



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 1, 2007

No. 70

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WELCH of Vermont).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

May 1, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable PETER WELCH to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) for 5 minutes.

PAUL WOLFOWITZ

Mr. COBLE. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in this town when a Democrat screws up, Democrats are reluctant to criticize. By the same token, when a Republican screws up, Republicans are reluctant to criticize. Today, Mr. Speaker, I intend to depart from this accepted practice and direct attention—if not criticism—to the World Bank matter.

Mr. Paul Wolfowitz was one of the architects of the war in Iraq. He was generally awarded low marks for his Iraqi

performance. Then he was subsequently elevated to the presidency of the World Bank. Allegations of mismanagement of the World Bank under Mr. Wolfowitz's leadership have recently been prominently reported.

The Congress may or may not become involved, and the two House committees on which I sit—Transportation and Judiciary—likely will not become involved, nor am I accusing Mr. Wolfowitz of wrongdoing. That is for the appropriate World Bank panel to resolve.

Mr. Speaker, if it is determined in fact that mismanagement did occur on President Wolfowitz's watch, I suppose two options would follow: his resignation or his retention. If the latter, the appropriate World Bank panel may consider attaching a shorter, tighter leash to Mr. Wolfowitz because the present leash—if there is a leash at all—appears to be inadequate. But based upon my limited familiarity with facts surrounding the World Bank matter, I opt for the retention of Mr. Wolfowitz in lieu of his resignation.

His questionable and misguided leadership regarding the Iraqi War, plus the allegations of mismanagement at the World Bank under his watch notwithstanding, Paul Wolfowitz has made significant contributions during his years of public service and probably deserves another chance with the aforementioned leash permanently attached.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, if Members of the Congress openly criticize members of our own party—especially members of our own party—when criticism is warranted, I believe our constituents will applaud such objectivity. And I furthermore believe, Mr. Speaker, that fewer accusations of screw-ups, mischief, mismanagement and scandal will be voiced and hopefully fewer acts of screw-ups, mischief, mismanagement and scandals will be practiced.

Mr. Speaker, on that optimistic note, I conclude and yield back the balance of my time.

IRAQ

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, President Bush and Vice President CHENEY have made much on the talk shows of the last 2 weeks saying the Congress—the Democrats—are trying change direction in Iraq and should listen to the military professionals. Now, if only this administration had taken its own advice. If they had listened to the military professionals and the intelligence professionals, we would never have gone to war in Iraq. The trail of this administration to the sad fourth anniversary of Mission Accomplished is littered with professional, military and intelligence advice that was either ignored, discarded or deliberately distorted.

There were no links to 9/11 and al Qaeda. That was recently declassified in a report on April 6 of this year.

There were no weapons of mass destruction, despite statements from the likes of Vice President CHENEY. “We believe Saddam has in fact reconstituted nuclear weapons.” 3/16/2003.

The war has drag on for 4 long years since the President—dressed as a fake fighter jock—landed on the deck of an aircraft carrier and declared Mission Accomplished. Since that day, more than two U.S. soldiers have died every day for 1,460 days. Three thousand three hundred forty-two have died, 3,205 since George Bush proclaimed mission accomplished.

Now, they have been so wrong all along with their inside advice, their made-up intelligence, their own neocon theories. They were wrong about, again, “We will, in fact, be greeted as liberators. I think it will go relatively quickly, weeks rather than months.” Vice President CHENEY. 3/16/2003.

“We’re dealing with a country that can finance its own reconstruction and

□ 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.

H4211

relatively soon." 3/27/2003, Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz, who was promoted to the World Bank so he could get his girlfriend a job. He was kind of wrong, too.

Now the scandals are unfolding about what little reconstruction has been done and how poorly it was done. But Halliburton has benefited tremendously—over \$25 billion of no-bid contracts which has probably boosted Vice President CHENEY's portfolio quite a bit. So there have been some successes in this effort.

Our troops have done everything that was asked, many of them now on their second and third tour of duty. They are mired in the midst of a 1,400-year-old sectarian conflict—a civil war. The Iraqi government has delivered on no promises to take meaningful steps to end that civil war. There is not a singular military solution to this conflict. There must be a political solution in Iraq. There must be diplomacy in the region. And yes to the President and the Vice President—we need a new direction.

And this Congress is listening to the professionals. Unfortunately, mostly we have to hear from the retired generals and the others because those who are still in uniform are being gagged by this administration from giving their true opinions about the changes that are necessary to extract our troops from the midst of that conflict.

This is a sad fourth anniversary. But it is the first anniversary of attempts by this Congress to stand up for its constitutional obligations and begin to try and change course, to end the stay-the-course, open-ended commitment of George Bush and DICK CHENEY who have been wrong every step of the way.

Someone else needs to push for change in Iraq, because it will never come from this White House.

GEORGE SCHAEFER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 2 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished businessman, philanthropist, decorated military officer, fellow West Point graduate and a pillar of our community in northern Kentucky and Cincinnati.

Next month Mr. George Schaefer will retire from his position at Fifth Third Bank. Beginning as a management trainee in 1971 after completing his service in the Army, George rose through the ranks at Fifth Third and helped the company to grow into one of the largest financial institutions and bank holding companies in the United States.

As George's career grew, so too did his commitment to making the entire Cincinnati metropolitan region a better place to live, work and go to school.

He has raised millions of dollars for the United Way and the Cincinnati Fine Arts Fund. For 12 years, he sat on the board of trustees of the University of Cincinnati where he helped the University grow into one of the Nation's premier educational institutions.

George, while your talents and leadership will surely be missed at Fifth Third, I know that your inspired work in the community will continue. I wish to thank you and your wife Betty Ann for all of your service and wish you the best as you embark on this new chapter in your life.

Thank you for your service to our Nation in uniform, for answering the Nation's call. Thank you for your contributions to our community. Thank you for pouring yourself into so many aspects to improve the quality of lives for our communities in northern Kentucky and the greater Cincinnati area and every city where Fifth Third is involved.

We are grateful for that commitment, for the example of service and your upholding the values that we both share of duty, honor and country.

HONORING NICK POLIZZOTTO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) is recognized during morning hour debates for 2 minutes.

Mr. DONNELLY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today in tribute to Corporal Nick Polizzotto, 9-year veteran of the South Bend Police Department who gave his life in the line of duty. For the people of South Bend, Indiana, Corporal Polizzotto is our hero.

On April 24th, 2007, a report of gunshots brought Corporal Polizzotto and his partner, Patrolman Michael Norby, to a local motel. There at 1:37 a.m. an armed suspect shot both policemen, killing Corporal Polizzotto and wounding Patrolman Norby. Patrolman Norby credits Corporal Polizzotto with saving his life.

Our community has lost a beloved family member, a generous friend, a devoted father, and a dedicated protector. Often described as having a heart of gold, he proudly wore his uniform and bravely patrolled the streets of our city until making the ultimate sacrifice.

Born and raised in South Bend, Nick always wanted to be a police officer. During his many years as a South Bend officer, he received 18 commendations and was officer of the month in 2006.

Corporal Polizzotto leaves behind his parents, his wonderful son Joe and Joe's mom Michelle, a brother Tony, a sister Amy and countless relatives and friends who loved him. South Bend has lost a brave guardian.

Mr. Speaker, we grieve for our hero, Corporal Nick Polizzotto. May God welcome him home and give comfort to his family and friends.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 44 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Lord our God, great provider and bulwark of justice, listen to our prayers today as we pray for all those who by their daily labor build Your kingdom and establish relationships that will last.

Created in Your image and commissioned to be stewards of creation, guide the judgments of our minds and the precision of our hands that the work of this day may give You glory and serve the needs of our sisters and brothers.

Since we look upon the whole universe in relation to You, order all the endeavors of the human family to benefit the least in our midst and realize Your gracious plan at work in our humble service.

To You be praise, glory, and honor now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. GINGREY 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.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE COMMITTEE TO ATTEND FUNERAL OF THE LATE HONORABLE JUANITA MILLENDER-MCDONALD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 328, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of

the House to the committee to attend the funeral of the late Honorable Juanita Millender-McDonald:

The gentleman from California, Mr. STARK

The gentlewoman from California, Ms. PELOSI, and the members of the California delegation:

Mr. GEORGE MILLER
 Mr. WAXMAN
 Mr. LEWIS
 Mr. DREIER
 Mr. HUNTER
 Mr. LANTOS
 Mr. BERMAN
 Mr. GALLEGLY
 Mr. HERGER
 Mr. ROHRBACHER
 Mr. DOOLITTLE
 Ms. WATERS
 Mr. BECERRA
 Mr. CALVERT
 Ms. ESHOO
 Mr. FILNER
 Mr. MCKEON
 Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD
 Mr. ROYCE
 Ms. WOOLSEY
 Mr. FARR
 Ms. ZOE LOFGREN
 Mr. RADANOVICH
 Mr. SHERMAN
 Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ
 Mrs. TAUSCHER
 Mrs. CAPPS
 Mrs. BONO
 Ms. LEE
 Mr. GARY G. MILLER
 Mrs. NAPOLITANO
 Mr. THOMPSON
 Mr. BACA
 Ms. HARMAN
 Mrs. DAVIS
 Mr. HONDA
 Mr. ISSA
 Mr. SCHIFF
 Ms. SOLIS
 Ms. WATSON
 Mr. CARDOZA
 Mr. NUNES
 Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ
 Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN
 Mr. COSTA
 Ms. MATSUI
 Mr. CAMPBELL
 Mr. BILBRAY
 Mr. MCCARTHY
 Mr. MCNERNEY, and
 Mr. CONYERS, Michigan
 Mr. LEWIS, Georgia
 Mr. FALCOMA, American Samoa
 Mr. McDERMOTT, Washington
 Ms. NORTON, District of Columbia
 Mr. JEFFERSON, Louisiana
 Mr. BISHOP, Georgia
 Ms. CORRINE BROWN, Florida
 Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Texas
 Mr. SCOTT, Virginia
 Mr. WATT, North Carolina
 Mr. THOMPSON, Mississippi
 Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Texas
 Mr. CUMMINGS, Maryland
 Mr. HINOJOSA, Texas
 Ms. KILPATRICK, Michigan
 Mr. KUCINICH, Ohio
 Mr. MEEKS, New York
 Ms. BERKLEY, Nevada
 Mr. GONZALEZ, Texas

Mr. HOLT, New Jersey
 Mrs. JONES, Ohio
 Mr. DAVIS, Alabama
 Mr. MEEK, Florida
 Mr. SCOTT, Georgia
 Mr. BUTTERFIELD, North Carolina
 Mr. CLEAVER, Missouri
 Mr. AL GREEN, Texas
 Ms. MOORE, Wisconsin
 Ms. CLARKE, New York
 Mr. ELLISON, Minnesota
 Mr. JOHNSON, Georgia

MISSION ACCOMPLISHED

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

Mr. COHEN. Today is the fourth anniversary of the President of the United States announcing "Mission Accomplished." It is also the day of the publication of a book called "The Life and Times of Warren Zevon," a biography of a dear friend of mine who was a late, great singer/song writer. I wanted to address both topics, and I think I can do it together.

Four years ago, when the President announced "Mission Accomplished," he was right if he was talking about Saddam Hussein's government being toppled; but otherwise, he was wrong and he has been channeling Warren Zevon who said, "I'm caught between a rock and a hard place. Send lawyers, guns, and money. The Shiites have hit the fan."

Warren Zevon, requiescat in pace. Mr. President, please sign the bill the Congress has given you to end this war, to end the occupation, and to bring our troops home.

WE MUST PROVIDE FOR OUR TROOPS

(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. Madam Speaker, just this morning we received reports that the al Qaeda leader in Iraq has been killed. Despite such signs that support for the terrorist group in Iraq is fading, Democrats in Congress continue to advocate retreat and defeat. Fortunately for American families and our troops in the battlefield, we have a Commander in Chief who understands that victory is essential. As the Washington Post has editorialized: "America's defeat will lead to catastrophic civilian deaths, the reestablishment of terrorist training camps, and possibly a regional war. We must face the terrorists overseas, or we will face them again in the streets of America."

Our Nation is at war. Our troops are bravely serving their country. We have a responsibility to provide for their well-being. I support President Bush's pending veto and look forward to passing a clean supplemental bill that fully funds our soldiers' mission of protecting American families.

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

A NEW DIRECTION

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, 4 years ago, the President declared victory onboard the *Abraham Lincoln*.

Indeed, our troops have performed valiantly and achieved military victory. There is no question about that or their performance. But 4 years later, we find ourselves still in a quagmire, a quagmire that even the head of the CIA said was now all trumped up with misinformation, misled the country, sacrificing brave men and women and their lives in Iraq.

What we need is for the President to step up and recognize what the American people are calling for: a new direction. Refocus on Afghanistan, go after the terrorists where they are, go after Osama bin Laden, the people who actually took down the tower, and end this quagmire. And the only reason that we are there and continue to lose lives, because there is no mission other than arrogance and hubris that has led this President to stay this course in spite of the sacrifice by our brave troops and men, when 61 percent of the Iraqi people say it is okay to kill Americans, that sectarian violence is okay, and in the midst of the civil war is not where we belong.

IRAQ SUPPLEMENT

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

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, indeed it is an anniversary. It's about the 80th-day anniversary since the President asked for funding for our troops. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the theatrics the Democratic majority is trying to pass off as some kind of policy.

Today, Speaker PELOSI will stage an elaborate and politically timed signing ceremony for the Iraq troop withdrawal bill Congress passed 5 days ago. As President Bush has already vowed to veto this irresponsible legislation, Speaker PELOSI's theatrics are simply slowing down the process of getting much needed funding and money to our troops.

Let me remind the American people that our warfighters have been waiting nearly 3 months for Congress to pass the President's requested supplemental funding for the war. The Democratic leader might think a few days here don't mean much, don't matter much. Every day they stall to appease left-wing activists is another day our military must wait for the funding it needs to win this war.

Madam Speaker, I admonish Speaker PELOSI to quit playing politics with our

national security. Let Congress vote on a clean funding bill for our troops. The Democratic leaders may be content to lose the war, but the troops are in harm's way, and they certainly will not lose this war.

THE PRESIDENT NEEDS OUR HELP

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

Mr. KAGEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remind everyone here and throughout the country that our President needs our help. The President needs our help to support our troops before, during, and after serving in harm's way, and to guarantee our soldiers receive everything necessary to heal their wounds from battles fought on our behalf.

The President needs our help to fulfill Abe Lincoln's promise to our veterans, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphans. The President needs our help to hold the freely elected Iraqi Government accountable to his own benchmarks. And the President needs our help to accept the new direction away from Iraq back towards al Qaeda.

The people of Wisconsin urge the President to sign the Iraqi Accountability Act, for in doing so he will be able to once again tell our troops and all the American people: "Mission Accomplished."

Mr. President, the American people hope you will accept our help.

IRAQ SUPPLEMENTAL—THE WRONG WAY FORWARD

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, the Democrats' Iraq supplemental bill is the wrong policy for America and the wrong signal to send our troops in harm's way.

The Democrats' attempt to micro-manage the war accomplishes nothing of strategic value. Rather, by meddling in the decisions which are best left to our commanders on the ground, they merely succeeded in telegraphing our plans to the enemy.

Setting deadlines and tying the hands of our generals is not a plan for success and not a safe way to conduct this war. Congress, an inherent political body, should not be dictating military strategy. Rather than support a bill that leaves our troops in harm's way for a cause Democrats believe cannot be won, a bill the President has promised to veto, the Democratic leaders should be willing to vote up or down on a clean bill that supports funding the global war on terrorism.

TIME FOR A CHANGE IN COURSE

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. The Republican minority would say take the advice of the professionals. Well, if this administration had taken the advice of the military professionals, remember General Shinseki, "400,000 troops on the ground or you'll have an insurgency," they fired him because he talked about reality.

From day one they've been dumb: firing Shinseki; delusional: "we'll be greeted as liberators" and the war will be short; and deliberately deceptive: Saddam Hussein had links to 9/11 and they had weapons of mass destruction.

It's time for a change in course. They want status quo, stay the course. It's not working. Our troops are mired in the middle of a civil war. Someone needs to take the role of leadership here. It's not going to be Bush and CHENEY. It can be the United States Congress reasserting itself as a third equal branch of government and the only branch which has the authority to declare war and set limits. Yes, set limits on a war, and bring it to an end.

IRAQ SUPPLEMENTAL

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

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, House Republicans believe that our commanders on the ground in Iraq deserve to have the resources and flexibility they need to lead our troops in harm's way during this critical phase of their mission.

On the other hand, Washington Democrats would rather use our troops to make a political statement than work in a bipartisan fashion to get our brave men and women in uniform the funding they need to succeed in their mission.

I thought the San Diego Union Tribune made a good point in an editorial stating: "And even though this sham bill is merely a political show, the Democratic majorities in the House and Senate managed to lard it up in nearly \$25 billion in wasteful pork, most of it entirely unrelated to war funding."

It's time the Democratic leadership send the President a clean supplemental. It is simply unacceptable for Democrat leaders to restrict the necessary funds our troops need so political points can be scored with their defeatist base.

MISSION ACCOMPLISHED

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, 4 years ago, the President declared: "Mission Accomplished." I would ask the President, Madam Speaker, whose mission was accomplished by the invasion and occupation of Iraq? Was Halliburton's mission accomplished?

Was the oil companies' mission accomplished? Was the defense contractors' mission accomplished?

I was at Arlington Cemetery this morning where so many of our brave young men and women responded to the call of duty. Their mission was to put their lives on the line for America. They accomplished their mission. This Congress has not accomplished its mission.

We must stop funding the war. We must end the occupation. We must use the money in the pipeline to bring our troops home. We must reach out to the nations of the region to create an international peacekeeping and security force to stabilize Iraq. And we must bring to justice under our Constitution and under the laws of this Nation those in high office who took us into a war based on lies. Then we will have accomplished our mission. Then we will have restored America's honor, America's greatness.

□ 1215

U.S. COURTS VS. WORLD COURT

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, teenagers Jennifer Ertman and Elizabeth Pena were viciously raped, beaten, strangled and stomped to death by six gang members in Houston in 1993. One of these killers, Mexican national Jose Ernesto Medellin, was given the death penalty. But the World Court claims that Medellin was denied access to the Mexican consulate during his arrest. The U.S. administration sided with the World Court in Mexico and ordered Texas to hold a new hearing for Medellin based on a treaty the United States signed in 1969. But the Texas court, highest Texas court, ruled 9-0 the administration had no constitutional authority to order Texas courts to do anything; upheld the conviction, ordered the execution, especially because Medellin never objected at trial that he did not see his consulate. The killer, with the support of the administration and Mexico, has appealed the Texas court decision to the United States Supreme Court. One wonders why the administration is siding with Mexico over the American court system.

Madam Speaker, the ironic thing is the United States has withdrawn the consulate treaty provision. The United States justice system and the sovereignty of the United States Constitution should be paramount to the wishes of Mexico, the World Court and the administration. The Supreme Court should uphold this valid conviction and not give in to the wishes of Foreign Courts.

And that's just the way it is.

EITHER WE DO OUR JOB OR WE DON'T

(Mr. WELCH of Vermont asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Last week, the Government Reform and Oversight Committee voted to subpoena Secretary Rice and it was faced, the committee, with a simple question. We could do our job or not.

There is no question, no question that the intelligence used by the administration to justify the war in Iraq was dead wrong. Secretary Rice was the administration's principal spokesperson, and under her leadership the administration was certain but wrong about the Niger claim; certain but wrong about the aluminum tubes, certain but wrong about the al Qaeda connection, about the mobile labs, about unmanned aerial vehicles. And there are now three questions that Congress must answer. How did the White House and Secretary Rice have such confidence they were so right when, in fact, they were so wrong? How can we protect the American people and U.S. military from such misinformation in the future? And was the administration's active dissemination of bad intelligence premeditated and deliberate, done with the intention to deceive the American people, or was it reckless and cavalier, done to justify a decision to go to war that had already been made?

MISSION ACCOMPLISHED

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

Mr. PENCE. As we've heard this morning, Madam Speaker, 4 years ago today, aboard the USS *Abraham Lincoln*, President Bush gave a speech. Now, it has been characterized by Members of Congress this morning that the President "announced 'mission accomplished.'" And one other speaker said that the President "declared 'mission accomplished.'" Actually, here's what the President said, and I am quoting: "We have difficult work to do in Iraq. We're bringing order to parts of the country that remain dangerous." But he added, "our mission continues. Al Qaeda is wounded, not destroyed. The enemies of freedom are not idle and neither are we, and we will continue to hunt down the enemy before he can strike."

The President said, "the battle of Iraq is one victory in a war of terror that began September 11 and still goes on."

As the President said 4 years ago, Madam Speaker, "our mission is not accomplished in Iraq or in the war on terror." So now is not the time to tie the funding for our troops to deadlines and defeat. Now is not the time for politicians in Washington, D.C. to micromanage and make decisions for our commanders in the field.

Mr. President, veto this bill.

IT'S TIME FOR SOME ACCOUNTABILITY IN IRAQ

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, today Congress will send President Bush an emergency war supplemental that finally begins moving this war in a new direction.

Four years ago today, the Bush administration sent out a message of "Mission Accomplished" in Iraq. But our mission was not accomplished. Instead, for 4 years, the President has stumbled, and past Republican Congresses refused to hold the administration accountable for its miscues and mistakes. Well, those days are over now.

Our legislation brings real accountability to the war. It provides accountability to our soldiers who were sent into battle without proper equipment or a clear mission. It provides accountability to our veterans who are not getting the best medical care when they come home, and to our military that is stretched to the limits by the current Bush war policy. And it finally holds the Iraqi government accountable to meet the benchmarks the President has created.

Madam Speaker, the American people want this war to move in a new direction. The President should sign the bill today.

DEMOCRAT DECLARATION OF DEFEAT

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, we come to this floor as representatives of our constituents, of the American people. And I am astonished to hear some of the comments on this floor. We can disagree in terms of policies. We can disagree in terms of decisions, but to go from that to suggest lies, to suggest deception, to have a distinguished Member on the other side of the aisle say this past weekend that we ought to consider impeachment of the President, this declaration of defeat from the Democrats that is sent to the President's desk today ought to be vetoed by this President.

General Petraeus was here last week presenting to us his view of what's happening. And, frankly, I think General Petraeus has a better idea what we need to do than any other erstwhile general sitting here in the halls of Congress.

