feet, and the promise was that you could at least harvest 1.1 billion, 25 percent of it. We are not even close to that. We are not even close to that because the interpretation of that law and the ensuing law-

suits have kept any activity in these multipurpose areas. And I should make this point: This is national forestland. National forests were created to be multipurpose, including commercial activity. If you want to lock it up and not have any activity at all, the way to do that is put it in a wilderness area. This is not wilderness. Some de facto policies, unfortunately, in the past have led to sometimes this being treated as wilderness areas but it is not. So as a result of this, as a result of the timber receipts going down, these counties who relied on the Federal receipts from timber because they couldn't tax land now are facing huge, huge cuts.

Chelan County in my district, one of the counties that has 80 percent ownership by the Federal Government, will have severe cuts in education, road maintenance, search and rescue, and this is a big tourist area up there, and the forestry education programs. Skamania County, a small county in the southern part of my district, loses 40 percent of its school budget. Forty percent of its school budget. And here we are and that 40 percent starts at the end of last year and they have to get through the end of the year.

So this is something that needs to be resolved, and I really appreciate your allowing me to come down to participate in this. Both of you have been really champions on getting this through. And, hopefully, we will be successful sooner rather than later, because these counties and these communities in our States simply can't wait.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues here this evening to urge this Congress to take action now and extend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act, commonly referred to as the county payments bill. This bill is an essential lifeline of support for rural communities throughout the country that are impacted by federal forest land ownership.

I thank my colleagues, GREG WALDEN and PETER DEFAZIO, for their steadfast efforts to address this problem.

What we are talking about here tonight is keeping a promise—a promise made to county governments a century ago in what was then still the early years of the National Forest system. County governments, of course, cannot tax the Federal Government. However, they still must provide for schools, roads, and emergency services. The Congress recognized this reality when it promised these communities that they would get a fair share of revenue produced from federal forest lands as compensation for the tax exempt status of federal forest lands. This revenue sharing, which Congress made permanent in 1908, served all parties well and was for many years an equitable solution to the problem.

Unfortunately, since the early 90s, special interest groups that oppose federal timber sales have used the Endangered Species Act to bring harvest activities in the Pacific Northwest to a standstill. The Clinton administration attempted to resolve the crisis by brokering the Northwest Forest Plan in 1994, which called for setting aside 80 percent of the federal forests in the Northwest and allowing for a modest level of continued harvest on some

of what remained. This was supposed to produce a steady and reliable level of timber to help meet the growing U.S. demand for building materials and wood products.

However, even this compromise was not good enough for the radical environmentalists that have continuously used litigation to sharply limit federal harvest levels. What resulted is the closure of hundreds of mills throughout the Northwest—leaving thousands of people without family wage jobs and many counties with little or no compensation for the impact of federal land ownership. Today, we import more wood products than we ever did before, and the spotted owl—which was supposedly what all the litigation was about—isn't any closer to recovery as a result of our de facto zero harvest policy.

Fortunately, the Congress at least recognized the dramatic impact to local governments caused by the sharply declining Forest Service timber receipts. This is why we passed the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act in 2000. This law, which expired at the end of Fiscal Year 2006, enabled local governments to either remain with the traditional receipt sharing system or take a payment based on historical harvest levels. In addition, it authorized funding for local governments to work in cooperation with interested stakeholders to carry out special forest restoration projects. These payments made the difference for many county governments that would otherwise not be able to provide essential services.

Today, however, the future of these payments is in doubt. Despite the many efforts on both sides of the aisle, we were unable to secure an extension of this bill before the 109th Congress adjourned. I am proud of the fact that the House did at least identify and act upon a couple of legislative items last year that would have helped offset the cost of the reauthorization. However, the situation remains that we need to find a way to get the county payments extension through the Congress and on to the President. Time is quickly running out for these rural communities.

Let me give you examples of what will happen to two of my counties if we fail to act now.

Chelan County, which is almost 80 percent federally-owned land, will face severe cuts in education, road maintenance, search and rescue operations and many other county services. In addition, they would be forced to eliminate the Forestry Education Program, which takes "at risk kids" from several local rural school districts and involves them in hands on habitat restoration projects during the summer. This program is administered with the help of Washington State University and local employees of state and federal agencies and has been recognized by the National Association of County Officials.

In Skamania County, which is more than 80 percent tax exempt federal land, the local school districts will lose 40 percent of their current budget. That means the loss of dozens of teachers and support positions, the shuttering of school buildings, and dramatic cutbacks in classes and extracurricular offerings. The county government would be forced to cut more than half of their law enforcement personnel, road workers, and court employees. These people will likely have to leave the county to find alternate employment, taking their families with them and further eroding the county's economy.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a couple of examples of the kinds of the consequences to real communities if we fail to act. I again urge the leadership of the Congress to move the extension of the county payments bill on the next available legislative vehicle. Let's keep our promise to these local governments and reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act before it's too late.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his work and his help in the Rules Committee and on this issue.