We can only have one Commander in Chief. We had a unanimous decision in the Senate to send General Petraeus there and yet, now you are trying to undercut his mission by this Democratic declaration of defeat.

Let us have the President veto it as soon as possible.

MISSION ACCOMPLISHED

(Ms. SHEA-PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Madam Speaker, 4 years ago today, 4 long years ago today, we heard "Mission Accomplished." What mission? We are not even sure what the mission is anymore, the President has changed the mission so many times.

But I have to tell America the truth about this war. I sit on the Armed Services Committee, and I'm tired of hearing what I hear every hearing. What am I hearing? I'm hearing that the American military is strained to the breaking point. I'm hearing that 88 percent of our National Guard is not ready to be sent. I'm hearing that we're having problems with equipment. I'm hearing problems from military families. What I'm hearing is that at the top leadership, we have failed the military and we have failed the people of the United States. We need to get a grip on this.

The Democrats have presented the White House with a responsible exit from Iraq. We need leadership here. The President has failed to show that leadership, but the Democrats are prepared now to give that responsible road map out of Iraq.

I urge the President to sign this legislation.

WAR IS AN UGLY THING

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, you know, nobody likes war. I don't like it. My constituents from Fort Campbell that are fighting this war, they don't like it. But they understand it.

And we all know there are some things worth fighting for. Freedom is one of those things. Freedom is one of those things.

Listen to this from British historian John Stuart Mill. He said back in the 1800s, "War is an ugly thing, not the ugliest of things. The decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks that nothing is worth war is much worse." People that don't care, that is what is worse.

Using our troops as a political tool during a time of war is not wrong. It is ugly. It is downright ugly. It is wrong, and it jeopardizes our national security. Just yesterday, Iraq's Ambassador to the U.S. said American troops are critical to the success of that.

Today we stand and recognize the demise of al Masri, the leader of al Qaeda in Iraq. Tenacity. Focus. That is what yields results. Our men and women are getting results. It should be the first priority. We should all be reading this bill. We should recognize war is ugly.

Veto the bill, Mr. President.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to the President.

HONORING THE CAREER AND RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF FRANCES E. ALLEN, THE 2006 RECIPIENT OF THE A.M. TURING AWARD

(Mr. HALL of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALL of New York. Madam Speaker, on a different subject, regarding H. Con. Res. 95, I thank my colleague, Ms. WOOLSEY from California, for introducing this resolution honoring Dr. Frances Allen.

Through her years of groundbreaking work at IBM, Frances Allen has been described as a pioneer, teacher, mentor and friend, and I am proud to say a constituent of mine in New York's 19th District. Now, the A.M. Turing award winner can be added to that last list.

The A.M. Turing award is considered to be the Nobel Prize of computing, and I cannot think of an individual more deserving than Frances Allen. Her work has been groundbreaking; not an exaggeration to say it's been part of one of the great technological revolutions in history.

Over the course of her career, Frances Allen's long journey took her from a teacher of FORTRAN to a nationally recognized leader in computer science.

At IBM's T.J. Watson Research Center in Hawthorne, New York, her research and development of program languages and algorithms helped to create the theory of optimization and laid the foundation for much of today's compilers and high performance computing systems.

Her work has been a bridge from the theoretical to the practical in the computer science.

Just as her work has been pioneering, Frances herself has been a pioneer in advancing the role of women in computer science.

An Advisory Council Member of the Anita Borg Institute for Women in Technology, whose goal it is to increase the participation of women in all aspects of technology, she has worked tirelessly to help more women enter the field, and has served as a role model for women and men hoping to make new breakthroughs in computing.

In 1989, she was the first woman to be given prestigious title of IBM fellow. It would seem fitting then that she is also the first woman to receive the A.M. Turing award.

Described as a strong mentor, and noted for her willingness to lend her expertise, advice and experience to anyone, from a struggling graduate student to a university president to an

industry executive. Through it all, she's been willing to stand up for what she believes in, and has had a remarkable career.

Dr. Allen is a great source of pride for the Hudson Valley, and I congratulate her for receiving the prestigious A.M. Turing award.

OPERATION HOMEFRONT MAKING
A POSITIVE DIFFERENCE

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, as the contentious and sometimes ugly debate over our strategy in Iraq continues here in Washington, it's important to remember that there are patriotic Americans helping with positive activity abroad and at home. And today it's my privilege to acknowledge the incredible work being done by some folks in my State of Georgia and all across this Nation. Operation Homefront is a national nonprofit organization founded in the wake of September 11. The decent and committed Americans at Operation Homefront are providing necessary assistance and comfort to our troops and their family.

Through financial assistance programs and other goods and services, these tireless volunteers are helping America's military families cope with the everyday difficulties that they face. They are truly making a difference.

Our military families deserve nothing less than the unending gratitude and support of our entire Nation. Thanks to Operation Homefront for their efforts. I encourage every American to get involved. And let's show our military men and women that we honor their sacrifice, and we will never forget all that they do to defend our freedom at home and abroad.

IRAQ

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

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, 4 years ago, President Bush used soldiers and sailors as stage props to declare "Major combat operations in Iraq have ended." Those combat operations indeed, should have ended, in fact, they should never have begun. This combat was constitutionally and strategically unjustifiable, operationally poorly executed with regard to armoring and deploying the troops, and politically and diplomatically disastrous.

This war is not making anyone safer or more free and it cannot be won militarily. As retired General Odom said, "The challenge we face today is not how to win in Iraq; it is how to recover from a strategic mistake: invading Iraq in the first place."

The President continues to squander American influence, blood and treasure. The President's intransigence is

why our Congress was forced to pass a spending bill that forces a change in course in Iraq. The President needs to know that the days of congressional blank checks in support of a failed policy are over.

IRAQ SUPPLEMENTAL

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, time is running out to send our troops the funds and resources they need to continue their critical mission in Iraq. It is time to pass a porkless supplemental bill aimed at victory rather than defeat.

The National Intelligence Estimate released in January warned of the perils of an early troop withdrawal stating, "If coalition forces were withdrawn rapidly during the term of this estimate, we judge that this almost certainly would lead to a significant increase in the scale and scope of sectarian conflict in Iraq."

Many on the other side of the aisle urge Congress to heed the other warnings in this document, yet they willfully ignore this particular warning. They prefer a strategy that would tie the hands of our military commanders on the ground, removing our troops and continuing a defeatist policy of cut and run.

It is obvious to me that Washington Democrats would exploit our troops to make a political statement rather than work in a bipartisan fashion to provide our brave men and women in uniform the funding they need.

Madam Speaker, it is time we vote a clean supplemental to give our troops the support they must have.

□ 1230

NEW DIRECTION IN IRAQ

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, it is absolutely correct: 4 years ago President Bush stood before this sign declaring "Mission Accomplished," but today he insists on staying the course. To accomplish our own mission, President Bush needs to listen. He needs to listen to the retired military generals who support the approach of this Congress.

Retired MG Paul Eaton said, "This bill gives General Petraeus great leverage for moving the Iraqi Government down the more disciplined path laid out by the Iraq Study Group."

LTG William Odom said, "The bill gives the President a chance to pull back from a disastrous course, reorient U.S. strategy to achieve regional stability, and win help from many other countries, the only way peace will eventually be achieved."

Major General Montano said the bill "not only reflects the thinking of the

Iraq Study Group but puts teeth to the phrase of 'supporting our troops.'

Madam Speaker, the President needs to listen. He needs to listen to these retired generals.

And, Mr. President, I will not address you directly, but I would ask you, Madam Speaker, to allow me to say that the bill will be on his desk this afternoon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must remind all Members on both sides of the aisle that they should refrain from trafficking the well while another is under recognition.

URGING A CLEAN IRAQ EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL

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

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, here we are again. Another week has gone by, and we are still discussing the Iraq emergency supplemental. The Democrats were successful in forwarding a strategy of cut and run, knowing the entire time their strategy would be vetoed by the President.

It is an ill-conceived idea to state you support the troops on the one hand while on the other hand you push forward with legislation that you know has no chance of gaining the President's support. I believe the Democrat leadership owes the American people an explanation of why they would do this.

Time is up and the Democrats need to come back to the realization that our troops don't deserve to be caught in the political mess between the radical left and the rest of the Democrat Party. It is time for a clean supplemental to come to the floor so that we can send the President a bill that supports our troops without handcuffing our generals and withdrawing our troops before this critical mission is complete.

THE IRAQ WAR

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, 4 years after the banner was unfurled, these are the missions that have been accomplished by the President:

America is more divided than at any time since the Vietnam War. The Iraq Government has before it a sweetheart deal that benefits Big Oil that the U.S. brokered behind the scenes. Read Josh Holland's investigative piece on alternet.com;

America is increasingly isolated in the Arab world, and countries that

looked up to America now look out or look the other way. Read Rami Khouri's commentary published in the April 19 issue of the Daily Star in Lebanon;

The number of Pentagon contractors in Iraq who are profiting in the spoils of war, raking in vast sums of U.S. taxpayer money, nearly equals the number of U.S. soldiers. Read "Iraq War: a Nice Little Earner" in the Asia Times newspaper dated April 19;

Americans are so fed up with the President's state of denial that they returned Democratic majorities to the House and Senate last November. Read the April 26 editorial in my hometown newspaper, the Seattle PI: "Iraq: Keep Speaking Out."

Missions accomplished? All but the most important one: getting U.S. soldiers out of Iraq.

That is the will of the American people and the mission of the new Congress.

IT IS TIME THE DEMOCRAT LEADERSHIP PUT OUR TROOPS, NOT POLITICAL STATEMENTS, FIRST

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

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, now that the Democrats have satisfied their base and passed a bill that is guaranteed to be vetoed and delayed the necessary funding for our troops, we need to get down to business and pass a clean supplemental.

Yesterday I received a letter from a marine mom. She said she was embarrassed and saddened by the fact that somebody would leave her son and those fighting forces that are doing such a wonderful job in harm's way without funding their needs as they fight the battle for freedom. This lady was heart broken that a portion of this Congress would vote not to provide a clean bill for her son's protection.

The Chicago Tribune editorial says that President Bush is going to veto this spending bill because it has a timetable for withdrawal, and it goes on to say: "He is right to do so."

We have a new commanding general on the ground and he has a plan, and that plan has not even started to be executed. We are already seeing modest improvements.

I urge my colleagues, and that marine mom urges my colleagues, to support a clean supplemental. It is time the Democrat leadership put our troops, not political statements, first.

THE IRAQ WAR

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

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Madam Speaker, on Sunday in a speech at Miami Dade College, the President said to graduating students, "One of the great strengths of America is that the

most important issues are decided by the will of the people."

Today, on the fourth anniversary of "Mission Accomplished," the President is faced with a choice: either listen to the will of the American people to refocus our strengths to win the war on terror by signing the emergency supplemental bill or continue to send our brave men and women into harm's way to police a religious civil war.

Madam Speaker, today the President will decide if he will veto our bill and, in doing so, deny critical funding for our troops and for our veterans. His veto will let our troops down by not giving them the rest, the equipment, and training they need.

Madam Speaker, today all Americans need to pray for our President. We need to pray for wisdom. We need to pray that he listens to his advisers, his generals, the Iraqi people. And, most importantly, we pray that he will listen to the will of the American people.

SEND THE PRESIDENT A CLEAN BILL THAT GIVES OUR TROOPS THE MONEY THEY NEED

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, we've got the lights. We've got the cameras. We've got the characters for some fine political theater in the House of Representatives today.

Last week this Congress passed an ill-conceived, wrong-headed, ill-fated war funding bill, even though every Member of this House knew the President would veto it, even though our troops are on the front lines of a war awaiting this funding.

And while the troops face fire, the Democratic leaders fiddled. They slowed down the process even more by sitting on the bill for days.

Madam Speaker, it's time for the majority to change out of their costumes, take down the curtain, take their bow, and exit stage left because Americans don't want to see the last act of this Democratic script that calls for waving the white flag of surrender.

We owe it to our Nation and to our troops to change the ending of the story. Send the President a clean bill and give the troops the money they need to do the job. And they will be victorious.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McNULTY. Madam Speaker, last Thursday, April 26, on roll call No. 269, I missed the vote. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted in the affirmative.

URGING SUPPORT FOR A CLEAN IRAQ EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL BILL

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, it is my hope that we can come together and agree on an Iraq emergency supplemental that provides the resources our troops need without tying the hands of our generals and forcing them to adhere to unrealistic timetables.

Last week in a Chicago Tribune editorial, they stated: "President Bush will veto the war spending bill approved by Congress this week because it contains a timetable for withdrawing U.S. combat troops from Iraq. He is right to do so."

With a new commanding general on the ground and the surge strategy still ramping up, our troops deserve this chance to make progress, and we are starting to see signs in Iraq that things are modestly improving.

I urge my colleagues to support a clean supplemental and to encourage patience as we heard 4 years ago before we even went to Iraq that this would be a long time coming, that our ultimate goal in accomplishing victory in Iraq would take some time. We need to listen to those comments, and, again, I urge patience.

THE IRAQ EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL

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

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, the American people have demanded a new direction in Iraq, and last week this Congress voted to put an end to the administration's failed stay-the-course policy.

The President should support our troops and sign this responsible bill instead of issuing veto threats that continue to ignore the reality of our troops' being caught in the middle of a civil war. It is ironic that we are expecting the President to veto this bill to bring our troops home 4 years to the day after he declared the job done in Iraq. It is time for accountability from the administration and from the Iraqi Government.

Our bill provides what the American people are demanding and what our troops need: a responsible policy that funds our troops, demands accountability from the administration and the Iraqi Government, and supports our veterans.

The President should listen to Congress. Sign this bill, take the funding, and accept accountability.

TIME IS RUNNING OUT: SEND OUR TROOPS THE FUNDS THEY NEED

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

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, time is running out to send our troops the funds and resources they need to continue their critical mission in Iraq.

The new congressional majority ensured the veto the President promised

by submitting a supplemental loaded with pork and a timeline for retreat on our commanders in the field. Now it's time to pass a clean supplemental.

The National Intelligence Estimate released in January warned of the perils of an early troop withdrawal, stating: "If coalition forces were withdrawn rapidly during the term of this estimate, we judge that this almost certainly would lead to a significant increase in the scale and scope of sectarian conflict in Iraq."

Many on the other side of the aisle urge Congress to heed the words in this document; yet they stare blindly at it as they force a strategy of retreat and defeat. This leads me to believe that the new congressional majority would rather use our troops to make a political statement than work in bipartisan fashion to give our brave men and women in uniform the funding they need.

It's time we vote on a clean supplemental and give the troops the support they deserve.

FOUR YEARS AGO IT WAS MISSION ACCOMPLISHED; NOW IT IS THE NEVER-ENDING, EVER-CHANGING MISSION

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

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, today we insist, we ask, the President to fund the troops by not vetoing this bill. We ask the President to sign the bill.

What has been described as pork is not pork. What it is, is money for traumatic brain injury. What it is, is money for veterans who are suffering, who have serious problems and serious needs for funding.

The President has received more money than he even asked for for these troops, and we insist and ask him to sign the bill so that the troops can get the money that they need. It is going to be on his desk. The funds that the President needs will be on his desk. And if the President vetoes the bill, it will be the President who denies the troops the funds that they need. The President must accept responsibility for denying the troops the help that they need, veterans the help that they need.

Madam Speaker, we urge the community to understand the truth about the situation, which is that a veto is undermining the troops.

□ 1245

IRAQ SUPPLEMENTAL

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, our enemies are listening, and they are planning on our actions today, just like the North Vietnamese did decades ago. And don't believe me, but listen to

the words of Colonel Bui Tin, who served on the general's staff of the North Vietnamese Army and received the unconditional surrender of South Vietnam on April 30, 1975.

In an interview with The Wall Street Journal in 1995, he drew some important parallels to the debate today. When asked how the North Vietnamese intended to defeat America, Colonel Tin responded, "by fighting a long war which would break their will to help South Vietnam." He went on to quote Ho Chi Minh, who said, "We don't need to win military victories, we only need to hit them until they give up and get out." Colonel Tin said the American antiwar movement was essential to their strategy. He said it represented the conscience of America and the conscience of America was part of its war-making capability, and we were turning that power in our favor.

Through protests, America lost its ability to mobilize a will to win. That is what this supplemental does here today. Let's listen to the past and not repeat its mistakes. Let's pass a clean bill and give our soldiers what they need to win.

IRAQ TIMETABLE AND FUNDING

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

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, I would just like to say that there has been a lot of talk about Democrats cutting and running and not helping our troops. Well, I would like to clarify the record on my own behalf.

Just a month ago, I had an opportunity, with four other Members of Congress, to visit Iraq, to visit our soldiers. I met with many, many platoons and individuals representing my State of California. We are there working hard. We need to support those troops.

Indeed, many of them said that they have been on their second and third tours. They were exhausted. They wanted to come home and see their families. One young man told me he hadn't even seen his child, who had been born 18 months already. Several of them told me that they did not have adequate equipment. And I said please explain that. "Well, ma'am, we don't have light bulbs." "What do you need light bulbs for?" "We need light bulbs for our vehicles. When we go into town and we are checking for explosive devices, we have vehicles that are not adequately equipped."

In addition, with the escalation going on right now, they are having to share their equipment with the troops that are coming in. That is shameful. That is what this administration has done to our troops.

Democrats are asking for a signature on the supplemental because we care about those troops and we care about the benefits that they deserve.

FOUR YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF
"MISSION ACCOMPLISHED"

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

Mr. PASCARELL. Madam Speaker, 1,460 days ago, we had lost 139 troops, brave men and women, in Iraq. 1,460 days later, Sergeant Michael Hullender from my district, from Little Falls, New Jersey, died on Saturday when an IED detonated near his patrol. He is one of 3,214 more troops that have died since supposedly major operations would cease.

The President made the Iraqi people believe that a new day of democracy was dawning and that brighter times lay ahead. Even the reconstruction of Iraq has gone awry. Even the reconstruction has been bought by the filthy hands of contractors who are concerned only for profit.

The President made the American people believe that the war was over, that the thousands of sailors who stood on the deck of that aircraft carrier that day were coming home soon. They did not.

The President has an opportunity to mend his ways this afternoon. Let's see what he does.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

HONORING THE CAREER AND RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF
FRANCES E. ALLEN

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) honoring the career and research accomplishments of Frances E. Allen, the 2006 recipient of the A.M. Turing Award, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 95

Whereas Frances Allen joined IBM in 1957 early in the history of the computer industry and just after an IBM team developed Fortran, one of the first high-level programming languages;

Whereas Frances Allen during her 45 year career at IBM rose from being a teacher of Fortran to highest level of IBM technologists;

Whereas in 1989 Frances Allen was the first woman to be named an IBM Fellow and in 1995 became President of the IBM Academy of Technology, a global organization of IBM technical leaders charged with providing technical advice to the company;

Whereas Frances Allen made fundamental contributions to the theory and practice of

program optimization, which translates the users' problem-solving language statements;

Whereas Frances Allen's work led to remarkable advances in compiler design and machine architecture that are at the foundation of modern high-performance computing;

Whereas Frances Allen's unique dedication to meeting the needs of her customers led to IBM's innovation model;

Whereas Frances Allen is nationally renowned for her work in encouraging women to study computer science;

Whereas the Association for Computing Machinery, an international organization of computing professionals, gives the A.M. Turing Award annually to individuals whose contributions in the field of computing are long-lasting and are of major technical importance; and

Whereas Frances Allen has now been honored as the first woman recipient of the Turing Award, computer science's most prestigious award, which is equated by some to the Nobel Prizes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress honors the pioneering life work of Frances Allen in computer research and development and salutes the Turing Award Committee for recognizing, through the selection of Frances Allen, that creative women have contributed mightily to the development of this important field.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 95, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H. Con. Res. 95 honors a pioneer in the world of computing, Dr. Frances Allen, the first woman awarded the A.M. Turing Award by the Association for Computing Machinery, ACM. The Turing Award is widely considered to be the Nobel Prize of computing. By being the first female recipient, Dr. Allen has set the bar as a role model for women everywhere who aspire to a career in math and science.

As a scientist at IBM since the early 1960s, Dr. Allen pioneered new technologies which serve as the basis for complex theories which are widely used today throughout the computer industry. She is regarded as a pioneer in the field of optimizing compilers and has developed several programming languages that have advanced the field of computer science.

Dr. Allen also helped create one of the first automatic debugging systems, and developed the advanced code-breaking language known as Alpha,

which revolutionized how computers talk to each other and make computer programmers more efficient.

As computer science was ramping up in the early 1980s, Dr. Allen founded the Parallel Translation Group, the PTRAN, to study compiling for parallel machines. Subsequently, this group was recognized as one of the top research groups in the world dealing with this issue, and as a result, Dr. Allen was the first woman to be recognized as an IBM fellow in 1989.

In addition to her outstanding scientific achievement, Dr. Allen has also been an inspirational mentor to younger researchers and a leader within the computing community.

With the Nation's information technology workforce suffering from a lack of qualified candidates, it is all the more important, Madam Speaker, that Dr. Allen be recognized as the first female recipient of the A.M. Turing Award to show what women can accomplish.

It is certainly telling that women who earn more than half of all undergraduate degrees in this country and make up more than half of the professional workforce represent only 25 percent of all high-tech workers. In fact, the percentage of women graduating with degrees in computer science has fallen from 37 percent of total graduates in 1985 to just 15 percent in 2005. With grim statistics like these, it is clear that we are going to close the gap and ensure that information technology sectors have enough workers only if we get young women into this workplace. And Dr. Allen has done just that.

As a member of the Advisory Council of the Anita Borg Institute for Women and Technology, her goal has been to increase the participation of women in all aspects of technology. With her accomplishments in computing, it is clear that Dr. Allen lives up to the goals she sets for others and is a role model for women in science and technology.

Madam Speaker, Dr. Frances Allen has succeeded at the highest levels of math and science. It is clear that she deserves recognition for all of the tireless work she has done to promote women's roles in computing.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, not only in congratulating Dr. Allen on her success, but to show that this Congress supports an increased presence of women in science and technology.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor and congratulate Frances E. Allen, the 2006 recipient of the A.M. Turing Award.

The Turing Award, established in 1966, is given annually by the Association for Computing Machinery to individuals whose work has been of lasting and major technical importance to the computer field. Fran Allen is richly deserving of this honor. She is also the first woman to receive the award.

Fran Allen exemplifies the dedication and innovative spirit that has brought this country to the forefront of science, technology and commerce. As a researcher for IBM for nearly 45 years, she played a key role in building the high-performance computing world we live in today.

Her work on optimization of parallel processing has impacted all of our lives, for example, by setting the stage for today's computer systems that forecast our weather and analyze DNA sequences.

I would like to particularly commend Ms. Allen for her dedication to supporting and mentoring young men and women in her field. I note that after her retirement from IBM, she kept an office and has continued her work mentoring future leaders in computer sciences and, hopefully, future A.M. Turing Award winners as well.

As this Congress looks to improve our Nation's competitiveness and looks to provide for the next generation of scientists, engineers and business men and women, we should consider the great example that Fran Allen has given to us.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 95 and join me in congratulating Fran Allen today.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Science and Technology, I am proud to have brought H. Con. Res. 95 to the floor today.

Dr. Allen has contributed much to the world of science and technology. She is most deserving of this honor, and we are extending to her today our congratulations.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 95, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING NOBEL PRIZE RECIPIENTS IN SCIENCE

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 316) recognizing the accomplishments of Roger D. Kornberg, Andrew Fire, Craig Mello, John C. Mather, and George F. Smoot for being awarded Nobel Prizes in the fields of chemistry, physiology or medicine, and physics.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 316

Whereas, according to the National Academies landmark report "Rising Above the Gathering Storm", the United States is in peril of losing its global competitive edge unless we make substantial investments in science, math, research, and innovation;

Whereas breakthroughs in scientific research are the building blocks of a productive, competitive, and healthy society;

Whereas the Nobel Prize is a prestigious international award administered annually by the Nobel Foundation in Stockholm, Sweden, and has since 1901 recognized the world's most outstanding achievements in physics, chemistry, physiology or medicine, literature, and peace;

Whereas on December 10, 2006, in Stockholm, Sweden, the following five American scientists were awarded the three Nobel Prizes for science. The Nobel Prize in Chemistry was awarded to Roger D. Kornberg from Stanford University in Palo Alto, California, for his studies of the molecular basis of eukaryotic transcription. The Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine was awarded to Andrew Fire from the Stanford University School of Medicine in Palo Alto, California, and Craig Mello from the University of Massachusetts Medical School in Worcester, Massachusetts, for their discovery of RNA interference through gene silencing by double-stranded RNA. The Nobel Prize in Physics was awarded to John C. Mather from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, Maryland, and the University of Maryland and George F. Smoot, a National Science Foundation grantee from the University of California at Berkeley for their discovery of the blackbody form and anisotropy of the cosmic microwave background radiation;

Whereas American scientists have not swept the Nobel Prize science awards since 1983;

Whereas Roger D. Kornberg, Andrew Fire, Craig Mello, John C. Mather, and George F. Smoot have represented the United States and have served as unofficial ambassadors of science overseas; and

Whereas the accomplishments of these scientists are significant achievements in the field of scientific research and further promote the United States among the world leaders in science: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes Roger D. Kornberg, Andrew Fire, Craig Mello, John C. Mather, and George F. Smoot for advancing scientific discovery and dedicating their careers to scientific research;

(2) recognizes the National Science Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for their support of the physics Nobel Prize winners; and

(3) congratulates the achievement of Roger D. Kornberg, Andrew Fire, Craig Mello, John C. Mather, and George F. Smoot for being awarded Nobel Prizes in science.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

clude extraneous material on H. Res. 316, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL for their support of this resolution and working so quickly to ensure that we recognize a very deserving group of scientists on their important achievements.

□ 1300

The scientists will be honored tomorrow at a luncheon here in Washington, so the timing of this bill is perfect. I appreciate the opportunity to describe this legislation that highlights the contributions of American scientists.

H. Res. 316 is significant not only because it applauds the breakthroughs of scientific work, but the bill also draws attention to many issues that we frequently work on in the Science and Technology Committee, putting a spotlight on scientific discovery as a way to get young people interested in fields they might otherwise ignore.

For the first time in more than 20 years, U.S. researchers have swept the scientific categories of the Nobel Prize by winning the awards for chemistry, physiology and medicine, and physics. It is fitting that we recognize the contributions of these individuals, and I am pleased we are doing so here today.

In December of last year, the Nobel Prize in chemistry was awarded to Roger Kornberg from Stanford University in my home State of California; the physiology prize went to Andrew Fire, who also works at Stanford in the School of Medicine; and the physics award went to John Mather from NASA's Goddard Space Center and to George Smoot from the University of California at Berkeley. Mr. Smoot also has the distinction of adding his name to the list of more than 170 grantees from the National Science Foundation who have been granted the Nobel Prizes over the years.

I am sure that with the improvements we will be making in the NSF program tomorrow and the Congress' dedication to expanding education opportunities, Mr. Smoot will certainly not be the last recipient of NSF funding to receive the Nobel Prize.

H. Res. 316 officially recognizes the accomplishments of these scientists and their contributions to improving society.

Madam Speaker, I can't think of a better way to honor these individuals, and I commend them for helping the U.S. sweep the Nobel Prizes in science for the first time in 30 years.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I rise to add my whole-hearted thanks and admiration for the skill

and effort shown by the five individuals we are honoring here today. Since 1901, the Nobel Prize has recognized the world's finest minds in the fields of physics, chemistry, physiology and medicine, literature and peace. In 2006, five American scientists were chosen for this prestigious award. These five men join 763 previous men and women and 19 organizations recognized at the pinnacle of their fields.

Roger Kornberg received the Nobel Prize in chemistry for his studies on transcription, a fundamental cellular process that uses information encoded in genes to produce proteins. Dr. Kornberg's award comes 47 years after his father, Arthur Kornberg, received the 1959 Nobel Prize in physiology and medicine. In 2006 that prize was awarded to Andrew Fire and Craig Mello for their influential work on RNA interference, a process that uses RNA to control the production of proteins.

John Mather and George Smoot share the Nobel Prize in physics for their pioneering work in cosmology, discovering fluctuations in the cosmic microwave background that help explain the formation of galaxies, stars, and the Earth itself.

Drs. Roger Kornberg, Andrew Fire, Craig Mello, John Mather, and George Smoot deserve our thanks and sincere appreciation for their efforts supporting the greatest innovation economy in the world. Without men and women like them committed to the often arduous task of scientific discovery, we would not enjoy the economic prosperity that has graced our Nation.

This resolution signals this body's commitment to supporting and strengthening the scientific enterprise. While this resolution, unfortunately, does not match the \$10 million prize awarded to these Nobel Laureates, we can do better by ensuring that we support funding for the science and technology efforts of the Federal Government.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 316.

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

Mr. McNERNEY. Madam 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. McNERNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 316.

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.

45TH ANNIVERSARY OF JOHN HERSCHEL GLENN, JR. BECOMING FIRST U.S. ASTRONAUT TO ORBIT EARTH

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and

agree to the resolution (H. Res. 252) recognizing the 45th anniversary of John Herschel Glenn, Jr.'s historic achievement in becoming the first United States astronaut to orbit the Earth.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 252

Whereas John Herschel Glenn, Jr. was born on July 18, 1921, in Cambridge, Ohio, and grew up in New Concord, a small college town a few miles from the larger city of Zanesville, Ohio;

Whereas John Glenn attended New Concord High School and earned a Bachelor of Science degree in engineering from Muskingum College, which also awarded him an honorary Doctor of Science degree in engineering;

Whereas John Glenn enlisted in the Naval Aviation Cadet Program shortly after the attack on Pearl Harbor and was commissioned in the United States Marine Corps in 1943;

Whereas John Glenn served in combat in the South Pacific and also requested combat duty during the Korean conflict;

Whereas John Glenn was a dedicated military officer, flying 149 missions during 2 wars;

Whereas John Glenn received many honors for his military service, among them the Distinguished Flying Cross on 6 occasions, the Air Medal with 18 Clusters, the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal, the American Campaign Medal, the World War II Victory Medal, the China Service Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, and the Korean Service Medal;

Whereas John Glenn served several years as a test pilot on Navy and Marine Corps jet fighters and attack aircraft;

Whereas, as a test pilot, John Glenn set a transcontinental speed record in 1957 by completing the first flight to average supersonic speeds from Los Angeles to New York;

Whereas John Glenn was a pioneer in the realm of space exploration and was selected in 1959 as one of the original 7 astronauts in the United States space program, entering the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA) Project Mercury;

Whereas John Glenn was assigned to the NASA Space Task Group at Langley Research Center in Hampton, Virginia;

Whereas, in 1962, the Space Task Group was moved to Houston, Texas, and became part of the NASA Manned Spacecraft Center;

Whereas, on February 20, 1962, John Glenn piloted the Mercury-Atlas 6 "Friendship 7" spacecraft on the first manned orbital mission of the United States;

Whereas, after launching from the Kennedy Space Center in Florida, John Glenn completed a 3-orbit mission around the planet, reaching an approximate maximum altitude of 162 statute miles and an approximate orbital velocity of 17,500 miles per hour;

Whereas John Glenn landed Friendship 7 approximately 5 hours later, 800 miles southeast of the Kennedy Space Center near Grand Turk Island;

Whereas, with that pioneering flight, John Glenn joined his colleagues Alan Shepard and Virgil Grissom in realizing the dream of space exploration and engaging the minds and imaginations of his and future generations in the vast potential of space exploration;

Whereas, after retiring from the space program, John Glenn continued his public service as a distinguished member of the Senate, in which he served for 24 years;

Whereas John Glenn has continued his public service through his work at the John Glenn Institute at Ohio State University, which was established to foster public involvement in the policy-making process, raise public awareness about key policy issues, and encourage continuous improvement in the management of public enterprise;

Whereas, in March 1999, Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley appointed John Glenn as Chair of the newly formed National Commission on Mathematics and Science Teaching for the 21st Century;

Whereas the Commission played a pivotal role in improving the quality of teaching in mathematics and science in the United States;

Whereas, in 1998, John Glenn returned to space after 36 years as a member of the crew of the space shuttle Discovery, serving as a payload specialist and as a subject for basic research on how weightlessness affects the body of an older person; and

Whereas, combined with his previous missions, John Glenn logged over 218 hours in space; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors the 45th anniversary of John Herschel Glenn, Jr.'s landmark mission piloting the first manned orbital mission of the United States; and

(2) recognizes the profound importance of John Glenn's achievement as a catalyst to space exploration and scientific advancement in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WILSON) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Resolution 252, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 252, recognizing the 45th anniversary of John Herschel Glenn, Jr.'s historic achievement in becoming the first United States astronaut to orbit the Earth.

This resolution recognizes John Glenn's distinguished career as a military officer in the United States Marine Corps, during which he served in combat in the South Pacific and the Korean conflict and received many honors for his military service, as a test pilot on Navy and Marine Corps jet fighters and attack aircraft, and especially as an astronaut on the first manned orbital mission of the United States.

Madam Speaker, on February 20, 1962, John Glenn piloted the Mercury-Atlas 6 *Friendship 7* spacecraft on the first U.S. manned orbital space mission, completing three orbits of the

Earth and landing some 5 hours later 800 miles southeast of Kennedy Space Center near Grand Turk Island. With that pioneer flight, John Glenn joined his fellow Americans, Alan Shepard and Virgil Grissom, in realizing the dream of space exploration and engaging the minds and imaginations of his and future generations in the vast potential of space exploration.

This resolution recognizes that John Glenn, having retired from the space program, continued his public service as a distinguished Member of the Senate for 24 years and through his work at the John Glenn Institute at the Ohio State University, which fosters public involvement in the policy-making process.

In 1998, John Glenn returned to space after 36 years as a member of the crew of the Space Shuttle *Discovery*, helping researchers study how weightlessness affects the body of an older person.

Madam Speaker, I urge you and my colleagues to support House Resolution 252, to honor this 45th anniversary of John Herschel Glenn, Jr.'s landmark mission, piloting the first manned orbital mission of the United States, and to recognize the profound importance of his achievement as a catalyst to space exploration and scientific advancement in the United States.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 252, which honors the 45th anniversary of John Herschel Glenn, Jr.'s historic mission as the first American to orbit the Earth aboard the Mercury spacecraft *Friendship 7*. This was truly a landmark event in our human space flight program. These early successes captured the minds and imaginations of people around the world and were an inspiration to all Americans at a time when we were the underdog in a technological race with the Soviet Union.

Prior to his service with NASA, John Glenn had already received numerous honors for his military service during World War II and the Korean War. He set a transcontinental speed record in 1957 by completing the first flight between Los Angeles and New York at an average speed greater than the speed of sound.

John Glenn was selected as one of the original Mercury 7 NASA astronauts in 1959 and logged over 218 hours in space. After retiring from the space program, John Glenn continued to serve his country as a distinguished Member of the United States Senate for 24 years. In 1998, John Glenn returned to space after 36 years as a member of the crew of the Space Shuttle *Discovery*, serving as a subject for basic research into the effects of weightlessness on the body of an older person.

John Glenn is truly an American hero. I am proud to support this resolution honoring such a prominent American citizen, military veteran and astronaut. I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 252.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SPACE).

Mr. SPACE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 252, a resolution commemorating the 45th anniversary of John Herschel Glenn, Jr.'s historic first orbit around the Earth.

John Glenn's accomplishments and service to his country made him an inspiration to a generation of young men and women like me. He was a source of pride for our Nation. His contributions to space exploration helped to change our Nation's way of thinking about the new frontier and taught a generation of Americans to dream big. I am honored that this true American hero was born, raised and educated in Ohio's 18th District.

Born in 1921 in Cambridge, Ohio, and raised in nearby New Concord, John Glenn attended New Concord High School and earned a bachelor of science degree from Muskingum College in New Concord.

John Glenn began his distinguished military career by enlisting in the Naval Aviation Cadet Program, going on to become a Marine pilot, earning the Distinguished Flying Cross on six occasions and the Air Medal with 18 clusters. After leaving the military, John Glenn became a test pilot for the Naval Air Test Center. In 1957 he set a speed record by flying from Los Angeles to New York in 3 hours 23 minutes.

While these achievements are without question remarkable and cause for celebration, Madam Speaker, they are not what bring us here today. We are here to appreciate John Glenn's accomplishments in a space flight that revolutionized how Americans viewed space exploration.

In the 1950s, the concept of sending a man into space was foreign to most Americans. A mere 50 years after the Wright brothers made their first brief attempts at manned flight, the prospect of propelling a human being into outer space was daunting.

In 1959, John Glenn volunteered to become one of the original seven astronauts in the Mercury program, the first manned space flight program in the United States. Several years later, John Glenn embarked on his mission. In February of 1962, he became the first man to orbit the Earth, completing that feat three times over.

Madam Speaker, I understand that Senator Glenn knew there was a significant chance he would not survive the flight. I had the pleasure of a conversation with Senator Glenn recently where he told me that he chose to go on the mission because it was the right thing to do, knowing full well he may not return. And it was the right thing to do not for himself, but for America.

A year earlier than that, President Kennedy announced a bold new mission to place a man on the Moon. The success of John Glenn's flight helped bring credence and merit to President Kennedy's goal.

□ 1315

Americans saw that what was once impossible was now possible. The possibilities suddenly seemed endless.

Following the end of his career in aeronautics, Ohio was the fortunate benefactor of John Glenn's public service when he became a United States Senator. He served the State with dignity and honor for 28 years before retiring.

Of course, space exploration was never far from his heart. After retiring from the Senate, he joined the crew of the Space Shuttle *Discovery* and became the oldest man to ever venture into space.

Madam Speaker, I have had the privilege of meeting this American hero. I am struck by his humility and his passion for service to his country. Time and again, he risked his life for the benefit of the American people. He prioritized the good of the whole over the good of the one, and for that I will always admire him.

As a freshman Member of Congress, I often look for examples to follow. For me, John Glenn, along with his beautiful wife, Annie, represent the absolute best this country has to offer. They have shown courage in the face of adversity and selflessness for the sake of making our country better. They have instilled in all of us the hope and inspiration and pride that swells the heart and enriches our world.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to commemorate an achievement that was the catalyst for space exploration and scientific advancement in the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of this resolution honoring the 45th anniversary of John Glenn's historic flight, making him the first American to orbit the Earth.

His journey in the Mercury-Atlas 6 *Friendship 7* spacecraft was made all the more incredible by the complications that ensued during the flight. Scheduled for three orbits, the final two had to be piloted on manual control after a malfunction in the automatic controls. Still on manual control, Mr. Glenn piloted the capsule during reentry into the earth's atmosphere.

The spacecraft also sent a signal to the ground that the heat shield, designed to prevent the craft from burning up on reentry, was loose. Though ground control did not tell him, Mr. Glenn quickly deduced there was a problem. An external piece of the craft called a retropack, which was supposed to be jettisoned before reentry was left on to try to keep the heat shield in

place. During the reentry, pieces of retropack flew past the capsule's window in flames. Still, Colonel Glenn landed safely in the Atlantic Ocean to the relief of the Nation. During the flight, John Glenn was subjected to 7.7 Gs and traveled 76,000 miles.

His success helped lay the groundwork for the continuous string of successes NASA has since accumulated. John Glenn went on to continue his lengthy record of public service as a U.S. Senator from Ohio, even returning to space flight in 1999.

When we stand here and look back 45 years, it is almost impossible to imagine that a man would step into a small container with a huge rocket behind it that would propel him into an orbit. And when you think of the kind of courage that he demonstrated then, what is interesting about John Glenn is that all of the attention, the fame and adulation that came after that didn't affect him one bit. He was basically someone who served his country in the military, then went on to serve his country as a U.S. Senator, and while this historic occasion is being recognized, I think also we pay tribute to John Glenn the man, who has demonstrated that it is possible to be able to walk with kings and never lose the common touch.

And also, we celebrate his wife, Annie, who has been a constant companion at Senator Glenn's side and has always represented the finest tradition of American couples. John and Annie Glenn have so much to be proud of, and this Nation owes both of them a debt of gratitude, and I am glad to see that we are honoring the 45th anniversary of his historic flight. Also, I am so pleased that so many of my colleagues from Ohio are here to join in paying tribute to John Glenn.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

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

Mr. REGULA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize John Glenn, a fellow Buckeye, on the 45th anniversary of becoming the first astronaut to orbit the earth.

John Glenn is a pioneer in the field of space exploration and science, and his achievements serve as an inspiration for students studying math, engineering, science and technology.

His landmark journey propelled other missions and projects such as the first moon landing, NASA'S Hubble Space Telescope, and the International Space Station. Our economic prosperity depends increasingly on science and technology, and it is because of explorers like John Glenn that America remains on the cutting edge of science and technology research and discovery.

I would also add that John's wife, Annie, has always been a wonderful, supportive partner in the success of

John's endeavors. She also deserves our appreciation.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Madam Speaker, today I join my colleagues from Ohio and across the country in the celebration of the 45th anniversary of John Herschel Glenn Jr.'s historic journey around our planet.

Senator Glenn, a proud Ohio native, carried the hopes and dreams of an entire country with him on his February 20, 1962 trip. He carried those dreams in the tiny *Friendship 7* space capsule, no more than 9 feet high and 6 feet wide atop the *Atlas* rocket. He carried those dreams into orbit at the astonishing speed of 5 miles per second.

Senator Glenn piloted the *Friendship 7* capsule around the globe three times, becoming the first American to orbit the earth, an accomplishment that raised the spirits of all Americans.

When speaking about the historic journey, Glenn recounted later saying, "I don't know what you can say about a day in which you have seen four beautiful sunsets, three in orbit and one on the surface after I was back on board the ship."

While Glenn was witnessing sunset from the window of the space capsule, the country was witnessing the sun rising on America's fledgling space program, and our Nation's hunger for space exploration.

I had the tremendous honor of meeting Senator Glenn when I was in high school. I distinctly remember being in awe of his lifetime of accomplishments. He has led this country in almost every way possible, as a pioneering adventurer, as a scientist, as a military hero, as an elected leader, and as a champion of education.

Senator Glenn and all of his accomplishments are an embodiment of our country's can-do attitude. It is in recognition and eternal gratitude that I join my colleagues in rising today to honor this great man and the 45th anniversary of his momentous voyage into the great beyond.

Thank you, Senator Glenn, and may your continued journey through life be a lesson in adventure and bravery to us all.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise in proud recognition of the 45th Anniversary of Senator John Glenn's mission piloting the first manned orbital mission of the United States. This event spawned decades of manned space missions for the United States and eventually a manned mission to the moon with the *Apollo 11* mission in July of 1969. Senator Glenn has served this Nation proud as a Marine Corps Pilot, a U.S. Senator, and an Astronaut. He was the third American in Space and the first American to orbit the Earth aboard *Friendship 7*. He also holds the honor of being the oldest person ever to go into space in 1998 aboard the Space Shuttle *Discovery* mission STS-95 at age 77. John Glenn was first elected to the U.S. Senate in 1974, and served the State of Ohio proudly until

1999, and was a recipient of the Congressional Space Medal of Honor. The NASA Glenn research center, which is located at Lewis Field in Cleveland, OH, adopted Senator Glenn's name in 1999. I am proud to say that this institution has produced decades of aeronautics research and has become of vital part of our community. It is in no small part to Senator Glenn that this institution will remain a major research center for NASA.

I am especially proud to be able to say that Senator John Glenn comes from my home State of Ohio, he is an icon and a role model for millions of youths in our State. His accomplishments provide inspiration for every young person from our Great State of Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 252, recognizing the 45th anniversary of John Glenn and his historic 1962 orbital flight aboard *Friendship 7*.

I commend my colleague, the Honorable ZACH SPACE for his efforts on this resolution and am honored to be an original cosponsor.

John Glenn's orbital flight and his many extraordinary achievements in war and peace are appropriately enumerated and memorialized in this resolution—and it is an amazingly long account. Without doubt it is an unsurpassed record of accomplishment that includes six Distinguished Flying Crosses, the Congressional Space Medal of Honor, and the only Ohioan to serve four consecutive terms in the U.S. Senate.

At Cape Canaveral on February 20, 1962, John Glenn blasted into space and became the first American to orbit the Earth. After several excruciatingly long launch pad delays, people all over the world and every school child in America heard Scott Carpenter's lift off directive—Godspeed John Glenn—soon to be followed by the cool voice of the pilot: "Roger. Zero Gs and I feel fine. Capsule is turning around. Oh, that view is tremendous!"