You have been most diligent and most helpful and we appreciate your comments tonight. Harney County Judge Steve Grasty has said, "Loss of this program means losing future opportunities for young people here and in rural counties across America." We have comments like that, and I am sure Peter does as well, from every county that is affected, every school superintendent who is trying now to work with their school boards to figure out who stays, who goes, what gets cut, what gets left behind, and what do we do to help rural kids keep up in a school system that is going to be devastated by the loss of these dollars.

This is a national problem. These are national lands. National policy determines what happens on these lands, and you can see by the reduction in Federal timber receipts, one of the outcomes of Federal policy has been near elimination of receipts, which has brought us to this legislation, which now is expired. And I appreciate the work of my colleague from the Fourth District of Washington as we work to reauthorize this to keep the Federal Government's promise to rural schools, rural roads, rural counties, and our Federal forestlands.

And I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, again just to reiterate, 4,400 school districts across America, I believe, of more than 800 counties are impacted. Critical law enforcement, public safety, search and rescue services, road maintenance services, schools, school class size, school infrastructure, all these things are on the cutting block. Benton County in my district tried a levy. It failed. Again, the cuts will be targeted at law enforcement and the sheriffs' offices. That is the biggest part of the general fund for virtually all my counties. They have no choice.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I am told our time is about up. I just appreciate your help and that of our colleagues.

I would encourage all of our colleagues who are listening tonight, help us pass H.R. 17. Help us keep the promise to these rural people who are surrounded in their areas by Federal lands, which are gorgeous and we love them, but we need your help to deal with them.

Again, I thank all of our colleagues who came down at this very late hour on the East Coast to share their comments and concerns. And together we can keep the promise for America.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express support for full reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act.

My district in southwest Washington state is one of the 10 most forested districts in the entire country. Because so much of the land in my district is under the control of the Forest Service, counties in my district like Lewis, Skamania, and Cowlitz rely on the Secure Rural Schools program. They are among 27 counties in Washington state that rely on funds of over \$40 million a year.

These communities do not want to rely on this program, but a long series of events have left them without recourse.

For decades, heavily forested counties could rely on 25 percent of revenue generated by timber harvest in our federal forests. National Forests cannot be taxed locally, so this was a fair exchange. As timber harvest plummeted in the 1980s and 1990s, these local governments were left with barely enough funds to operate essential government services, including schools. The 2000 Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act saved these communities from dying off. It has allowed them to hire teachers, keep libraries open, and provide the services that many of us take for granted.

And Secure Rural Schools is about more than county payments. The program also authorizes Resource Advisory Councils and designates 15 percent to 20 percent of the county payments towards these Councils, known as RACs. RACs bring together members of the community including environmentalists, labor groups, and local elected officials to collaborate on necessary forestry projects. These forestry projects include preventive thinning that limits the danger of fires in our forests. Over 9 million acres of land burned in fires in 2006. Collaborative efforts to prevent this damage are a model that needs to be refined and expanded. That can only happen if we continue funding the program.

For the 780 counties, 4,400 school districts, and millions of Americans affected by this program, I implore my colleagues to help reauthorize and fund the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act. If we fail to reauthorize this critical program, counties in my district will see their school district budgets cut by more than 40 percent, community programs and services will be slashed, and jobs will be lost.

We must act now.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2255

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARDOZA) at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 63, IRAQ WAR RESOLUTION

Ms. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-12) on the resolution (H. Res. 157) providing for consideration of the bill (H. Con. Res. 63) disapproving of the decision of the President announced on January 10, 2007, to deploy more than 20,000 additional United States combat troops to Iraq, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CRAMER (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. EDWARDS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of medical reasons.

Mr. KAGEN (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of travel problems.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for February 5 through February 16 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.

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

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

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COSTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. MCHENRY, for 5 minutes, February 15.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, February 13.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and February 14, 15, and 16.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 56 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 13, 2007, at 9 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:

588. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Direct Single Family Housing Loans and Grants (RIN: 0575-AC54) received January 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

589. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Healthy Tomorrows Partnership for Children Program (RIN: 0906-AA70) received January 29, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

590. A letter from the Chief of Immigration Unit, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Board of Immigration Appeals: Composition of Board and Temporary Board Members [EOIR Docket No. 1581] (RIN: 1125-AA57) received December 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

591. A letter from the Federal Register Certifying Office, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Administrative Offset Under Reciprocal Agreements With States (RIN: 1510-AB09) received January 9, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

592. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulation Policy & Mgt., VA, Department of Veteran's Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Accrued Benefits (RIN: 2900-AM28) received December 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

593. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Ruling and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2007-8) received January 5, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

594. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Last-in, First-out inventories (Rev. Rul. 2007-6) received January 11, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

595. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Weighted Average Interest Rates Update [Notice 2007-12] received January 11, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

596. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Low-Income Housing Credit (Rev. Rul. 2007-5) received January 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

597. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Modification of the Substantial Assistance Rules [Notice 2007-13] received January 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. OBERSTAR. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 342. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 555 Independence Street, Cape Girardeau, Missouri, as the "Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr., United States Courthouse", with amendments (Rept. 110-10). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 798. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services to install a photovoltaic system for the headquarters building of the Department of Energy (Rept. 110-11). Referred to the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 157. Resolution providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 63) disapproving of the decision of the President announced on January 10, 2007, to deploy more than 20,000 additional United States combat troops to Iraq (Rept. 110-12). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. NORWOOD (for himself and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 979. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect consumers in managed care plans and other health coverage; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and 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. KILDEE (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 980. A bill to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. JONES of Ohio (for herself and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 981. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt from the harbor maintenance tax certain commercial cargo loaded or unloaded at United States ports in the Great Lakes Saint Lawrence Seaway System; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DREIER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 982. A bill to promote democratic values and enhance democracy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself and Mr. PICKERING):

H.R. 983. A bill to preserve local radio broadcast emergency and other services and to require the Federal Communications Commission to conduct a rulemaking for

that purpose; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 984. A bill to provide for reform in the operations of the executive branch; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 985. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify which disclosures of information are protected from prohibited personnel practices; to require a statement in nondisclosure policies, forms, and agreements to the effect that such policies, forms, and agreements are consistent with certain disclosure protections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut):

H.R. 986. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Eightmile River in the State of Connecticut as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TANNER (for himself, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H.R. 987. A bill to endorse further enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and to facilitate the timely admission of new members to NATO, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 988. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5757 Tilton Avenue in Riverside, California, as the "Lieutenant Todd Jason Bryant Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BOREN (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 989. A bill to prevent undue disruption of interstate commerce by limiting civil actions brought against persons whose only role with regard to a product in the stream of commerce is as a lawful seller of the product; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on 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. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. KELLER):

H.R. 990. A bill to provide all low-income students with the same opportunity to receive a Pell Grant by eliminating the tuition sensitivity provision in the Pell Grant program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

H.R. 991. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals eligible for veterans health benefits to contribute to health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 992. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require that food that contains product from a cloned animal

be labeled accordingly, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on 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. FEENEY:

H.R. 993. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to reaffirm the intent of Congress in the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL of New York (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 994. A bill to require the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to conduct an Independent Safety Assessment of the Indian Point Energy Center; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARE (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BOREN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 995. A bill to amend Public Law 106-348 to extend the authorization for establishing a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor veterans who became disabled while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mrs. CAPPAS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. REHBERG, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BERKLEY, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 996. A bill to provide for the issuance of a semipostal in order to afford a convenient means by which members of the public may contribute towards the acquisition of works of art to honor female pioneers in Government service; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SALI, Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. FOXX, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PENCE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LINDER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. CULBERSON):

H.R. 997. A bill to declare English as the official language of the United States, to establish a uniform English language rule for naturalization, and to avoid misconstructions of the English language texts of the laws of the United States, pursuant to Congress' powers to provide for the general welfare of the United States and to establish a uniform rule of naturalization under article I, section 8, of the Constitution; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 998. A bill to direct the Librarian of Congress and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution to carry out a joint project at the Library of Congress and the National Museum of African American History and Culture to collect video and audio recordings of personal histories and testimonials of individuals who participated in the Civil Rights movement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 999. A bill to provide for the Secretary of Agriculture to release the reversionary interest of the United States on certain land in the State of Florida if encroachments and trespassing have occurred on that land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts):

H.R. 1000. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Edward William Brooke III in recognition of his unprecedented and enduring service to our Nation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 1001. A bill to amend the Haitian Hemispheric Opportunity through Partnership Encouragement Act of 2006 to extend the date for the President to determine if Haiti meets certain requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRATT (for himself and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 1002. A bill to authorize appropriate action if the negotiations with the People's Republic of China regarding China's undervalued currency and currency manipulation are not successful; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WATSON:

H.R. 1003. A bill to amend the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 to reauthorize the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOOLSEY (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. KILPATRICK):

H.R. 1004. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to make grants to improve the ability of State and local governments to prevent the abduction of children by family members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKELTON (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution disapproving of the decision of the President announced on January 10, 2007, to deploy more than 20,000 additional United States combat troops to Iraq; to the Committee on Armed Services, 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 Mr. PENCE:

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that no funds should be cut off or reduced for American troops in the field which would result in undermining their safety or their ability to

complete their assigned missions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H. Res. 152. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should transmit to Congress detailed reports on the situation in Iraq to facilitate greater congressional oversight, work with the international community to create an international peacekeeping force and reconstruction program for Iraq, and seek to convene a peace conference in a neutral location to encourage Iraq's ethnic and religious factions to achieve the important goals of national reconciliation, security, and governance for Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. PUTNAM:

H. Res. 153. A resolution electing minority members to a committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COHEN:

H. Res. 154. A resolution recognizing Stax Records for enriching the Nation's Cultural life with "50 years of soul"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H. Res. 155. A resolution condemning the assassination of human rights advocate and outspoken defender of freedom of the press, Turkish-Armenian journalist Hrant Dink on January 19, 2007; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia:

H. Res. 156. A resolution honoring and thanking John Thomas Caulfield for a lifelong professional commitment to public service and for his years of dedicated service on behalf of the United States Capitol Police, the Capitol Police Board, and the Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII.

Mr. GONZALEZ introduced a bill (H.R. 1005) for the relief of Vicente Beltran Luna; 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:

February 12, 2007

H.R. 23: Mr. SHIMKUS and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 25: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 34: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 37: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 42: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 43: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 50: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 73: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 82: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BONO, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 84: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 85: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 119: Mr. PAYNE.

- H.R. 137: Mr. ARCURI.
 H.R. 139: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 156: Mr. FATTAH and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 169: Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 180: Mr. TANCREDO.
 H.R. 184: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.
 H.R. 197: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 207: Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 211: Mr. LEVIN and Ms. KILPATRICK.
 H.R. 213: Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H.R. 260: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. GILLMOR.
 H.R. 279: Mr. GINGREY and Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 297: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 303: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
 H.R. 402: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 403: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
 H.R. 477: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. ROSS, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. HALL of Texas.
 H.R. 488: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 493: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. MARKEY.
 H.R. 502: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. SIREs.
 H.R. 508: Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H.R. 511: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 529: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 530: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HARE, and Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 535: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 539: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H.R. 553: Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
 H.R. 556: Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 561: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 563: Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 566: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 579: Mr. CLAY and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
 H.R. 617: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
 H.R. 621: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. MARSHALL.
 H.R. 633: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.
 H.R. 642: Ms. CARSON and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 643: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 645: Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H.R. 659: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
 H.R. 670: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 676: Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. SOLIS.
 H.R. 677: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 695: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. EMANUEL.
 H.R. 699: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. EHLERS.
 H.R. 710: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. GINGREY, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 715: Mr. COHEN, Mr. KIND, Ms. CARSON, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 722: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 723: Mr. HOEKSTRA and Mr. EHLERS.
 H.R. 734: Mr. MCKEON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H.R. 741: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. WYNN.
 H.R. 743: Mrs. MUSGRAVE and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 746: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 759: Mr. COHEN, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. WOLF.
 H.R. 760: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 787: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 797: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 800: Mr. CUELLAR.
 H.R. 811: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. FARR, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. WAMP.
 H.R. 819: Ms. CASTOR, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. COSTA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 821: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CARSON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FARR, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 822: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. BACA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 855: Mr. FORBES and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 866: Mr. LINDER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
 H.R. 868: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 871: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
 H.R. 873: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 896: Mr. PETRI and Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 897: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota and Mr. SPRATT.
 H.R. 898: Mr. WAMP, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BOREN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. LEE, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. WYNN.
 H.R. 923: Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 933: Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 971: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 976: Mr. STARK, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BEAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. SHULER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BARROW, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. ARCURI, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. ROSS, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. BACA.
 H.J. Res. 22: Mr. KUHL of New York.
 H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. NADLER, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. SOLIS.
 H. Con. Res. 44: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. WATSON, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. ISSA.
 H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.
 H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. PALLONE.
 H. Res. 53: Mr. TOWNS and Ms. WATERS.
 H. Res. 64: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PENCE, and Mrs. BIGGERT.
 H. Res. 67: Ms. NORTON, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.
 H. Res. 76: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. FARR.
 H. Res. 87: Mr. HENSARLING.
 H. Res. 88: Mr. MICA.
 H. Res. 101: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WATT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H. Res. 107: Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GERLACH, Mrs. MYRICK, and Ms. BERKLEY.
 H. Res. 118: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. CARSON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Ms. WATSON.
 H. Res. 122: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
 H. Res. 126: Ms. CARSON and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H. Res. 128: Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H. Res. 134: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. CLARKE.
 H. Res. 137: Mr. McNULTY and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H. Res. 147: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. POE, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.