As he reached an altitude of 162 miles at a velocity of 17,500 miles an hour, the excitement quickly turned to tension and apprehension when the flight instruments indicated that a loose heat shield threatened a safe return. While the capsule skated back through the atmosphere, *Friendship 7* reported a real fireball outside. To our great relief the plume of parachutes and splashdown told us that after a nearly 5 hour flight, Glenn was safe and sound back on Earth.

On February 26, 1962, John Glenn was received with a standing ovation before a Joint Session of Congress in this chamber. Parades in Washington, New York, and New Concord, Ohio, soon followed. *Friendship 7* is now prominently displayed in the Smithsonian's Air and Space Museum near Orville and Wilbur Wright's *1903 Flyer*, Charles Lindbergh's *Spirit of St. Louis* and *Apollo XI*.

John and Annie Glenn celebrated their 64th wedding anniversary on April 6th. Annie is a true American hero for her extraordinary personal efforts to overcome stuttering. Her public efforts to help others with speech and communication disorders are nationally recognized. She received the first national award of the American Speech and Hearing Association for inspiring those with communicative disorders. The National Association for Hearing and Speech Action annually presents the Annie Glenn Award to an individual achieving distinction despite a communication disorder. She is a national treasure.

In 1941, John Glenn was on his way to Annie's organ recital at Muskingum College

when he heard over the car radio that Pearl Harbor had been attacked. His patriotic public service began shortly thereafter when he volunteered for military service and continues today through his work at the John Glenn School of Public Affairs at the Ohio State University.

In a lifetime of accomplishment he found in adventure and challenge he met with courage. John Glenn is an American hero. He has proudly served his Nation as soldier and statesman and he still likes to fly.

I join my colleagues in urging the passage of the resolution.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend our able colleague, Congressman ZACK SPACE of Ohio for recognition of our beloved former Ohio Senator John Glenn, who began his distinguished career as a World War II and Korean War fighter pilot. Glenn was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross six times and holds the Air Medal for his service during both of these conflicts.

As the beginning in a long line of firsts, Senator and Colonel Glenn went on to set a transcontinental speed record from Los Angeles to New York in July 1957. In February 1962, Glenn piloted the Mercury-Atlas 6 *Friendship 7* spacecraft on the first manned orbital mission of the United States. After his distinguished service in these two wars and following the first phase of his career as an aviator, John Glenn continued his public service as a Senator representing our home State of Ohio from 1974–1999.

Completing his career of firsts, I was proud to see our former colleague Senator Glenn bring his career of public service full circle in his triumphant 1998 return space voyage; this time as a senior citizen. Today I rise to honor his hard work and lifetime of dedication to public service. He and his devoted wife have inspired all the world with their commitment to family, community, state, nation and the future. Their spirit of patriotism, courage, discovery and self sacrifice cut a path all can emulate and hope to achieve. Godspeed to them for all they have done for others.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WILSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 252.

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.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE MONTH

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 334) supporting the goals and ideals of National Community College Month.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 334

Whereas there are more than 1,200 community colleges in the United States;

Whereas there are more than 11 million students enrolled in for-credit and not-for-credit programs at community colleges nationwide;

Whereas in 2007, community colleges in the United States will award more than 500,000 associate's degrees and 270,000 associate's certificates;

Whereas community colleges have educated more than 100,000,000 people in the United States since the first community college was founded in 1901;

Whereas community college students are a more diverse group in terms of age, income, race, and ethnicity than students attending traditional colleges and universities, making community colleges essential to providing access to postsecondary education;

Whereas community colleges enrich and enhance communities across the country, socially, culturally, and politically;

Whereas community colleges are affordable and close to home for most people in the United States;

Whereas community colleges allow many older students to take courses part-time while working full-time, creating opportunities that otherwise would not be available;

Whereas community colleges provide job training for workers who have lost their jobs or are hoping to find better jobs, helping millions of people in the United States support themselves and their families;

Whereas community colleges contribute more than \$31,000,000,000 annually to the Nation's economic growth and, by helping to provide a skilled workforce, are critical to our Nation's continued success and prosperity in the global economy of the 21st century; and

Whereas the American Association of Community Colleges, the Association of Community College Trustees, and more than 1,200 community colleges nationwide recognize April as National Community College Month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

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

(2) congratulates the Nation's community colleges, and their students, governing boards, faculty, and staff, for their contributions to education and workforce development, and for their vital role in ensuring a brighter, stronger future for the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert materials relevant to H. Res. 334 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank

my colleague from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) for introducing this resolution and for the work he has done.

This month is recognized as National Community College Month. Community colleges represent much of what is great about America. Diverse, dynamic and innovative, open and inclusive, they are one of America's greatest inventions.

The first community college, Joliet Junior College, opened its doors almost 100 years ago in Illinois. It was one of the many that sprung up in the early 20th century amid worries that America could not remain competitive without a better educated workforce.

Policymakers and educators sensed that one of the barriers keeping students from keeping their education was that they were unable or unwilling to leave home. And so a network of community colleges was set up to encourage more students to earn college degrees or obtain specialized training. Today, over 11 million students are enrolled in America's 1,200 community colleges.

Community colleges educate over half of the country's undergraduate students. Community college open enrollment policies mean that they welcome all students regardless of wealth, heritage, or previous academic experience. As a result, community colleges are more diverse in terms of age, income, race and ethnicity than traditional colleges and universities. They enroll students from all over the world.

About 40 percent of all international undergraduates in the United States attend our community colleges. By bringing people from all walks of life together to learn from one another, these schools enrich and enhance our communities.

Community colleges educate over half of the new nurses and 65 percent of new health care workers. They are also responsible for the education of 50 percent of teachers and close to 85 percent of our emergency responders.

Community colleges retrain workers who have lost their jobs, those looking to change fields mid-career or reenter the workforce after an extended absence, and high school students hoping to get a head start on college credit or take a course not offered in the regular curriculum.

Because of all that they have done for this country, on this day we would like to thank our Nation's community colleges and recognize the dedication of their facilities and staff for helping to educate our Nation's students.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of this resolution to support the goals and ideals of National Community College Month.

Community colleges are centers of educational opportunity. For over 100

years, they have been inclusive institutions that welcome all who desire to learn, regardless of wealth, heritage or previous academic experience.

□ 1330

Since their creation, community colleges have grown tremendously in numbers and have changed with the times. According to the American Association of Community Colleges, there are over 1,000 community colleges in this country serving about 11 million students. No other segment of higher education is more responsive to its community and workforce needs than the community college.

The community colleges help provide the country with professionals in fields like computer technology, law enforcement, homeland security, nursing and other health care fields. About 50 percent of new nurses are educated at community colleges, and close to 80 percent of firefighters, law enforcement officers, and emergency medicine technicians received their credentials from community colleges.

Not only do community colleges serve a unique role in graduating students with specific skills, but they are also extremely affordable. Tuition and fees at public community colleges average less than half of those at public 4-year colleges and one-tenth the tuition and fees at independent 4-year colleges.

In my congressional district, the Harrisburg Area Community College is a shining example of the important and successful role of community colleges in our Nation's higher education system. In fact, I am fortunate to have two branches of the Harrisburg Area Community College in my congressional district, in York and Gettysburg. Graduates from HACC begin careers in fields currently experiencing shortages such as nursing, early childhood education, and law enforcement. I have seen firsthand the successful partnerships created between the community college and local businesses.

We hope to continue to build on the support being given to community colleges through the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. The reauthorization is an opportunity to look at every program individually and determine if it is helping us meet our goal of providing a quality and affordable post-secondary education to every American.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution honoring the goals and ideals of National Community College Month.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

As cochair of the House Community College Caucus, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 334, a bill that recognizes the

goals and ideals of National Community College Month; and I thank Congressman BRAD MILLER, the gentleman from North Carolina, for his leadership and for introducing this legislation.

Almost 50 percent of undergraduate students are enrolled in community colleges. It is the tradition of community colleges to serve nontraditional students. Many students work either part-time or full-time while they take classes. Others are seeking job training to allow them to better support their families. Some are returning to the workplace after a few years, and some are single parents. Increasingly, many are high school students who attend community college before a 4-year institution. This saves them, and frequently taxpayers, tuition, fees and financial aid dollars. In other words, we have no sector of education that serves a wider spectrum of our citizens every day.

As we look to what this new century holds for us, we know that employers seek people who not only are well versed in science and technology concepts but are also adept at learning through experimentation, inquiry, critical examination, and discovery. In other words, employers are seeking a highly trainable workforce, rather than just a highly trained workforce.

Community colleges are at the forefront of this effort. They are a cornerstone of our system of undergraduate education, particularly in mathematics and the sciences. As we all know, these areas of study are ever more critical for our Nation and our State to maintain an economic edge in the global economy.

I strongly support this resolution and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER), the sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today as the sponsor of this resolution to support and celebrate the ideals of National Community College Month.

I am very proud to offer this resolution as one of the cochairs of the House Community College Caucus, and I am pleased to be joined with three cosponsors, the other three Chairs of that caucus, Mr. WU of Oregon, who just spoke, Mr. CASTLE of Delaware and Mr. WICKER of Mississippi. I would also like to thank Chairman GEORGE MILLER and Ranking Member MCKEON of the Education and Labor Committee, both of whom are also original cosponsors of this resolution, and without whose support this measure would not be before us today.

Madam Speaker, there are now 11 million Americans enrolled in more than 1,200 community colleges across the country; and in the past century since the first community college opened its doors, more than 100 million

Americans have taken courses at community colleges. Community colleges have developed a tradition and a purpose that is distinct from that of traditional 4-year colleges and universities.

Community colleges are distinct from 4-year colleges in many respects. They are regionally accredited, post-secondary schools. The highest credential awarded by a community college is that of an associate degree. In fact, Madam Speaker, many Americans who did not get a high school diploma go back to community colleges to get their GED.

The community college system in my State, and in most States, offers a comprehensive curriculum, including transfer, technical and continuing education programs. The community college system in North Carolina has 58 separate community-based institutions that collectively offer more than 2,200 curriculum programs.

Beyond that curriculum, Madam Speaker, what most distinguishes community colleges from 4-year colleges is their accessibility or affordability, their location, their diversity and how intensely relevant the training and the education community colleges provide for the ability of working Americans to improve their job skills, particularly in a changing economy as we go through a painful economic transition, certainly in my State but also in the entire country.

The distinctions between community colleges and 4-year colleges are fundamental to the core mission and success of America's community colleges; and with the month of April, we have the chance to celebrate those distinctions and recognize Community College Month.

Community colleges are frequently referred to as "the people's colleges" because they have open-door admission policies; and while that is true, they are accurately described as people's colleges for many reasons.

Madam Speaker, students that attend community colleges are more diverse than those enrolled in any other kind of college or university. Of the 11.6 million students enrolled in community colleges across the country today, more than one-third are members of racial or ethnic minority groups, and roughly 60 percent are women. Of the more than 5 million or so students who are enrolled full-time at community colleges, 76 percent, or more than three-quarters, are working; and about one-third are working full-time while carrying a full-time community college course load. There is an equal number or greater number of community college students who are going to community colleges attending community colleges part-time also while working full-time and fulfilling the responsibilities of their family and of their home.

Community colleges are affordable. The average annual tuition at a community college is only about half that

of a 4-year public. In addition, community colleges are close to home and students can stay at home, live at home. They do live at home so they save money on room, board, transportation, all the other expenses associated with community colleges.

Students at community colleges mirror the communities that support them, and that is nowhere more evident than in the age of the students. The average age of a community college student is almost 30. More than 57 percent of those enrolled in community colleges are older than 22, the traditional age that students graduate from college, and more than 16 percent are past the age of 40. In North Carolina, there are 368,000 students between the ages of 25 and 50 enrolled in community colleges.

Community college curricula are intensely relevant to the needs of American business and to the needs of American workers in having the skills that they need to support themselves and support their families, whether it is construction trades, the skills needed to do construction trades or computer programs, computer spreadsheet, all the different computer programs that any American officer worker is going to need, and frequently when they need to learn a new one, they can go part-time to a community college nearby and learn the skills they need for their job.

In North Carolina, almost every community college has a curriculum that is specifically geared, designed for an industry, a major employer in that area. When I was first elected to Congress, I visited the extrusion campus of Wake Technical College. Extrusion is a process by which plastic is pulled like taffy. In just the 5 years or 4½ years I have been in Congress, that technology has lost jobs. In just the 4½ years I have been in Congress, extrusion technologies have taken a hit.

We have lost jobs; but at that same community college, they now have a program in computer gaming. Americans will spend more on computer gaming this year than they will spend on movie box offices. Computer gaming is becoming more and more important in providing educational opportunities in a format that most Americans, younger Americans, are very familiar with. That industry is developing around Wiley. The community college curriculum is going to be part of what attracts new gaming companies to that area as well as supporting the ones that are there now.

So community colleges through open admission, affordability, community-based training are playing an amazingly important role in the American economy and have to do even more so.

I have asked two chairmen of the Federal Reserve Board, Alan Greenspan and Ben Bernanke, about how we can close the income inequality of Americans; and both of them have mentioned specifically community colleges in the role they need to play in providing

Americans the skills that they need to demand better wages, to be able to get better wages in the American economy and in the world economy.

Despite that importance, in the 4½ years I have been here, it has been a fight to get support for community colleges; and it has been 25 years since we have even had a resolution like this on the floor of Congress honoring the role of community colleges. It was 1985 during the 99th Congress that this Congress specifically recognized and honored community colleges.

So I am pleased to be here, and I urge all to be here in support of this resolution, and I encourage all of my colleagues to join me today.

Mr. PLATTS. Does the gentlewoman have other speakers?

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. We have one more speaker.

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HARE).

Mr. HARE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 334, honoring the goals and ideals of National Community College Month. I am proud to have the opportunity today to acknowledge all the community colleges in my district, and I want to thank them for the invaluable contributions that they make to education, to the communities that I serve, to our State and to our Nation in general.

Community colleges offer affordable opportunities for students of all ages to receive a higher education, retraining for new jobs and other university preparation courses. In my district alone, our community colleges work directly with workforce development one-stop centers, providing critical computer literacy courses, technical training and basic education that are needed for newly emerging jobs. In particular, Richland Community College in Macon County in my district is in the process of pioneering a course to prepare workers for the biofuels sector that is quickly becoming a major industry in my home State of Illinois.

□ 1345

As factories and other companies leave to go overseas, or as new industries emerge, creating new jobs that require unique skills, community colleges become increasingly important to educate, train and equip the new workforce that will fill these jobs. Additionally, they cannot allow students who cannot afford to go to a 4-year university, but who have the ambition and talent to succeed at one, the opportunity to complete the first 2 years of courses at affordable prices, and then allow those students to transfer to larger schools.

For these reasons and many more, I am happy to stand today to honor

Community College Month. As a member of the Community College Caucus, I am working hard with my other colleagues to make sure community colleges have the resources and funding they need to continue to offer the services that are so critical to all of our communities across our country.

I urge my colleagues to join me in celebrating Community College Month by passing H. Res. 334.

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Speaker, I again urge a "yes" vote and want to commend the sponsor, Mr. MILLER, and others supporting this, and my chairwoman, Mrs. MCCARTHY, for her advocacy here on floor. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 334.

Community colleges are the institutions that make things happen for our communities. They are the gateway to higher education for most of our students. They provide the opportunities that give lifelong learning real meaning. They are central to workforce development.

In short, they are the rapid response system, the innovators, and the engine for economic development for communities across the Nation.

I know first hand what a difference a community college can make. It was my great privilege to be the founding chair of South Texas College. When I was first elected to Congress in 1996, the unemployment rate in my district topped 22 percent.

In 1996, South Texas College was a couple of years old and just beginning to build from its initial enrollment of 800 students. Today, our unemployment rate is less than 6 percent, and South Texas College is enrolling over 18,000 students each year. That is the difference a community college can make.

Community colleges have also stepped up to offer new and exciting opportunities for students while they are still in high school. Community colleges are on the cutting edge of high school reform.

For example, in my district, Texas State Technical College in Harlingen is hosting a new Early College High School that will enroll its first class of 100 freshmen this fall. Students graduating from this new school will have a head start in college, earning a possible 60 credit hours along with their distinguished achievement high school diplomas.

In our rural communities community colleges are critical pieces of the economic infrastructure.

Consider the results of an economic impact study that found that the instruction provided by Coastal Bend College, in Beeville, Texas resulted in an accumulated contribution of \$48.5 million in annual earnings to the Rural Coastal Bend Economy. That is roughly the equivalent of 2,087 jobs, which is a significant number in our rural economies.

I would like to thank my colleague from North Carolina, Congressman MILLER, for bringing this resolution forward.

I wholeheartedly join him in supporting the goals and ideals of National Community College month. I urge my colleagues to support H. Res 334.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Bucks County Community College in celebration of National Community College Month. By

providing a gateway to higher learning for those who would otherwise be unable to continue their education, community colleges, like Bucks County, are improving our society and our communities. We need to continue to work to make college more accessible, so that we continue to build a more competitive workforce. Madam Speaker, by supporting these important institutions of higher education we can ensure their ability to serve students eager for knowledge and a path to a successful future.

Madam Speaker, I am a strong advocate of community colleges because I am the product of a community college. After graduating from high school, I enrolled at Bucks County Community College, in Newtown, Pennsylvania, where I gained the ability and confidence to achieve. My year at Bucks County Community College was very important. It prepared me for King's College, Widener University School of Law and eventually to serve as an educator myself at West Point. My love of learning and teaching blossomed at Bucks County Community College—an experience no doubt shared by so many across our great Nation.

For more than 40 years, Bucks County Community College has provided a critical service to Bucks County. Whether students are there as a stepping stone to another college or university, or preparing for jobs in business, public service or health care, Bucks provides a high quality education and a great environment in which to learn. The college has expanded its services by opening two campuses in addition to its main campus in Newtown. This has increased accessibility, especially for those continuing their education while working full-time. As one of the oldest community colleges in Pennsylvania, Bucks County Community College has established itself as a leader in education, not just among other community colleges, but among all colleges and universities.

If not for Bucks County Community College, I would not be where I am today. I know that mine is not the only case in which a community college changed the life of a young student. With 11 million students enrolled at more than 1,200 community colleges nationwide, these schools provide an invaluable service to a large portion of our community. Madam Speaker, these affordable, local institutions give every student, of every background, the ability to experience the benefits of higher education.

It was at Bucks County Community College that I learned how hard I could work and how much I could achieve. Like millions of other students, all I needed was an opportunity, and I took advantage of it. Madam Speaker, this is the unique and necessary function of our community colleges. They give every student a chance to succeed.

Madam Speaker, my appreciation for the opportunity provided by our community colleges is personal and near to my heart. I Urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 334.

Mr. WICKER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution celebrating National Community College Month.

For more than a century, community colleges have offered millions of Americans an affordable means of education close to home. Today 11 million students are enrolled in these institutions, and the reach of this educational opportunity goes far beyond serving

the traditional high school graduate. Many adults are taking classes to pursue a college degree, gain continuing education for their present jobs, learn skills for new careers, and earn high school diplomas.

Community colleges are also playing key leadership roles today in support of economic development activities. The unique ability of these institutions to adapt workforce training programs to meet specific needs in the areas they serve is a powerful resource. These schools have been partners in attracting new industry and helping existing businesses expand operations.

As co-chair of the bipartisan Community College Caucus, I am proud to join this effort to support the goals of National Community College Month and congratulate these institutions, their students, faculty, and staff for their contributions to education.

Our caucus was created in 2006 to help educate Members of Congress and focus national attention on the activities community colleges are undertaking to provide educational options and improve the quality of life in the areas they serve.

I am also proud of the role the State of Mississippi has played in the development of this important educational opportunity. In 1922, Mississippi became the first State to create a statewide system of junior colleges. It brought affordable and accessible post-secondary educational choices to all of our citizens. Today, more than 70,000 full-time students are enrolled at 15 community colleges in my home State.

I stand in strong support of our community colleges and salute their work to educate a diverse group of Americans spanning all age, income, race, and ethnic categories. The enhanced opportunities provided by these institutions are educating millions of people and helping provide a more skilled workforce to compete in our global economy.

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 334.

The question was taken.

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEAS OF A NATIONAL CHILD CARE WORTHY WAGE DAY

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) supporting the goals and ideas of a National Child Care Worthy Wage Day.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 112

Whereas approximately 63 percent of the Nation's children under 5 are in nonparental care during part or all of the day while their parents work;

Whereas the early care and education industry employs more than 2,300,000 workers;

Whereas the average salary of early care and education workers is \$18,180 per year, and only ⅓ have health insurance and even fewer have a pension plan;

Whereas the quality of early care and education programs is directly linked to the quality of early childhood educators;

Whereas the turnover rate of early childhood program staff is roughly 30 percent per year, and low wages and lack of benefits, among other factors, make it difficult to retain high quality educators who have the consistent, caring relationships with young children that are important to children's development;

Whereas the compensation of early childhood program staff should be commensurate with the importance of the job of helping the young children of the Nation develop their social, emotional, physical, and cognitive skills, and to help them be ready for school;

Whereas providing adequate compensation to early childhood program staff should be a priority, and resources may be allocated to improve the compensation of early childhood educators to ensure that quality care and education are accessible for all families;

Whereas additional training and education for the early care and education workforce is critical to ensuring high-quality early learning environments;

Whereas child care workers should receive compensation commensurate with such training and experience; and

Whereas the Center for the Child Care Workforce, a project of the American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation, with support by the National Association for the Education of Young Children and other early childhood organizations, recognizes May 1 as National Child Care Worthy Wage Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress supports the goals and ideas of National Child Care Worthy Wage Day, and urges public officials and the general public to honor early childhood care and education staff and programs in their communities and to work together to resolve the early childhood care and education staff compensation crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert material relevant to H. Con. Res. 112 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, on May 1 of each year, child care providers and other early childhood professionals nationwide conduct awareness and education efforts highlighting the importance of good early childhood education for our Nation's young children.

In support of these actions, I have introduced H. Con. Res. 112, a bipartisan resolution in support of National Child Care Worthy Wage Day. This resolution is an effort to support these initiatives and to help develop greater public awareness in this area. Every day, approximately 13 million children are cared for outside the home so that their parents can work, including some who work in our congressional offices.

The committed individuals who nurture and teach these young children are undervalued, despite their important work. We know that children begin to learn at birth, and that the quality of care they receive will affect their language, development, math skills, behavior and general readiness for school. However, the inadequate level of wages for child care staff, roughly \$18,000 a year, has led to difficulties in attracting and retaining high quality early childhood caretakers and educators.

In addition to low wages, less than one-third of child care workers have health insurance, and even fewer have pensions. As a result, the turnover rate for child care providers is 30 percent a year. This high turnover rate interrupts consistent and stable relations that children need to have with their caregivers.

Please join me in recognizing the important work of child care providers and support the efforts to provide them with a worthy wage. The Nation's child care workforce and the families that depend on them deserve our support.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 112, supporting the goals and ideas of a National Child Care Worthy Wage Day. I would like to thank my colleague from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) for her leadership on this issue and for introducing the resolution we are considering here today.

Child care is an integral part of the daily routine of millions of families with young children. Working parents depend on child care so they can earn the income needed to support their families, as well as ensure that their children are well cared for in safe environments while they are working. As a result, approximately 63 percent of children under 5 years of age are in some type of regular child care environment each week.

High-quality child care, care that provides a stable, safe, stimulating environment, helps children enter school prepared to learn. Research has repeat-

edly shown that children who receive high-quality child care demonstrate greater mathematical ability, greater attention and thinking skills and fewer behavioral problems than children who receive low-quality care.

Quality care is directly linked to the quality of the educators, helping children to grow, learn and gain new skills is rewarding. However, it's very physically and emotionally taxing, as educators work long days, must be constantly alert, deal effectively with disruptive children, anticipate and prevent trouble, and provide firm but fair discipline. As a result, many child care workers leave the profession. The turnover rate in this industry is roughly 30 percent per year.

Compensation and additional training are important variables to ensure a high quality child care environment for our children. We need to attract and retain educators who have the caring, consistent relationships that are critical to children's development. I am pleased to commend our Nation's child care providers for their dedicated service to our Nation's children and their families.

I think it's important that we are taking time to recognize the critically important work of child care providers and the importance of doing better when it comes to their pay and benefits.

As a parent myself, my children, now second grade, fourth graders, went through a preschool program that was exceptional, it was certified. In that facility, we had both the preschool program and a very high-quality child care center as well. We saw the benefits to our children personally of that professional setting. An important part of being able to retain professional workers, staff, in those settings, is the pay and benefits.

When we look at the quality of these facilities, if we don't reduce that turnover rate, that 30 percent turnover rate, we will continue to be challenged to get somebody new in and get them up to speed. That impacts the quality of the care provided.

So I, again, commend the sponsor of the resolution for helping to raise national recognition and the importance of this issue, and urge a "yes" vote.

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I want to thank the ranking member, Mr. PLATTS from Pennsylvania. Working with him on the committee has certainly been a joy. We do work very well together.

As the gentleman has said, passing H. Con. Res. 112 is extremely important. I stand by the words that my colleague has spoken. But I think that this Nation really has to start looking at how we prepare, certainly for the few future and for the global economy that we are all facing. Certainly having high-qualified teachers, day care workers to

make sure that our children are getting the best education they possibly can at the earliest age possible. We look at the other countries and see what they are doing. I have to say that many times we are shortchanging our children.

Madam Speaker, I am asking that our Members vote for H. Con. Res. 112.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 112.

The question was taken.

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA GATORS FOR THEIR HISTORIC WIN IN THE 2007 NCAA MEN'S BASKETBALL TOURNAMENT

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 298) to commend the University of Florida Gators for their historic win in the 2007 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Men's Basketball Tournament.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 298

Whereas, on April 2, 2007, the University of Florida Gators defeated the Ohio State Buckeyes 84-75 in the final game of the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Tournament in Atlanta, Georgia;

Whereas the Gators' became the first team since 1991-92 to win back-to-back national titles and just the 7th school ever to be repeat champions;

Whereas the Gators became the first team ever to repeat as champions with the same starting lineup;

Whereas Florida's overall athletic program has proven to be one of the best in the Nation, now having won 21 national champions in all sports combined;

Whereas the University of Florida remains the only program to hold both football and men's basketball championships at the same time and the first school in NCAA history to hold both the basketball and football championship titles in the same calendar year;

Whereas the Gators' head basketball coach Billy Donovan became the 12th coach to win multiple men's basketball championships and one of four active coaches to win multiple titles;

Whereas Donovan became the third youngest coach to win more than one NCAA title;

Whereas the Gators finished their season with an impressive record of 35-5, including

winning the final 10 games of the season, and have an 18-game win streak in the post-season, including sweeps at the Southeastern Conference tournaments the last two years and 12-0 in the NCAA Tournament;

Whereas the Gators contributed Corey Brewer, Al Horford, and Lee Humphrey to the All Tournament Team, joining Greg Oden and Mike Conley, Jr., of Ohio State;

Whereas each player, coach, trainer, manager, and staff member of the University of Florida Gators dedicated this season and their efforts to the common goal of repeating as NCAA men's basketball champions;

Whereas the Gators' players, coaches, and everyone associated with the men's basketball team represent the University and the State of Florida with exemplary sportsmanship and competitiveness; and

Whereas residents of Florida and Gator fans worldwide are to be commended for their longstanding support, perseverance, and pride in the team: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the University of Florida Gators for their historic win in the 2007 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Men's Basketball Tournament;

(2) recognizes the achievements of the players, coaches, students, and support staff who were instrumental in the Gators' victory; and

(3) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to transmit a copy of this resolution to University of Florida President J. Bernard Machen and head coach Billy Donovan for appropriate display.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert material relevant to H. Res. 298 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Congressman STEARNS for introducing this resolution. I rise in support of House Resolution 298, a bill to commend the University of Florida Gators for their historical win in the 2007 NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Tournament.

On April 22 the Florida Gators defeated the Ohio State Buckeyes 84-75 in the final game of the Division I Men's Basketball Tournament in Atlanta, Georgia. The Gators became the first team since 1992 to win back-to-back national titles and just the seventh school ever to be repeat champions.

They were also the first team in history to complete this feat with the same starting lineup. The University of Florida's athletic program has proven

to be one of the best in the Nation, now having won 21 national championships in all sports combined. They are the only program to hold both football and men's basketball championships at the same time, and the first school in NCAA history to hold both the basketball and football championship titles in the same calendar year.

The Gators' basketball team was led by their great coach, Billy Donovan, who became the 12th coach to win multiple basketball championships and one of four active coaches to win multiple titles. On top of that, Donovan became the third youngest coach to win more than one NCAA title. Coach Donovan is also a native of the Fourth Congressional District, originally hailing from Rockville Centre, in my district on Long Island.

The Gators finished their season with an impressive record of 35-5, winning the final 10 games of the season. Every player, coach, trainer, manager and staff member of the University of Florida Gators dedicated this season and their efforts to the common goal of repeating as men's NCAA basketball champions, and did so with class and sportsmanship.

I urge my colleagues to show their support for the Florida Gators and vote for House Resolution 298.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Speaker, I yield the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) as much time as he may consume.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Let me thank, first of all, my colleagues, for bringing this resolution to the floor. I certainly appreciate the gentlelady from New York, I believe, Long Island, for her gracious comments, to know that Billy Donovan also resided in her district. I think that is something that many of us did not know.

Madam Speaker, I do have a little feeling of modesty here and graciousness coming here again to the floor. It's almost like a great case of *déjàvu* again, because it seems like only a few months ago that I came to the floor to honor the University of Florida, which I represent, for winning the national football title.

Yet here I am again, feeling a great deal of humbleness, coming to the House floor to honor the Gators men's basketball team, as pointed out, for becoming the first team since 1991-1992 to win back-to-back national titles. Of course, I am honored to represent the University of Florida, because it's in my congressional district. As we say in Gainesville, "Go Gators." We do indeed hope for another championship.

With their win over the Ohio State Buckeyes on April 2, as mentioned, they became only the seventh school ever to repeat championships. In addition, Florida remains the only school in NCAA history to hold both the

men's basketball and football championship titles in the same year, which is an arduous feat, to say the least. This is quite an accomplishment, and one the entire university community should take a great deal of pride in, which they do.

Many of the so-called experts said that the Gators would not be able to repeat as champions. However, all throughout the season, Coach Billy Donovan kept his team focused and on track and eventually proved the pundits wrong. The Gators were chasing history, so to speak, and they would not be denied.

□ 1400

The Gators finished their season with an impressive 35-5, winning the final 10 games of the season. Furthermore, my colleagues, they have an 18-game winning streak in the post-season, including sweeps at the Southeastern Conference tournament the last 2 years and a 12-0 in the NCAA tournament.

By winning the championship, Coach Donovan became the 12th coach to win multiple men's basketball championship and one of four active coaches to win multiple titles. He also became the third youngest coach to win more than one NCAA title.

Now, Florida's overall athletic program has proven to be one of the best in the Nation, now having won 21 national championships in all sports combined. Ten Gator athletic teams turned in top 10 finishes in 2005-2006. Florida is one of two schools to appear in the top 10 in each of the last 23 national all-sports ranking.

I appreciate your indulgence here as I brag a little bit more. Gator athletes excel in the classroom as well. UF boasts a 91 percent graduation rate among its athletes, making it only one of four programs in the national all-sports top 10 to achieve a graduation success rate above 90 percent. Furthermore, in the 2002-2003 season, UF placed a record of 193 student athletes on the SEC academic honor role, making six consecutive years UF placed 100 or more student athletes on the SEC honor role.

The University of Florida is more than just athletics. It ranks fifth among Kiplinger's top 10 colleges and is among the Nation's most academically diverse public universities. It is home to 16 colleges and more than 150 research centers and institutes. And during the 2005-2006 school year, they awarded a little over \$500 million in sponsored research to do such things as to find diverse research in health care, citrus production including the world's largest citrus research center.

In addition, my colleagues, more than 300,000 Gator alumni are located throughout the world. Famous alumni include two current NASA astronauts, actress Faye Dunaway, and home improvement expert Bob Vila. Just a little bragging there.

UF's faculty are among the best and most decorated in the world, winning

awards such as the Fields medal, two Pulitzer Prizes, NASA's top award for research, and the Smithsonian Institution's Conservation award. Along with the faculty, the Gator students are among the brightest. UF admitted about 1,049 international baccalaureate students for the 2004-2005 academic year, more than any other university in the world.

So the Florida men's basketball team are excellent representatives of both the university and the great State of Florida in their focus, their persistence, and unassailable desire to succeed. I take great pride, my colleagues, in representing the University of Florida in Congress and congratulate Coach Billy Donovan and the entire university on this great accomplishment and hope for the best for next year. Go Gators.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield as much time as the gentleman may consume to another distinguished member of the Florida delegation, Mr. KELLER.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Florida's men's basketball team on their second consecutive NCAA, Division I championship. On April 2 of this year, they joined only six other teams in NCAA history to win back-to-back championships. My congratulations also go out to Coach Billy Donovan, who has done a fine job with these young men, not only leading them to back-to-back championships but also for preparing them for what lies ahead in life.

The University of Florida is a fine institution with many standout athletes. My home State of Florida and I are tremendously proud of their accomplishments on and off the field. The University of Florida is the only Division I college in history to win the national championship in basketball and football in the same calendar year. In fact, between the Gator championships in basketball and football, I don't think there will be an athlete on campus who has not met the President by the time they graduate.

Now, so many of these Gator basketball and football will be heading off to the NBA and NFL where they will have to struggle to make due on their multimillion dollar salaries. The good news for many of these other schools is that a lot of the starters will be moving on. The bad news, of course, is I am hearing they are having their best recruiting classes ever in both football and basketball. Ohio State was such a worthy opponent both in football and basketball and handled themselves with so much class, much praise is warranted to the Buckeye fans as well. Congratulations on a job well done.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Speaker, we have got a great group of very proud Floridians here today. I am pleased to yield again as much time as the gentleman may consume to the gentleman, Mr. BILIRAKIS, from Florida.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, it is with great Gator pride that I rise today to support this resolution honoring my alma mater, the University of Florida, on winning the 2007 NCAA men's basketball championship.

The Gators began this season looking to become the first team since 1992 to repeat as national champions. Everyone in the Gator nation anxiously anticipated this season's tip-off, as all five starters unselfishly returned to school in hopes of making history. And they did. They became the only team in history to repeat as champions with the same starting lineup.

Last year, this Gator team came from obscurity to win the championship. However, this year the Gators were expected to win, which made them a target for every school they played. These young men not only handled the pressure and scrutiny, but they used it to fuel another amazing title run through both the SEC and the NCAA tournament.

Madam Speaker, I believe that this basketball team represents the true embodiment of sportsmanship and teamwork. For the last 2 years, these young men won with class, not selfishness. The five starters gave up their very lucrative NBA contracts to return to the school they loved. How refreshing. In today's society, this an act that is remarkable. Believe it or not, it is remarkable. I want to commend all of them for their hard work and discipline.

I also want to recognize Coach Billy Donovan and all of his assistants for the tremendous job they have done over the years. We are very lucky to have them, and I am glad he stayed at the University of Florida.

Finally, I want to thank president Bernie Machen and athletic director Jeremy Foley, whose leadership made it possible for the Gators to be the only team in NCAA history to hold both the football and basketball titles simultaneously.

I wish the University of Florida the best of luck in continuing this remarkable trend. And on behalf of my entire family, including my sons Michael, Teddy, Manuel, and Nicholas, thanks for making our dream come true, Gators.

Madam Speaker, it truly is great to be a Florida Gator.

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

The Florida Gators team will certainly go down as one of the best teams in the history of college basketball. After winning back-to-back championships this year, Coach Billy Donovan said, "I sit up here very, very humbled, because I think I was fortunate enough over the last 2 years to coach a group

of guys that has to go down in history as one of the greatest teams of all time."

The love for the game and each other, the hustle and hard work that the players exemplified the past 2 years is something they certainly learned from their head coach, Billy Donovan. At the young age of 41, Coach Donovan is now in some elite company being one of only four active coaches to have won multiple championships.

I extend my heartiest congratulations to Head Coach Donovan, all of the hardworking players, their fans, and all members of the University of Florida family, including another distinguished graduate of the University of Florida who I would be in trouble with if I didn't mention when I go home tonight. My next oldest brother, Mark Platts, graduated in 1987 with a master's degree from the University of Florida.

I am happy to join with my chairwoman as well as my colleagues from Florida in honoring this exceptional team and all of its accomplishments and wish them continued success, unless they are playing my alma mater in the years to come.

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, again I encourage my colleagues to pass H. Res. 298. And congratulations again and certainly may they have a great future.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HARMAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 298.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CONGRATULATING CHARTER SCHOOLS FOR THEIR ONGOING CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 344) congratulating charter schools and their students, parents, teachers, and administrators across the United States for their ongoing contributions to education, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 344

Whereas charter schools deliver high-quality education and challenge our students to reach their potential;

Whereas charter schools provide thousands of families with diverse and innovative educational options for their children;

Whereas charter schools are public schools authorized by a designated public entity that are responding to the needs of our communities, families, and students and promoting the principles of quality, choice, and innovation;

Whereas in exchange for the flexibility and autonomy given to charter schools, they are held accountable by their sponsors for improving student achievement and for their financial and other operations;

Whereas 40 States and the District of Columbia have passed laws authorizing charter schools;

Whereas charter schools improve their students' achievement and stimulate improvement in traditional public schools;

Whereas charter schools must meet the student achievement accountability requirements under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in the same manner as traditional public schools, and often set higher and additional individual goals to ensure that they are of high quality and truly accountable to the public;

Whereas charter schools give parents new freedom to choose their public school, routinely measure parental satisfaction levels, and must prove their ongoing success to parents, policymakers, and their communities;

Whereas charter schools nationwide serve a higher percentage of low-income and minority students than the traditional public system;

Whereas charter schools have enjoyed broad bipartisan support from the Administration, Congress, State Governors and legislatures, educators, and parents across the United States; and

Whereas the eighth annual National Charter Schools Week, to be held April 29 through May 5, 2007, is an event sponsored by charter schools and grassroots charter school organizations across the United States to recognize the significant impacts, achievements, and innovations of charter schools: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) acknowledges and commends charter schools and their students, parents, teachers, and administrators across the United States for their ongoing contributions to education and improving and strengthening our public school system;

(2) supports the eighth annual National Charter Schools Week; and

(3) joins the President in calling on the people of the United States to conduct appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities to demonstrate support for charter schools during this weeklong celebration in communities throughout the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may insert material relevant to H. Res. 344 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Mr. BOUSTANY for introducing this resolution to honor National Charter School Week. He has been the sponsor of this resolution for the past 3 years, and we appreciate his leadership on this issue.

Charter schools across the country are marking this occasion by opening their doors to the community and inviting them to learn about the role of charter schools in public education. With over 3,600 charter schools educating nearly 1.1 million children, charter schools have changed the landscape of public education. Almost 250 schools are created each year. Committed parents and students and community leaders have led the way, creating charter schools to meet the needs of the local community.

Charter schools are free from regulations but not accountability. There are model charter schools that are producing good outcomes for their students. The public school system in this country continues to generate innovative strategies for educating all children. Quality charter schools represent one model for this innovation.

On the occasion of National Charter School Week, I want to commend the 90,000 public schools in this country that are working hard to provide opportunity for children across the country. I urge my colleagues to support our Nation's charter schools and to vote for this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend and colleague from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 344, congratulating charter schools and their students, parents, teachers, and administrators across the United States for their ongoing contributions to educational excellence.

Charter schools are public schools that are created by teachers, parents, and other members of the community as innovative means to educate students and to stimulate reform in the public school system. As public schools, they must serve students from all backgrounds and educational abilities.

In exchange for greater accountability for student achievements, these schools are exempt from many local and State regulations. Grassroots support for charter schools continues to grow, from one school in the 1992-1993 school year, to over 4,000 schools serving over 1 million students in the 2006-2007 school year.

□ 1415

The demand is simply remarkable. The charter model itself is playing a

critical role in these schools' success. Its flexibility and accountability are allowing individuals with nontraditional backgrounds and relentless attitudes to create high achievement cultures. These charter schools are setting new standards about what's possible and about what we should expect from all our public schools. Indeed, charter schools are shattering low expectations and breaking through long standing barriers that have prevented large numbers of at-risk students from achieving educational success.

Charter schools are usually among the top performers in big city school districts and often rival the highest performing schools in surrounding suburban districts. These high performers are setting important examples about what public schools can achieve with disadvantaged students.

More and more data indicates that charter schools deliver promising results for student achievement. In an analysis of almost three dozen charter school studies, a vast majority found that overall gains in charter schools were larger than in other public schools, sometimes in certain significant categories of schools such as elementary schools, high schools or schools serving at risk students.

Yet, even with these outstanding results, of the 40 States that have passed charter school laws, 25 States and the District of Columbia have some type of legislative cap on charter school growth. These caps serve as blunt instruments that do not lead to high quality schools. Instead of stifling growth, States should focus on providing the resources, oversight and accountability that helps charter schools thrive.

We know what produces high quality charter schools—dedicated students, parents, teachers and principals, rigorous approval processes, conscientious oversight and sufficient resources, including facilities funding. We should work to replicate these models of best practices and apply them to local school districts throughout the country.

It is my hope that the charter community will continue to build on its 15-year history of providing a high quality option in public education that is based on innovation, freedom from red tape, and partnership between parents and educators, an option that is giving new hope to disadvantaged and minority families across the country.

I also appreciate the contribution charter schools have made in ongoing efforts to rebuild and strengthen my home State of Louisiana after Hurricanes Rita and Katrina, particularly in New Orleans.

For these reasons, it is my honor to congratulate charter schools and their students, parents, teachers and administrators across the United States for their ongoing contributions to education, as well as recognizing this week as National Charter School Week. I commend President Bush for his recent

proclamation, "recognizing the important contributions of charter schools," as well as my good friends and colleagues, Mr. PLATTS and Mrs. MCCARTHY for bringing this resolution to the floor.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. CHRIS MURPHY.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from New York and the gentlemen from Pennsylvania and Louisiana for bringing this resolution before us.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution to recognize the contributions of charter schools to education. So often we talk about the crisis of America's schools and our educational system, but it's equally important to take some time to recognize the good that's being done. That's why I welcome this opportunity to acknowledge the impact that charter schools are making in our education system nationally.

In congratulating charter schools, I want to also acknowledge the work of all of our administrators and our educators in our public school system and our public charter school system as well. Noncharter public schools remain the bedrock of our educational system, and we need to make sure that we are doing everything here in Congress and at our State level to make sure that our public schools have the opportunity to succeed.

But charter schools are growing because, when done right, they're working. They represent a network of committed and innovative administrators, teachers and parents whose great determination and resolve complement the public education system. This national network of 4,000 charter schools infuses hope and possibility into communities. In Connecticut alone, there are 16 charter schools educating over 2,500 students.

Charter schools are infused with an imagination. Moreover, these schools are effectively engaging students around innovative and aggressive curriculum. They are setting the bar high and they are getting results. As we consider solutions for improving math and science education and increasing the number of high school graduates and students matriculating to colleges and university, we should remember the contributions that charter schools are making to the education of our Nation's children.

Again, Madam Speaker, I commend the tremendous dedication of all educators. Their unsung sacrifices are critical to ensuring the success of America's youth today and the skill of tomorrow's workforce.

I urge all Members to support this resolution.

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to support House Resolution

344, congratulating charter schools and their students, parents, teachers and administrators across the United States for their ongoing contributions to education.

Charter schools are innovative public schools with a simple interest in providing a quality education to children in their communities. They explore new educational approaches, such as longer school days or extended school years, and are free from most rules and regulations governing conventional public schools.

These schools meet the student achievement and accountability requirements under No Child Left Behind in the same manner as traditional public schools and they often set higher individual goals to ensure that they are of high quality.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues from New York, Louisiana, Connecticut, elsewhere around the country in recognizing these innovative public schools, and I am proud to recognize this week as National Charter Schools Week.

I commend President Bush for his recent proclamation stating, quote, "recognizing the important contributions of charter schools," as well on the executive branch side; and again urge a "yes" vote for this resolution.

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, again, I would like to thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) for introducing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 344.

As you can tell, today we have been talking about the children of this Nation on so many of our different issues. And again, I am very happy to work with my colleague on the committee, Mr. PLATTS from Pennsylvania.

When we talk about our children and the future of the Nation, obviously, education is the most important thing. So, again, it has been a pleasure introducing these resolutions.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, as we celebrate charter schools I want to recognize the Youth Connection Charter School (YCCS) operating in my Congressional District. The Youth Connection Charter School (YCCS) has a unique mission and purpose. It has been said that education is the great equalizer—it is the key to success.

The mission of YCCS is to provide individuals who have dropped out of school an opportunity—to drop back in and receive a quality education. Since its creation in 1997, YCCS has graduated more than 5,700 students who had previously dropped out of traditional high schools. Just think, what would have happened to those students if YCCS was not available to them. They likely would have become another statistic.

Clearly, the data shows that students who drop out are more likely to be unemployed. In fact, the unemployment rate nationally for high school drop-outs was 29.8 percent in 200. (Dept. of Labor). We know that students who drop out are more likely to be candidates for prisons. A total of 75 percent of America's

state prison inmates are high school drop-outs, with only 59 percent of America's federal prison inmates completing high school (Harlow, 2003). We also know that high school drop-outs are more likely to be receiving public assistance and living in poverty. These negative consequences lead to the destruction of a community and country. Students who drop out are less likely to be married or see a doctor on a regular basis. The benefits of a high school education move society forward economically and socially. A person with a high school diploma is more likely to be employed, live longer, and become a productive part of society.

The impact of YCCS and its involvement as the only charter school in Illinois providing alternative educational services focused primarily on drop-outs can be seen throughout education. In 2005, YCCS placed in the upper third for school performance in reading by CPS in comparison to all of the other 76 high schools in the city of Chicago.

Conversely, we know that a quality education opens the doors of opportunity and provides hope for a brighter future. An investment in the education of young people who have dropped out of school saves our city and state taxpayers' money. The Alliance for Excellent Education reports that a 1 percent increase in high school graduation rates would save approximately \$1.4 billion in incarceration costs yearly. Additionally, a 1-year increase in average education levels would reduce arrest rates by 11 percent.

I am pleased to honor the outstanding work of the Youth Connection Charter School.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 344.

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.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to fill the existing vacancy thereon:

Mr. GALLEGLY, California

COMMEMORATING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ABOLITION OF THE TRANSATLANTIC SLAVE TRADE

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 272) commemorating the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the transatlantic slave trade, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 272

Whereas the United Kingdom outlawed the African slave trade in 1807 by passing the Slave Trade Abolition Act which recognized that “the African Slave Trade, and all manner of dealing and trading in the Purchase, Sale, Barter, or Transfer of Slaves, or of Persons intended to be sold, transferred, used, or dealt with as Slaves, practiced or carried on, in, at, to or from any Part of the Coast or Countries of Africa, shall be, and the same is hereby utterly abolished, prohibited, and declared to be unlawful”;

Whereas the transatlantic slave trade entailed the kidnapping, purchase and commercial export of Africans, mostly from West and Central Africa, to the European colonies and new nations in the Americas, including the United States, where they were enslaved in forced labor between the 15th and late 19th centuries;

Whereas the term “Middle Passage” refers to the horrific part of the transatlantic slave trade when millions of Africans were chained together and stowed by the hundreds in overcrowded ships where they were forced into small spaces for months without relief as they were transported across the Atlantic Ocean to the Americas;

Whereas historians claim that it is not possible to give an accurate number of slaves imported to the Americas from Africa, but scholars estimate that, at minimum, between 10,000,000 and 15,000,000 Africans survived the Middle Passage, were imported as chattel through customs houses and ports across the Americas, and were sold into slavery;

Whereas historians agree that many slaves arrived in the Americas ill with infections and diseases, disabled from the iron chains that bound them or from the physical abuse they endured, or traumatized by rape;

Whereas historians estimate that 10 to 50 percent of the Africans who were shipped from the continent perished during the Middle Passage as a result of physical abuses, torture, malnutrition, disease, infection, suicide or repercussions from their resistance to their bondage;

Whereas Africans’ resistance to the transatlantic slave trade culminated in revolts—collective acts of rebellion—against slave ships and their crews during the Middle Passage, and rebellions against slavery occurred frequently on colonial and post-colonial plantations throughout the Americas;

Whereas historians estimate that 1,200,000 men, women, and children were later separated from their families and displaced from their communities by being sold to slaveholders in other regions, colonies, States, and nations in the inter-American and domestic slave trade that took place through much of the 19th century;

Whereas the transatlantic slave trade is commonly recognized by historians as the largest forced migration in world history;

Whereas, as a result of the slave trade, an estimated 80,000,000 to 150,000,000 persons of African descent live in Latin America and the Caribbean, making them the largest population of persons of African descent outside of Africa;

Whereas the institution of slavery, which enslaved Africans, their progeny and later generations for life, was legally sanctioned by the colonial governments and later the nations and States engaged in slavery, including the Government of the United States, through most of the 19th century;

Whereas slavery in the United States, during and after British colonial rule, included

the sale and acquisition of Africans and African Americans as chattel property in interstate and intrastate commerce;

Whereas enslaved Africans and African Americans were defined as property that passed to heirs under inheritance laws of the British colonial rule and later under the laws of the various States;

Whereas enslaved Africans adapted to their environment and created a new, rich culture that marked the development of the African American community and continues to strongly impact culture and society in the United States today;

Whereas the slavery that flourished in the United States constituted an immoral and inhumane dispossession of human life, liberty, and citizenship rights and denied Africans and African Americans the fruits of their own labor;

Whereas the treatment of enslaved Africans and African Americans in the colonies and the United States included the deprivation of their freedom, exploitation of their labor, psychological and physical abuse, separation of families, and the targeted efforts to repress their culture, language, and religion through legal and social restrictive measures;

Whereas enslavement has been defined as a crime against humanity pursuant to the Nuremberg Charter (Agreement for the Prosecution and Punishment of the Major War Criminals of the European Axis, entered into force on August 8, 1945 (82 U.N.T.S. 279)), and subsequent international tribunals for war crimes;

Whereas the United Nations has adopted various treaties, declarations, and conventions and hosted conferences that condemn slavery and the slave trade, including the transatlantic slave trade, and has acknowledged that such acts were barbaric in their nature and were appalling tragedies;

Whereas the slave trade and the legacy of slavery continue to have a profound impact on social and economic disparity, hatred, bias, racism, and discrimination, and continue to affect people of African descent throughout the Americas today; and

Whereas March 25, 2007, marked the 200th anniversary of the Slave Trade Abolition Act enacted by the British Parliament: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the historical significance of the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the transatlantic slave trade to the people of the United States and to the world;

(2) respects the memory of those who died as a result of slavery, including through exposure to the horrors of the Middle Passage and in revolt against, and resistance to, enslavement;

(3) supports the preservation of historical records and documents in private collections, local and State governments, shipping ports, and corporations in the United States and throughout the Americas relating to the transatlantic slave trade and the centuries of slavery that followed; and

(4) urges increased education of current and future generations about slavery and its vestiges by honoring their significance in United States history and the history of other nations of the Americas with appropriate research, scholarship, curriculum, textbooks, museum exhibits and programs, library resources and programs, and cultural programs and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE, Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I would like to first commend our distinguished colleague and former member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Ms. LEE of California, for introducing this very important resolution.

I am honored and humbled to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the abolition of transatlantic slave trade with this resolution, for its legacy continues to reflect the racial biases and socioeconomic disparities that still exist in this country and throughout the Americas.

As we consistently admonish the prevalence of modern-day slavery worldwide, because it still exists in some parts of the world, it would be hypocritical if we did not acknowledge the history of transatlantic slave trade which existed for so long in this country, and therefore it is appropriate that we speak about it at this time, its 200th anniversary.

For over 300 years the United Kingdom and other European countries kidnapped and sold millions of Africans into slavery. The transatlantic slave trade is known as the largest forced migration in the history of the world. Estimates range from 25 to 50 million Africans were forcibly brought to the United States, the Caribbean, Central and South America and to Europe. Sharks migratory patterns were changed because these predators followed the ships in the Middle Passage because when a slave died they were thrown overboard, or if they were killed because they were protesting, or if they committed suicide, the sharks knew that they could follow the ships, and it changed the migratory patterns of sharks during this period of time.

African labor was an essential feature of economic development in Europe and her former colonies, including the United States. All of the nations involved flourished economically as a result of slave labor.

The fact that slavery was not abolished in the United States until Abraham Lincoln declared to end slavery in the Confederacy in 1863 with the Emancipation Proclamation. However, slavery was really not abolished in the Union.

Interestingly enough, in my State of New Jersey, slavery continued until 1866. In New Jersey, a mother, a woman could become free at the age of 21, and a man at the age of 25, but their children had to continue in slavery. And so

the emancipation only freed slaves in the Confederacy, and did not free slaves in the Union. And so, as I have indicated in New Jersey, there were still slaves a year after the end of the Civil War in 1866.

The dignity of our Nation demands our recognition of this tragic part of American history. I extend my highest respect and appreciation for the contributions and struggles of African Americans to create an equitable and just society from which we all benefit today.

I strongly support this resolution, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, thank you for bringing up this important resolution to this floor today. And I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 272, which recognizes the historical significance of the abolition of transatlantic slave trade. It respects the memory of those who perished as a result of slavery. It supports preservation of related historical documents, and it urges greater education about this sad period in history for both current and future generations.

□ 1430

While addressing the Community of Democracies' opening plenary in Chile on April 29, 2005, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice stated: "We at the Community of Democracies must use the power of our shared ideals to accelerate democracy's movement to ever more places around the globe. We must usher in an era of democracy that thinks of tyranny as we thought of slavery today: a moral abomination that could not withstand the natural desire of every human being for a life of liberty and of dignity."

While Secretary Rice's remarks were specifically on the promotion of democracy around the world, she reminded us of a very unsettling fact. Even 200 years after the abolition of the slave trade in the United Kingdom and nearly 145 years after the Emancipation Proclamation in our United States, slavery still exists in the modern world. It exists through tyranny. It exists through oppression. It exists where human rights and freedom are systematically repressed.

Secretary Rice's statement serves as a call to action for those of us who would seek to break the shackles of tyranny and promote human dignity around the world.

I appreciate the bipartisan fashion by which we have sought to heed the Secretary's call and to recognize the significance of the abolition of the transatlantic slave trade, as evidenced by our consideration today of both this resolution by the Congresswoman from California (Ms. LEE) and House Resolution 158, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS). Collectively,

these resolutions remind us of the courage and the fortitude of those who came before us to fight the scourge of slavery, while helping us come to terms with our own shameful past.

I believe that there would be no better way to respect the memory of those forced to suffer under the horrors of the transatlantic slave trade, or to honor those who dedicated themselves to its abolition, than to stand together today in a bipartisan fashion and publicly recommit ourselves to the eradication of slavery and the promotion of human rights around the world.

Madam Speaker, I again thank you for bringing this important resolution to the floor.

Madam Speaker, because I know that the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentlewoman from California have many speakers on their side, except for the 2 minutes that I would like to yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) to comment on this important resolution, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey will control the balance of the time except for 2 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her generosity.

Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 7 minutes to the sponsor of the resolution, Representative BARBARA LEE from the Ninth District of California, member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding and for your leadership. Mr. PAYNE, in making sure that this resolution came to the floor today in a bipartisan way and also for making sure that the history of African Americans, which, of course, started during the Middle Passages, is told not only here on the floor of Congress but in our public schools. So thank you very much.

Let me thank our ranking member, Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and also Mr. LANTOS for their leadership and for their assistance.

And let me take a moment to acknowledge our staff, because they have worked very diligently. And not only do they work for us. They really do believe in what we are doing, Madam Speaker: Kristin Wells, Pearl Alice Marsh, Joan Condon, Genora Reed, and Ven Neralla from my office. They have done remarkable work in a bipartisan fashion to get this resolution to the floor.

This resolution, Madam Speaker, H. Res. 272, commemorates a very somber and very serious occasion, the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the transatlantic slave trade by the United Kingdom. Two hundred years ago on March 25 in 1807, Great Britain abol-

ished the transatlantic slave trade in England and its colonies. This act began a worldwide revolt against the trade of human beings by other European nations.

This is a very important milestone because it represents the beginning of the end of one of the most deplorable, deplorable chapters in human history.

Madam Speaker, on several occasions, like many of my colleagues, I have had the overwhelmingly heart-wrenching, and I mean heart-wrenching, experience of traveling to the areas from where slaves were captured and put on ships for that deadly passage to America from Africa. And this is called, of course, the Middle Passage. One of my most distinct memories was standing on several occasions at the "doors of no return" in Ghana and in Senegal. Every slave castle has such a door. This door represents so many things to me. At this door my ancestors stood on the shores of their homeland for the last time in their lives. At this door a fate awaited them that I wouldn't wish on my worst enemy. And over 400 years later, there I was standing in the doors as one of their descendants who survived and returned.

Standing in front of those doors, it is really impossible for me to ignore the fact that those who walked chained through those doors laid the foundation of many modern nations that have a colonial past, including the United States of America.

The slave trade was vital to England and other European colonial powers. It provided the basis for modern capitalism to take root, generating immense wealth for business enterprises in colonial America and Europe. In many ways the industrial strength of our Nation was built on the blood, sweat, and tears of African American free labor. Free labor. Today, this great country of ours, the United States of America, reaps the fruits of labor of these enslaved Africans, and we cannot forget that.

However, in spite of the considerable riches enslaved Africans created for others, what the slave trade also represented was really the lowest expression of humanity, and I mean the lowest expression. Captured Africans were subjected to the worst forms of cruelty and inhumanity. Millions were crammed in the hulls of slave ships like sardines in a can. The stench of filth and death reeked from the ships. Disease ran rampant through the ships. Traders used any means of violence to subdue insurrection, including torture, mutilations, and rape. The death rate during transport would reach as high as 50 percent. The world will never know really the exact number of enslaved Africans transported to America, but it is estimated that between 10 to 15 million were brought here to the United States, making it the largest forced migration in history.

Given its immense significance, it is unfortunate that the transatlantic slave trade is a subject only briefly discussed in our Nation's classrooms, and

the study of the transatlantic slave trade really, if you ask me, should be a requirement for all of our public schools. It is essential that we acknowledge how slavery created attitudes of racism that persist in our society today.

Sadly, the legacy of the slave trade and slavery are with us to this day. Just consider these facts: nearly one quarter of African Americans in the United States live in poverty. African Americans have one of the highest unemployment rates at 9.6 percent, and of the 46 million who lack health insurance, about 20 percent are African American and many of these are children.

Slavery may be over, at least legalized slavery may be over, but in many ways the vestiges remain. That is why, Madam Speaker, it is important that we are considering this resolution today. We must honor the memory and the legacy and the courage of those who died in slavery and those who worked to end it. But at the same time, we must use this occasion to recommit ourselves to eliminating the disparities that exist in our society. We must not let their sacrifices be in vain.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I would like to claim my 2 minutes, and then I will yield to my colleague.

First of all, let me just say that this is a very important resolution. I don't think many people in America really understand or remember all of the horrible things that occurred during the slave trading that took place in the past.

There is a movie out right now that talks about the slave trade and how horrible it was. It is called "Amazing Grace." And I don't tout movies very much, but I would submit to all of my colleagues they ought to go see that movie. It is about William Wilberforce, who has been a hero of mine for a long time since I was a State legislator, and he led the fight in England to abolish slave trading; and it took him, I think, 18 years to get it done. But he was a real crusader for the rights of man and for the ending of slave trading.

So I would say to my colleague, Ms. LEE, I think this is a great bill you introduced. I whole heartedly support it, and I hope everybody in this House will. And as I said before, we ought to remember the horrible fight, the great fight that took place in ending slavery in England and in subsequent years.

So this is a great resolution. I really appreciate your bringing it forward.

And I hope everybody will remember William Wilberforce and the fight he made to end slavery and slave trading in England.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey will control the remainder of the time, and there are 23½ minutes remaining in this debate.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, Representative EDDIE BERNICE

JOHNSON, chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure's Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, let me say thanks to Mr. PAYNE and Ms. LEE for bringing this forth.

I rise today in support of this resolution to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the transatlantic slave trade.

This anniversary marks a significant moment in not only American history but the history of the world. For 300 years the transatlantic slave trade represented one of the most horrific periods in the history of human events. During this time, 12 million Africans were captured and brought to America as slaves. Millions more did not survive this horrific trip overseas, which could have lasted as long as 3 months. These individuals forcibly gave their lives and freedom to build the economic future of America, which includes this Capitol.

While nothing can replace lives or freedom, it is important to acknowledge that the consequences of slavery still exist. While 200 years may have passed since the end of the transatlantic slave trade, the legacy of racism still persists. Today we take a step forward in healing those wounds by recognizing the past and acknowledging the impact it still has on our Nation.

I would like to thank Representative LEE for writing this and bringing it forth. Because all too often, we think nobody remembers but us, those who still suffer from this horrific period in our history.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, Representative G. K. BUTTERFIELD, the vice chairman of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I also want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey, my friend Congressman DONALD PAYNE, for his tireless efforts on behalf of the continent of Africa and other related issues. I also want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her work on this resolution. And, hopefully, we will pass this resolution and move forward with greater work of this Congress.

Madam Speaker, this Nation has yet to fully come to terms with and recognize the institution of slavery that existed in this country for so long. Slavery is perhaps the most underrecognized crime against humanity in the history of the world.

Madam Speaker, I am often asked about my light complexion. Some people do it out of curiosity and it does not offend me, but I am often asked about my complexion. It is a fact that I am indeed an African American. My great-grandmother was a slave.

□ 1445

And my great grandfather was the slave master. And my situation is not

unique. The enslavement of millions of people who were taken from the west coast of Africa still affects millions of Americans today.

I represent the First Congressional District of North Carolina. My area of the country was one of the destinations of the slave trade. My congressional district today suffers from the effects from slavery. My constituents, half of whom are African American, suffer from disparities across the spectrum. I can trace directly these conditions to the fact that their foreparents were legally denied citizenship and the benefits of citizenship. Even after slavery ended, the United States continued to disrespect black citizens and forced them to endure inferior schools, health care, income and the like.

In my hometown of Wilson, North Carolina, my mother did not have access to a public education beyond the sixth grade. Had she lived in the rural area of my county, she would not have had the benefit of any education, save only a token opportunity offered by black churches. When my mother left the sixth grade, she was given an opportunity to move to another city to get an education, and it made a difference. She returned to our home community and became a teacher for 48 years and instilled in my generation the importance of education. There were hundreds of thousands who were denied educational opportunities, and their descendants today continue to suffer.

Madam Speaker, we have a tremendous responsibility as a Nation to remedy past wrongs. This resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the transatlantic slave trade is a step in the right direction. We must do more. Poverty is pervasive. This Congress must set the tone and begin the process of healing and remedy the cruelty of slavery and racial discrimination.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the 11th District of New York, Representative YVETTE CLARKE, a member of the Commerce and Small Business Committee.

Ms. CLARKE. Thank you very much to Representative PAYNE and to the gentlelady from California.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 272, a resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the transatlantic slave trade.

The abolition of the trade was an important milestone in the fight against slavery, but that campaign continued throughout the 19th century and it still continues today.

Currently, 27 million people are held in slavery around the world. Like the slaves of the past, slaves of today are controlled by violence, and suffer the theft of their labor and humanity.

Our commemoration today rings hollow if we do not learn from the lessons of the abolition movement of the past. That botched emancipation of 1865

forced four million ex-slaves into the economic social society with no access to education, political participation or equal citizenship, nor a true recognition of their humanity.

As I reflect on my own history as a descendant of African slaves who were survivors of the Middle Passage, my ancestors, kidnapped, brutalized and brought to the island Nation of Jamaica West Indies where centuries later my parents were born, who then migrated as subjects of the Queen to Brooklyn, New York, where I was born.

The history of Africans in the Americas has been suppressed as evidenced by the lack of presence in our school's curriculums. Today, we see the results of granting freedom without dignity. People of African descent still face economic inequality, social inequality and racism.

Slavery can be brought to an end within our lifetime. Madam Speaker, it is my prayer that someday soon this body will be celebrating of the global eradication of slavery. And in the spirit of the liberation and suffrage of my ancestors, the Civil Rights movement, human rights for every man, woman and child will be recognized. The liberty and the dreams of all will be attained through their collective will will not go unnoticed. We are not going to achieve true liberty unless and until we all embrace our collective and diverse humanity together.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the Seventh District of Illinois, chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service and the District of Columbia, Representative DANNY K. DAVIS.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 272, commemorating the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the transatlantic slave trade. I also rise in honor of my forefathers and foremothers who were captured through raids and kidnappings, sold to Europeans and subjugated to four and a half centuries of the transatlantic slave trade.

The transatlantic slave trade is sometimes called "Maafa," meaning "holocaust" or "great disaster" in Kiswahili by African and African American scholars because it resulted in a vast loss of life for African captives both in Africa and in America. It is believed that 50 percent of African deaths, 10 million, occurred in Africa as a result of wars between native tribes. 4.5 percent, around 900,000 deaths, occurred in large forts called factories. Around 2.5 million Africans died during voyages through the infamous Middle Passage, where they were packed into tight, unsanitary spaces on ships for months at a time.

While estimates of the number of slaves brought to North America vary from a few hundred thousand to a few million, the slave population in the United States had grown to 4 million

by the 1860s. From the latter 18th century, and possibly before that even, until the Civil War, the rate of natural growth of North American slaves was much greater than the population of any nation in Europe and was nearly twice as rapid as that in Europe. In North America, the treatment of slaves was very harsh and inhumane. Whether laboring or walking about in public, slaves were regulated by legally authorized violence. On large plantations, slave overseers were authorized to whip and brutalize noncompliant slaves. Significantly, slave codes authorized, indemnified or even required the use of violence and were denounced by abolitionists for their brutality.

In the present phase of society, we must recognize the historical significance of the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the transatlantic slave trade to the world. More broadly, respect the memories of those who gave their lives in the fight for freedom, and make sure that no generations yet to come will ever experience this kind of inhumane brutality.

And so I commend Representative LEE for introducing this resolution, commend Representative PAYNE for his tremendous leadership in human rights.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the Representative from the Sixth District of California, Representative LYNN WOOLSEY.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I want to thank Chairman PAYNE and Congressman BARBARA LEE for bringing this important issue before us today.

Madam Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor and in support of H. Res. 272, which celebrates the end of what was one of the most horrific and immoral human rights abuses in history, slavery.

The slave trade must be remembered. It has to be remembered for its brutality, for its inhumane cruelty, and for the injustices that it caused millions of families. I say families, because for every one of the more than 12 million Africans forced from his or her homeland, subjected to the Middle Passage, that terrifying journey on slave ships, overwhelmed by disease and left in famine, every one of those folks left a family behind in grief or they were separated by slave traders. These human beings taken from their homeland and stripped of their freedom suffered more than a loss of their humanity and of their families, however; many times they lost their very culture, their language, their religion and their true homeland.

It is important to remember that many of those captured in the slave trade did not survive the journey. Indeed, for every 100 slaves who reached the new world, another 40 died in Africa or during the Middle Passage.

This resolution, H.R. 272, is important because it recognizes the injustices of the transatlantic slave trade and the historical significance of its abolition. In order to come to terms

with slavery and the impression of black Americans in our past, it is also important that we acknowledge not only the historical events of the slave trade and of slavery, but also its legacy, its lasting effects on the lives of every single American.

We see even today the long-term consequences of slavery in the persistent inequalities between black and white Americans, the economic disparities, poverty rates, and the discrimination that still lives in our country today. Educating and teaching future generations about the historical wrongs of the slave trade can help because it could help prevent such crimes against humanity in the future, but it will also identify many forms of slavery that still exist, forms that we pretend aren't there.

So I urge my colleagues, support H.R. 272.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from the 18th District of Texas, Representative SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, chairwoman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Transportation, Security and Infrastructure Protection.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the Africa Subcommittee on the Foreign Affairs Committee. I thank the author and sponsor of this legislation, it is historic. And certainly, I thank the ranking member of the full committee for her leadership and presence here on the floor today and our full committee Chair.

This is a day that really emphasizes the long and diverse history of this Nation. It is a day that I hope that members of this body will unanimously pass this legislation, H. Res. 272.

Certainly, the historic aspect of it has already been noted, some 10 million to 15 million Africans were transported as slaves across the Atlantic. It does not, however, add all of the history when you look at the broadness of this question of slavery and America. What it really did to America was carve out this issue of race. And Judge Higgenbotham made it very clear as he rendered decisions on segregation and separation, that in this Nation, race matters. This historical perspective now puts all of this horrible legacy in place, and it does so as America. It does so, it speaks to America about the horribleness of the slave trade. It adds that this was not a very positive part of America's history, but it is part of America's history. It does so in the backdrop of the commemoration of the 400th year of Jamestown, 1607. And the first slaves that came over were actually from Angola. The person who fought against the slaves who were being taken was a woman warrior of the tribes in that part.

Just a few weeks ago, I saw the reenactment or the refilming, if you will,

or the reshewing of Roots, the Alex Haley Roots, on TV1, interestingly enough, a station and a company owned by an African American woman. And it brought home again the fierceness of slavery, the violence of slavery, and in fact, that these slaves were taken and violated and abused. And those that came over and made it here were infected with disease, they were suffering from rape and they had been brutalized.

□ 1500

This is an important statement. But a more important statement is the vestiges of slavery, and I am glad to have joined the Honorable Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and a number of others who went to South Africa to the Conference on Racism, organized by the United Nations in 2001. That was a very, very important effort, and I am glad that Members of Congress did not accept the administration's rejection of going to that conference. It was vital for us to be there. It was a vital part of the healing process, because it had to do with racism around the world. In fact, we know today that slavery still exists around the world.

So as we stand here today, we acknowledge the horribleness of the slave history of this country, but we also condemn slavery that exists today around the world, in parts of Asia, in parts of Africa, in parts of South and Central America, in parts of all aspects of the world, possibly even in Europe, where people are held against their will.

But the United Nations conference was to speak to the issue of stamping out the vestiges of slavery, so that we could do it in unity, so that we could respect each other for our dignity and for where we have come from, our religious difference, our racial difference, even our regional and country differences.

That is why this resolution is so important, because it says to the world that the United States House of Representatives accepts and acknowledges the wrongness of slavery, but we are going forward. We also recognize the vestiges of slavery, and we must go forward to end that separation on the basis of race. We must be able to say that race matters in a positive way.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 272, commemorating the Abolition of the Transatlantic Slave Trade.

When slavery was introduced into the European colonies in 1619, the dark days that followed ignited the faith and hope of our ancestors that one day their descendants would live in freedom and helped them bear the unbearable burden of bondage. For over 300 years, the United Kingdom and other European countries kidnapped and sold millions of Africans into slavery; contemporary historians estimate that between 9.4 and 12 million Africans arrived in the new world. Although on March 25, 1807, the United Kingdom outlawed the African Slave trade by passing the Slave Trade Abolition Act, the road to freedom was a perilous one, and without Abolitionist movements,

protests, and opposition, would not have been realized.

Madam Speaker, it is important to commemorate this occasion so that the world will not quickly forget the incorrigible injustices African-Americans suffered as slaves and the humiliation and degradation they bore when they were taken and adjudged to be real estate, the same category as livestock, household furniture, wagons and goods.

Although slavery was long, vicious and arduous, African slaves were instrumental in the economic development of this Nation and allowed Europe and the United States of America to be built. Slaves were the foundation of the country—today we recognize the end of this heinous trade of human cargo. It was from the institutional slave trade of Africans that the strong African-American people who have survived despite racism and second class citizenship emerged in the United States.

As we condemn the atrocities, human rights abuses, and modern-day slavery worldwide, it would be hypocritical if we did not acknowledge the history of the transatlantic slave trade and slavery that existed not long ago in our country.

The end of slavery did not come to pass until 1865, when the United States ratified the 13th amendment to the constitution. But the fight for equality against injustices, though easier today, still carries on. The consequences of the slave trade have been profound and the scars that it produced still have not healed. The most serious legacy is the endurance of racism in various forms that keep changing, but do not seem to dissipate.

Madam Speaker, we are committed to overcoming this legacy and assuring a just world society. The dignity of African-Americans demands recognition of the tragic history of the slavery era. It is for that reason that I rise in strong support of H. Res. 272, commemorating the 200th Anniversary of the Abolition of the Transatlantic Slave Trade. I urge all members to do likewise.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentelady from California (Ms. SOLIS), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman of our subcommittee, and I stand in strong support of House Resolution 272.

As the daughter of immigrants, I understand very clearly what it means when individuals are brought to a country either of their own free will or against their will. In the case of Latin American immigrants coming to this country, many fled because of poverty and injustices, sometimes civil wars.

In the case of our brothers and sisters from Africa, many were brought here as slaves and were indentured and never were paid for the hard work that they provided. In fact, a large number, hundreds of thousands, reside in the Caribbean and in Latin America. We are also descendants of those individuals, and we should proudly proclaim that we not forget that part of our history and that it go down and be noted and that we do everything in our power to help educate future generations about the injustices that exist, existed, and continue to exist in this country now. Whether it be forced slave labor

in our sweatshops or whether it be the maquiladoras in Mexico or Central America, there are many people who are still suffering from enslavement.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the 13th District of Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus and a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. KILPATRICK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I also want to thank my colleague, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE from the great State of California, for offering this resolution, House Resolution 272, commemorating the 200th anniversary of the end of the transcontinental slave trade for our country. Awesome that it is, we thank the President who signed that proclamation and that we began to work as one country with many ethnicities in our country.

Slavery is a cruel, unusual, inhumane treatment. Many of us just returned from overseas and were in the slave dungeons, and to see the inhumane treatment that many of our ancestors felt then and some vestiges of it today is awesome. But we are still here. We are still here running businesses, contributing to America. We are still here attending universities and in the Halls of this Congress of the United States of America.

We have much work to do, 200 years, and we hope thousands of years from now, because, you see, Africans brought the gifts of civilization, religion and science to the world, documented in anthropological studies, the first man.

So it's unfortunate but it's past, chattel slavery, but we have much work to do. We need better schools. We have got to be the best that we can be, first class, no exceptions, and we accept that responsibility.

To my young sisters and brothers across this Nation of all ethnic persuasions, rise up and be the very best that you can be. Never let anyone take the intellect, the intelligence or the mastery that God has given you to be the very best. Slavery is an abominable crime that we must never have again for any race of people, and in vestiges around the world, we see pockets of it.

But we rise today to support House Resolution 272, and to ask as Americans and people of the world that we build together a stronger America, where people have access to quality education that helps us to compete with the Chinas and the Taiwans and the Indias of the world, that we rise as a Nation of Americans and that we never again forget that all people are created by one God known by many names.

So I stand here as Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, one of 435 Members of this Congress, one of 43 members of the Congressional Black Caucus, to say to America, we are still the best country in the world. We still have a lot to achieve, and as we improve our schools, as we invest our

moneys, this \$3 trillion budget that we have in this country, make sure that this Congress, this administration, the people rise up to have a fair immigration policy, to have fair schools that are funded, that are technologically sound to compete.

And we pledge to you as African Americans, we will produce young people and others who are rising up, owning their own businesses, doing what we need to do to do our part so that our children know that we are the best, we intend to be the best, and we want the doors of opportunity to stay open so that access will be there.

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

Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentlelady from California once again. As she said, we hope that the history will be integrated into our textbooks. In New Jersey, I am proud to say, William Payne, assemblyman, passed Amistad legislation that will integrate the history of African Americans in the history of New Jersey. Our current Member of Congress, ALBIO SIREs, was the Speaker of the Assembly when that great legislation was brought through with his assistance.

When we read about Patrick Henry, who said, "Give me liberty or give me death," or Nathan Hale, who said "I regret that I only have one life to give for my country," we will read about Crispus Attucks, the first person killed in the Revolutionary War on March 3, 1770. We will read about Peter Salem and Salem Poor at the Battle of Bunker Hill, that fired the shot. They said, "Don't fire until you see the whites of their eyes." They killed Major Pitcairn, who led the Boston Massacre.

When we hear about the Civil War, 50 percent of the Navy were African Americans, once Frederick Douglass convinced President Lincoln to allow them.

In the Spanish-American War, as I conclude, we hear about the Rough Riders of Teddy Roosevelt, but it was the Buffalo Soldiers at the Battle of San Juan Hill that saved the Rough Riders of Teddy Roosevelt from annihilation, which has been kept from our history.

I could go on and on, but since the time has expired, at another time I will hope to be able to get through World War I and World War II and to the present time.

Mr. HONDA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 272, a resolution offered by my fellow Californian Representative BARBARA LEE to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the elimination of the transatlantic slave trade. I commend my colleague for introducing the resolution and I am proud to be a co-sponsor.

As Chair and Founder of the Congressional Ethiopian American Caucus, I am particularly interested in the history of the African Diaspora. My experience has taught me that the history of the Diaspora is as complex and divergent as the communities themselves. Our challenge is to educate ourselves about the Diaspora and to understand how African

Americans embrace and explore their heritage.

To tell the story of African immigration to the United States, we have a moral and cultural obligation to acknowledge the transatlantic slave trade. Today, the House is recognizing an important milestone in world history by considering H. Res. 272, Commemorating the 200th Anniversary of the Abolition of the Transatlantic Slave Trade. On March 25, 1807, the transatlantic slave trade was abolished by the British Parliament, and the United States Government followed suit a year later. The transatlantic slave trade was the largest forced migration in the world history, and it accounted for nearly 12,000,000 people transported in bondage from their African homelands to the Americas.

On this day, we pay our respects to those who died as a result of slavery, including through exposure to the horrors of the Middle Passage and in resistance to enslavement. As the resolution notes, the slave trade and its legacy continue to have a profound impact on social and economic disparity, racism and discrimination, and continue to affect people of African descent today. As a Nation we must move beyond telling the story about this crime against humanity, to empowering current and future generations to take action against the political and economic structures that impede our social progress.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to develop policies that will repair the damage that resulted from the devastating practice of transatlantic slave trade, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution commemorating its abolition.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I stand before you today in support of H. Res. 272, drafted by my colleague Representative BARBARA LEE from California. I would like to thank her for her leadership on this issue in recognition of this important part of our shared history.

This year marks the 200th anniversary of the end of the transatlantic slave trade. In 1807 the United Kingdom outlawed slavery recognizing that the African slave trade and all manner of dealing and trading in the purchase, sale, barter, or transfer of slaves from any part of the coast or countries of Africa was unlawful and thereby abolished.

The transatlantic slave trade conducted the capture of Africans, mostly from West Africa, for the purpose of enslavement in the colonies that would become the United States, during the 15th and late 19th centuries.

The Middle Passage was the forced migration through overseas transport of millions of Africans to the Americas, many of whom suffered abuses of rape and perished as a result of torture, malnutrition, disease and resistance in transit. Those who survived this perilous journey were sold into slavery.

More than 12,000,000 Africans were transported in bondage from their African homelands to the Americas, and an estimated 1,200,000 men, women, and children born in the Americas were displaced in the forced migration that was the domestic slave trade.

It is important to acknowledge that as a result of the slave trade approximately 80,000,000 to 150,000,000 persons of African descent live in Latin America and the Caribbean, making them the largest population of persons of African descent outside of Africa.

The transatlantic slave trade is characterized as the largest forced migration in world history.

The institution of slavery which enslaved Africans, their progeny and later generations for life was constitutionally and statutorily sanctioned by the Government of the United States from 1789 through 1865.

Slavery in the United States during and after British colonial rule included the sale and acquisition of Africans as chattel property in interstate and intrastate commerce. However their presence in southern states posed a problem for representation when the Union solidified. The Great Compromise of 1787 declared that the enslaved Africans would be counted as three-fifths of a person for the purposes of representation in the House of Representatives as not to give undue representation to southern states.

The slavery that flourished in the United States constituted an immoral and inhumane dispossession of Africans' life, liberty, and citizenship rights and denied them the fruits of their own labor. The enslaved Africans in the colonies and the United States suffered psychological and physical abuse, destruction of their culture, language, religion, and families.

I am disappointed that this body has been slow to act on the resolution denouncing slavery and offering an official apology to the descendants of slaves and the African American community. The 2001 World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance, held in Durban, South Africa, declared the slave trade and slavery a crime against humanity. The world recognizes the magnitude of this atrocity so why can't we make this simple step towards reconciliation?

The slave trade and the legacy of slavery continue to have a profound impact on social and economic disparity, hatred, bias, racism and discrimination in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support this and other legislation that serves to educate and increase awareness of the history of the slave trade and its impact on American culture.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 272, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OBSERVING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ABOLITION OF THE BRITISH SLAVE TRADE

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 158) observing the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the British slave trade and encouraging the people of the United States, particularly the youth of the United States, to remember the life and legacy of William Wilberforce, a member of the British House of Commons who devoted his life to the suppression and

abolition of the institution of slavery, and to work for the protection of human rights throughout the world, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 158

Whereas in 1780, William Wilberforce was elected at the age of 21 years to the British House of Commons;

Whereas Mr. Wilberforce and his friends were active in at least 69 different projects focusing on issues such as prison reform, education, child labor conditions, animal cruelty, and the reformation of the culture;

Whereas Mr. Wilberforce was mentored and counseled by former slave trader and author of the hymn "Amazing Grace", John Newton, on the horrors of the slave trade;

Whereas at the time, 11 million human beings had been captured and taken from Africa to the Western hemisphere and forced into slavery and bondage;

Whereas at the time, the British Empire controlled the largest portion of the slave trade;

Whereas Mr. Wilberforce devoted his life to the suppression and abolition of the institution of slavery;

Whereas a dedicated group of like-minded reformers, the Clapham group, assisted, supported, and encouraged Mr. Wilberforce in his fight against the slave trade;

Whereas Mr. Wilberforce fought for 20 years in the House of Commons to pass legislation banning the slave trade;

Whereas on February 23, 1807, Britain passed a bill banning the slave trade;

Whereas Mr. Wilberforce helped inspire and encourage those who fought against slavery in the United States, including political leaders like John Quincy Adams, spreading a message of hope and freedom throughout America and the promise of the future;

Whereas Mr. Wilberforce labored 46 years to abolish the institution of slavery in the British Empire, ceaselessly defending those without a voice within society;

Whereas in 1833, Mr. Wilberforce was informed on his death bed that the House of Commons had voted to abolish slavery;

Whereas in 2006, the United States Department of State estimated that between 600,000 and 800,000 men, women, and children were trafficked across international borders;

Whereas the International Labour Organization estimates that there are more than 12 million people in forced labor, bonded labor, forced child labor, and sexual servitude around the world; and

Whereas the people of the United States, particularly the youth of the United States, are called upon to form clubs and groups dedicated to working against the modern slave trade, human trafficking, and the degradation of human dignity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends to the people of the United States the example of William Wilberforce and his commitment to each and every person's human dignity, value, and freedom in observation of the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the British slave trade;

(2) encourages the people of the United States, particularly the youth of the United States, to—

(A) observe the anniversary of the abolition of the British slave trade;

(B) reflect on Mr. Wilberforce's selfless dedication to the fight against slavery and his commitment to the neediest in society;

(C) commit themselves to recognize the value of every person and to work actively against slavery in all its forms;

(D) work to educate themselves and others to recognize that individuals who are subject to slavery and human trafficking are victims of those who traffick such individuals; and

(E) form high school clubs and groups working against modern day slavery and the trafficking of persons; and

(3) condemns to the highest degree all forms of human trafficking and slavery which are an assault on human dignity and of which Mr. Wilberforce would steadfastly resist.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would first like to thank Congressman Joe Pitts, who was the prime sponsor of this resolution, and the other cosponsors. Congressman PITTS is a strong human rights activist and has worked on issues of Western Sahara and other issues dealing with suppressed people, and so this resolution honoring William Wilberforce by Congressman PITTS and encouraging young Americans to remember his life, legacy and dedication to the abolition of the British slave trade.

Mr. Wilberforce was born in 1759 in England into a wealthy merchant family. He studied at Cambridge University, where he began a lasting friendship with the future Prime Minister of England, William Pitt.

In 1780, Wilberforce was elected at the age of 21 years of age to the British House of Commons. His self-indulgent lifestyle as a young man changed completely when he became an evangelical Christian, prompting him to dedicate his life to social reform, particularly dealing with the institution of slavery.

During his time, the British Empire controlled the largest portion of the slave trade. As we have heard, estimates are from 25 to 50 million Africans were captured and taken from Africa to the Western Hemisphere and forced into bondage over centuries.

Wilberforce was mentored and counseled by John Newton, a former slave trader and the author of "Amazing Grace," which was a song that John Newton wrote when he was caught in a storm with slaves. That is when he said "Amazing grace, how sweet the sound," and he asked the Lord to forgive him and he became an Abolitionist. That is where this song originated, which is still sung at Irish funerals, played by the bagpipes, and, of course, it opens up many services in African American churches throughout this country.

But Mr. Wilberforce talked about the horrors of the slave trade and he devoted the rest of his life to the suppression and the abolition of slavery. In his

major speech on abolition in the House of Commons, he argued that the slave trade was morally reprehensible and an issue of natural justice. He described in vivid details the appalling conditions in which slaves traveled from Africa through the Middle Passage and argued that abolishing the slave trade would also bring an improvement in the conditions of existing slaves in West Indies, then, of course, under the domination of Great Britain.

In addition to his anti-slavery activities, Wilberforce was active in at least 69 different projects, focusing on issues such as prison reform, education, child labor conditions, animal cruelty, and cultural reformation. He was certainly a man who was indeed ahead of his time.

Mr. Wilberforce fought for 20 years in the House of Commons to pass legislation banning the slave trade; and on February 23, 1807, Britain passed a bill banning slave trade. Wilberforce died on the 29th of July, 1833, shortly after the act to free slaves passed. He had labored for 46 years to abolish slavery in the British Empire.

Wilberforce helped inspire and encourage those who fought against slavery in the United States, including political leaders like John Quincy Adams, who actually handled the Amistad Case in Connecticut of some slaves who in the Caribbean freed themselves and ended up on trial, and John Quincy Adams won the case. But he was influenced by Mr. Wilberforce, spreading the message of hope and freedom throughout America.

As a matter of fact, Wilberforce University, as we heard Mr. BURTON mention earlier, founded in 1856 in Wilberforce, Ohio, and the first historically black college in the United States of America, is part of the honored legacy of Wilberforce in the United States.

□ 1515

Wilberforce University was a final destination for the Underground Railroad that brought over 100,000 slaves from the South to freedom. As a matter of fact, currently, the president of Wilberforce University is a former Member of this body, Reverend Doctor Floyd Flake.

Wilberforce once said, "Men of authority and influence may promote good morals. Let them, in their several stations, encourage virtue. Let them favor and take part in any plans which may be formed for the advancement of morality." I think those words stand today, if we would listen to what Mr. Wilberforce said at that time.

I ask all of you to listen to the words of Wilberforce and to vote for this resolution to honor Mr. Wilberforce's work and legacy, his commitment to each and every person's human dignity, value and freedom. I urge that we pass this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PRITS), for introducing the bill before us, House Resolution 158, which observes the 200th anniversary of the end of the British slave trade and commends the heroic legacy of William Wilberforce, the outspoken British parliamentarian and Christian who was instrumental in its abolition.

The African slave trade was a heinous practice that inflicted degradation and misery on those millions of people whose human dignity it denied or destroyed.

In celebrating the 200th anniversary of Britain's abolition of the slave trade, we cannot help but reflect on the tragic fact that it took the United States another six decades and a wrenching Civil War to do the same, to begin living more fully according to the principles of our Founding Fathers.

I commend the author of this resolution, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PRITS), for focusing on the challenges of the present day, in addition to the sins of the past.

Although the scourge of formalized slavery has been eliminated in the west and for much, but not all, of the rest of the world, millions of women, children and men suffer similar severe assaults on their dignity and liberty today as victims of trafficking, sexual servitude, and forced labor.

This resolution is a welcomed opportunity to publicly recommit ourselves to the protection of human dignity. In the words of the man whom we honor in our resolution, William Wilberforce, he said, "Let us act with an energy suited to the importance of the interests for which we contend, stimulated by a consciousness of what we owe to the laws of God and the rights and happiness of man."

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) be allowed to control the remainder of our time.

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

There was no objection.

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

I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for yielding and for her principled leadership on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for his leadership on this and the preceding resolution, and for his leadership on the issue of human rights in general around the world.

Madam Speaker, with this resolution, we rightly honor one of humanity's great heroes. William Wilberforce was a man of integrity, a man of courage, a man of faith, and a man of principle. And he used these qualities, Madam Speaker, to forever change the world for the better. He is someone that each of us in this Chamber can relate to and draw inspiration from.

In a legislative body of 435 Members, it can be difficult to make progress on

the issues we care about. Indeed, the odds sometimes appear insurmountable.

But the life and accomplishments of William Wilberforce are proof that individuals of character truly can change the world. Wilberforce was himself a member of an elected legislative body. He was first elected to the British Parliament more than 220 years ago.

In his day, the human slave trade dominated England's economy. As a result, the interests of the slave traders were firmly entrenched in the halls of Parliament. Arguments used to justify the sale and trade of human beings and the horrific injustices that occurred in that trade were commonplace in that day.

But William Wilberforce refused to accept these arguments. He knew that slavery was an unspeakable injustice, and he made it his object to end it. This conviction would lead him on a decades-long effort to end slavery in England. It was a journey full of setbacks and disappointments. Again and again, he introduced his bill in parliament to end the British slave trade. Again and again it was soundly defeated, and again and again he was ostracized by his peers. For years this went on, and the discouragement grew.

But all the while, Wilberforce's call to conscience was slowly winning over hearts and minds. His willingness to stand for what was right and fight what was wrong was being noticed by his colleagues. And after 20 years of perseverance, 20 years of unbending principle, 20 years of standing for justice in the face of daunting odds, Wilberforce at last tasted success.

On February 23, 1807, Parliament voted, and on March 25, the King signed the bill that outlawed the British slave trade, a move that was once thought impossible.

And 26 years later, Wilberforce was informed a few days before his death that the House of Commons had finally voted to abolish slavery altogether in the British Empire.

Madam Speaker, throughout this year, we celebrate the 200th anniversary of this tremendous accomplishment. And as part of this celebration, a number of efforts are underway to inform people of this often-forgotten hero of humanity and his colleagues who worked to end in slavery.

We could mention others, like John Newton, who has already been mentioned. John Newton was a former slave trader who wrote the hymn "Amazing Grace," whose testimony before Parliament was so influential.

We could mention John Wesley, who a week before he died in 1791, wrote William Wilberforce about American slavery which he called "the vilest form of slavery known to mankind."

We could mention Wilberforce's direct influence on John Quincy Adams, and John Quincy Adams' direct influence on Abraham Lincoln. There are many people who could be mentioned, but this resolution before us today is

part of the celebration of the life and accomplishments of William Wilberforce, and are certainly worthy of recognition.

Madam Speaker, I would submit this is not merely an effort to look back and give credit where credit is due, it is also a call to fight modern-day injustice.

Sadly, every generation must confront evil in its own time, and ours is no different. Around the world, thousands of people are deprived of their basic human rights every single day. Good men and women of this world have a moral duty to fight these modern-day injustices.

The U.S. State Department estimates that approximately 800,000 men, women and children are trafficked each year into slavery, into the sex industry, other slave-like labor conditions.

In South Asia, an entire class of people numbering in the millions are considered to be "untouchable," and as a result, they are denied basic services and subjected to terrible living conditions. Horrible human rights abuses continue in places like Burma and Sudan and China and many others. These are just a few examples. The list could go on.

Madam Speaker, as we honor William Wilberforce, may we also be inspired today to educate ourselves and others about modern-day injustice, inspired to not turn a blind eye to millions of people worldwide who need our help; and inspired, Madam Speaker, to act.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, we have one additional speaker who has not yet arrived, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the former chairman, current ranking member, of the Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health and a great champion of human rights today.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. PITTS of Pennsylvania, for authoring this important resolution recognizing the abolishment of the inhumane, grossly immoral and ubiquitous British slave trade 200 years ago, and the highly principled member of the House of Commons, William Wilberforce, who poured his life into that noble cause. One man can—and did—make a difference.

H. Res. 158 also links the abolition issue to today's modern-day slave trade, human trafficking, and I appreciate that the gentleman from Pennsylvania recognized that there are lessons learned that need to be applied to our current battle against modern-day slavery.

Madam Speaker, William Wilberforce was 21 years old when he was elected to the House of Commons in 1780. And perhaps like some of us, later said, "The

first years in Parliament I did nothing, nothing to any purpose. My own distinction was my darling object.”

But that all changed, Madam Speaker, after a profound conversion to Christianity and a serious rethinking as to whether politics, with all of its diversions, distractions, vanity, lies, and deception, was compatible with his ever-deepening religious faith. He even thought of quitting politics and entering into a ministry.

John Newton, the former slave captain turned convert to Christ, among others, encouraged him to fight the battle against slavery where it could be won, in Parliament. The Commons is the place where you can stop slavery. Wilberforce agreed, and then poured his life into that battle.

William Wilberforce once said: “Never, never will we desist until we extinguish every trace of this bloody traffic to which our posterity, looking back to the history of these enlightened times, will scarce believe that it has been suffered to exist so long to disgrace and dishonor this country.”

He also said: “So enormous, so dreadful, so remediable did the trade’s wickedness quickly appear that my own mind was completely made up for its abolition.”

Madam Speaker, 200 years ago the slave trade was abolished, and he went on for the rest of his life with a group of prayer warriors, men and women who prayed every day for the abolishment of the slave trade, who believed it was a blight not just against man and woman, but against God himself. And it was through prayer and action that they came up with a number of very interesting and creative legislative ways of trying to stop it.

Wilberforce was also tenacious. Time and time again, he would offer his bill to abolish the slave trade, only to have all kinds of shenanigans, filibusters and misinformation, diversions, and threats including physical threats to himself, used as a way of deferring action, but he nevertheless persisted and in the end, he prevailed.

We need to learn from that example, Madam Speaker, because we have a slave trade today. In 1990s, the phenomenon of human trafficking, ever present in all of history, exploded in prevalence, sophistication and cruelty.

With the breakup of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact nations, suddenly new mobsters, many of them former KGB operatives, were all of a sudden on the scene buying and selling young women as commodities.

Additionally, the Internet suddenly brought pornography, including child porn, into homes all over the world, furthering the demand for victims. The sleazy X-rated theater went mainstream.

Organized crime in countries all over the world, including the United States, made profits seemingly without limit while incurring next to no risk of prosecution.

As Mr. PITTS pointed out earlier, today the United States is the net im-

porter of upwards of 18,000 people, mostly women or children, who are trafficked into this country to be exploited. That is an abomination.

We also have our own interstate slave trade where young girls who are runaways are quickly picked up by pimps and bought and sold like commodities. That, too, must stop.

□ 1530

Madam Speaker, I believe that because too much evil is involved here and because the prospect of making billions of dollars has enticed some of the most unsavory and cruel individuals, including and especially organized crime, into this nefarious trade we have to beef up our efforts to stop this slavery. Because too much demand enabled by crass indifference, unbridled hedonism and misogynistic attitudes has turned people, especially women, into objects valued only for their utility in the brothel or in the sweat shop we have to accelerate and expand our fight, and because of the relative lack of visibility, all of this makes the task of combating trafficking in modern day slavery all the more difficult.

But trafficking, like germs, infection and disease, thrives only in the shadows and in the murky places and cannot survive when brought to the light. Light remains a very, very powerful disinfectant.

So my challenge to all of us is that we have to bring the light, the bright light of scrutiny, of criminal investigations, the disinfecting of investigations and convictions, probing legislative inquiry, having the students, as Mr. PITTS in this bill encourages them to do, to form student groups to look into slavery. We need to use every tool, best practice and well-honed strategy to win the freedom of the slaves and to spare others the agony, especially through prevention measures, the agony of slavery.

Together, we can make the pimps and the exploiters pay by doing serious jail time, as well as the forfeiture of their assets. The boats, the villas and the fat-cat bank accounts must go. Together we can end this barbaric and utterly cruel modern day slavery, just as William Wilberforce and other great men and women did so in antiquity.

Make no mistake about it; the abolition of modern day slavery is a winnable war. We need to fight in ways so as to win. We need to pray. I believe we need to fast, and we need to have good, well-developed strategies, and we need to work as a bipartisan team, to end this cruelty.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank again Mr. PAYNE for yielding.

Let me commend Mr. PITTS and all those who have cosponsored this resolution, and say how important it is today for us to be discussing this in a bipartisan way and commending and remembering Mr. Wilberforce.

This resolution talks about how he devoted his life to the suppression and abolition of the institution of slavery, but it also calls upon the youth of the United States, especially, to form clubs and groups dedicated to working against modern slave trade and human trafficking and the degradation of human dignity.

Also it calls on the reflection of Mr. Wilberforce’s selfless dedication to fight against slavery and his commitment to the neediest in society. I think we should today remind ourselves that we need to rededicate ourselves to the principles and values which Mr. Wilberforce demonstrated through his life.

Let me give you some examples of how we really can do this today. When you look at this budget and the appropriations process, we are talking about cutting programs such as GEAR UP and TRIO that really help our youth, especially our African American and Latino youth, receive an education that allows them a level playing field.

When you look at California, affirmative action ended. We have very few students entering into the University of California, very few African American and Latino businesses because we have ended equal opportunity efforts in California, very few people of color employed by the State of California. And why? Because they did not adhere to Mr. Wilberforce’s ideals and his principles.

When you look at the prison population and the disparities, when you look at African American young men and women, the huge disparities in the prison populations, huge disparities in the dropout rate. Why? You have to understand, and I think this resolution, as minded, talks about the vestiges and the legacy of slavery; and so in rededicating ourselves to end this, we need to do what we can do today and close these disparities and make the right, correct budget decisions as we look at these budgets that we are putting together.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, we have no additional speakers; therefore, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the Representative from the 14th District of Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), chairman of the Judiciary Committee and dean of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise to join in this discussion to congratulate my colleague from New Jersey DON PAYNE and my dear friend who brought this to my attention only yesterday from California (Ms. LEE). I am so pleased to hear this discussion going on commemorating the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the transatlantic slave trade, but also the recognition of William Wilberforce, after whom the famous African American university, Wilberforce, was named, a distinguished member of the British House of Commons.

What we are discussing here is not just ancient history. It is not just a

recollection of why we have a 13th amendment to the Constitution prohibiting slavery. But we are talking about one of the great iniquities of our civilization. Slavery has always been a problem that we have dealt with across our centuries; but today and in countries all over the world, we are beginning to examine where it goes.

We heard the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) recite present problems. We have heard the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) talk about things that lead us into conditions of such abject poverty that people are made vulnerable to the whole question of being subjugated and eventually so impoverished that they end up being oppressed or exploited.

We know that many are still being trapped in trying to leave one country to improve their economic conditions, and they end up under false pretences in a forced work circumstance. Frequently, it's prostitution for young women. And for this 110th Congress, with these resolutions, H. Res. 272 and H. Res. 158, are now beginning to deal with this subject, not only in the present circumstance but examining the roots and the origins of this obnoxious, inhumane, indescribably evil circumstance in which we find men, women and children still under such oppression today.

For that reason, I am proud to stand here as the chairman of the committee that has jurisdiction over our constitutional amendments and to join with the distinguished members of the Foreign Affairs Committee who recognize that after many unsuccessful attempts, the British Parliament finally abandoned and made slavery illegal, but finally, after a great deal of effort were able to stop it. It didn't stop because we passed a law. Slavery and second-class citizenship and the denial of the rights of Americans didn't stop because we passed the 13th amendment. It didn't even stop after we passed a series of Voting Rights Acts to enforce the 13th, 14th and 15th amendments.

So here we are today, again recommitting this Nation through the people's House to make certain that everyone understands how this came about, how the Atlantic slave trade was so evil and that its legacy lingers over this Nation today.

I congratulate all of the leaders of these two measures and in commemorating the legacy and remembering this great Parliamentarian from England, William Wilberforce. Many of our predecessors worked, as tirelessly as we do, through the last couple centuries to deliver on the simple promise of freedom; but guess what, it doesn't turn on us just keeping people free. A free people have to become educated. They have to work. They have to raise their family. We have to put this enormously important consideration into the context of what it means.

To be free is not free. To be free means that you can get educated to compete in a computerized technology.

It means to be able to be healthy and to live and grow to make everyone have this wonderful opportunity. It was said so then to every man and woman and child the chance, the chance, the gold shining opportunity to become whatever they could in the course of one's life.

We celebrated the life yesterday of our dearest colleague Juanita Millender-McDonald as she was memorialized in Los Angeles. What a dynamic, unusual, amazing circumstance of a young girl from Alabama transporting herself to the first elected chairwoman of color of the House Administration Committee.

These are the kinds of opportunities that are open to us, to the 43 members of the Congressional Black Caucus, who all have equally poignant stories. We have an African American chairman who had to join the Army because he could not get a job. That is existing today.

It is in that spirit of looking back and yet confronting the realities that I am so proud to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have made this an important day to remember, to reflect on and to plan how we move the condition and the plight of all 300 million of our citizens forward.

I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time.

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

Let me conclude once again by thanking the prime sponsor, Congressman PRTTS, for this resolution and just say that as I was indicating before about a little bit about our history, it is important that we remember history. It is important that the House of Commons fought and Mr. Wilberforce would not give up his fight.

Actually, New Jersey back in 1863 passed the 13th amendment that was proposed by President Lincoln, although New Jersey did not support Lincoln in his elections. The Republicans passed the 13th amendment, but interestingly enough, the Democrats opposed this, and in the next election the Democrats swept out all the Republicans in the New Jersey State legislature and actually rescinded the 13th amendment.

□ 1545

So New Jersey did not pass the 13th amendment, refused to take up the debate on the 14th or 15th amendments. There was a time in our State where we were called, rather than down south was called up north or down north, because we did have problems, even in the North, attempting to get basic things like 13th amendment abolishing slavery; 14th amendment, due process under the law; and 15th amendment, giving the right to vote to all citizens.

We still have to fight injustice. No one would think that our great Garden State, which today is such a leader in the right things, had such a spotted past and a troubled history.

I urge support of this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 158, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution encouraging the people of the United States, particularly the youth of the United States, to observe the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the British slave trade and remember the life and legacy of William Wilberforce, a member of the British House of Commons who devoted his life to the suppression and abolition of the institution of slavery, and to work for the protection of human rights throughout the world".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 158.

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

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY TO FAMILIES OF WOMEN AND GIRLS MURDERED IN GUATEMALA

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 100) expressing the sympathy of the House of Representatives to the families of women and girls murdered in Guatemala and encouraging the Government of Guatemala to bring an end to these crimes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 100

Whereas Guatemalan women were among the victims during the 36-year Guatemalan internal armed conflict which ended with the signing of the 1996 Peace Accords and ushered in the process of reconciliation;

Whereas since 2001, more than 2,000 women and girls have been murdered in Guatemala often preceded by abduction, sexual assault, or brutal mutilation;

Whereas from 2001 to 2006, the rate at which women and girls have been murdered in Guatemala has increased sharply, at a higher rate than the murder rate of men in Guatemala during the same period;

Whereas the number of murders of Guatemalan women and girls has increased significantly from 303 in 2001 to more than 500 in 2006;

Whereas, according to reports from Guatemalan officials, most of the victims are women ranging in age from 18 to 30 and many were abducted in broad daylight in well-populated areas;

Whereas the manner and rate of murders of Guatemalan women and girls suggests an increase in gender based killings, an extreme form of violence against women that can include torture, mutilation, and sexual violence;

Whereas, according to data from Guatemala's Public Prosecutors Office, few arrests and fewer convictions have taken place, leading to accusations that police, prosecutors, forensics experts, and other state justice officials have not brought the perpetrators to justice;

Whereas inadequate financial, human, and technical resources, as well as a lack of forensic and technical expertise, has complicated the arrest and prosecution of suspects;

Whereas the Guatemalan Human Rights Ombudsman reports that on ten separate occasions police officers have been implicated in the murder of Guatemalan women and girls and recommends that such officers and other officials be held accountable for their acts;

Whereas the Guatemalan Special Prosecutor for Crimes Against Women, in her statements regarding the Guatemalan murder cases, reported that her office has reviewed approximately 800 reports of domestic violence per month, with some of those cases ending in murder;

Whereas the Government of Guatemala has undertaken efforts to prevent violence against women, as evidenced by its ratification of the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the Convention of Belem do Para, and other international human rights treaties, and the enactment of laws and the creation of state institutions to promote and protect the rights of women;

Whereas, in June 2006, the Government of Guatemala successfully abolished the "Rape Law" which had absolved perpetrators of criminal responsibility for rape and certain other crimes of violence upon the perpetrator's marriage with the victim;

Whereas the Government of Guatemala has created special police and prosecutorial units to address the brutal murders of Guatemalan women and girls;

Whereas Guatemalan legislators from various parties have joined lawmakers from Mexico and Spain to form the Inter-parliamentary Network against "Femicide";

Whereas the Government of Guatemala and the United Nations recently signed an agreement to establish the International Commission Against Impunity in Guatemala (CICIG), which has a mandate to investigate and promote prosecution of illegal security groups and clandestine security organizations that function with impunity and are suspected of attacking human rights defenders, and other crimes that have undermined overall security in Guatemala;

Whereas murders of Guatemalan women and girls have brought pain to the families and friends of the victims as they struggle to cope with the loss of their loved ones and the fact that the perpetrators of these heinous acts remain unknown to the proper authorities; and

Whereas continuing impunity for the crime of murder is a threat to the rule of law, democracy, and stability in Guatemala: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its sincerest condolences and deepest sympathy to the families of women and girls murdered in Guatemala;

(2) expresses the solidarity of the people of the United States with the people of Guate-

mala in the face of these tragic and senseless acts;

(3) condemns the ongoing abductions and murders of women and girls in Guatemala which have been occurring with increasing brutality and frequency;

(4) recognizes the courageous struggle of the victims' families in seeking justice for the victims;

(5) urges the Government of Guatemala to recognize domestic violence and sexual harassment as criminal acts;

(6) encourages the Government of Guatemala to act with due diligence in order to investigate promptly the killings of women and girls, prosecute those responsible, and eliminate the tolerance of violence against women;

(7) supports efforts to identify perpetrators and unknown victims through forensic analysis, including DNA testing, such as the National Institute for Forensic Science in Guatemala (INACIF) and encourages such efforts to be conducted by independent, impartial experts;

(8) urges the President and Secretary of State to continue to express support for the efforts of the victims' families and loved ones to seek justice for the victims, to express concern relating to the continued harassment of these families and the human rights defenders with whom they work, and to express concern with respect to impediments in the ability of the families to receive prompt and accurate information in their cases;

(9) encourages the Secretary of State to urge the Government of Guatemala to honor and dignify the victims of the brutal murders and to continue to include in the Department of State's annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices all instances of improper investigatory methods, threats against human rights activists, and the use of torture with respect to cases involving the murder and abduction of women and girls in Guatemala;

(10) encourages the Secretary of State to urge the Government of Guatemala to hold accountable those law enforcement and judicial officials whose failure to investigate and prosecute the murders adequately, whether through negligence, omission, or abuse, has led to impunity for these crimes;

(11) encourages the Secretary of State to support and urge the Government of Guatemala to take measures to ensure that the special Guatemalan police and prosecutorial units have an adequate number of appropriately trained personnel with sufficient resources to conduct thorough and proper investigations and prosecutions that reflect the gravity and magnitude of this national security crisis;

(12) recommends that the United States Ambassador to Guatemala continue to meet with the families of the victims, women's rights organizations, and Guatemalan officials responsible for investigating these crimes and preventing such future crimes; and

(13) recommends that the Secretary of State develop a comprehensive plan to address and combat the growing problem of violence against women in Latin America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIRES) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise

and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I want to thank our colleague, Congresswoman HILDA SOLIS, the sponsor of this resolution, as well as original cosponsors, the Chair and the ranking member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, ELIOT ENGEL and DAN BURTON, for bringing this issue to us.

This important resolution raises awareness of the increasing number of women and girls who have been brutally murdered in Guatemala. Since 2001, more than 2,000 women and girls have been killed in Guatemala, and the murder rate of women has increased sharply, more so than the rate for men.

Many of these murders are preceded by mutilation or sexual assault of the victims, and almost none of these cases are properly investigated or prosecuted. The fact that most of the murders go unpunished has contributed to the decline of overall security in Guatemala and demonstrates the dangerous situation for women and girls throughout the country.

While Guatemala has made some strides to improve the treatment of women under the law, there are still major obstacles for the country to overcome. For instance, domestic violence and sexual harassment are not considered crimes in Guatemala. This resolution condemns the murders, expresses sympathy and support for the struggle of victims' families for justice and urges that the murders be promptly investigated and prosecuted.

I hope that our two countries can work together to end the brutal murders of women and girls in Guatemala and to improve the security for all Guatemalans. I urge all my colleagues to support H. Res. 100.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

First of all, I want to congratulate Representative SOLIS for introducing this bill. She and I have worked together on it, and I really appreciate her hard work. She is really concerned about the rights of women around the world and not just Guatemala. I appreciate that.

Let me start out by saying today we have heard a great deal about human rights violation, slavery and other issues. The problem is not confined just to one part of the world. In China today, as Representative SMITH of New Jersey has pointed out many times, there are as many as 10 million people suffering in communist gulags, and other parts of the world. In the Sudan,

we see the oppression and the horrible atrocities that are taking place and the mistreatment of not only men and women but children as well. It's just a horrible thing that we see these kinds of atrocities taking place around the world.

I really appreciate my colleagues on both sides of the aisle working so hard to focus attention on what's going on in these various areas to try to bring them to a halt. For humanity's sake, we can do no less.

I, however, today, rise in support of H. Res. 100, which recognizes and honors the women and girls who have been murdered in Guatemala. This bill brings to light the problem women in the democratic nation of Guatemala face in their daily struggle for survival. Given the current environment in Guatemala, women are not safe to walk along the streets day or night. A simple walk from home or school or work to mean abduction, mutilation or death for a Guatemalan woman or girl. Given the lack of legislative protection and judicial investigation, women are often subjected to domestic abuse, often leading to death within the home as well.

Given that there is nowhere for these victims or their families to turn, over 2,000, as has been said to my colleague, over 2,000 Guatemalan women and girls have suffered horrendous deaths in the past 5 years. Tremendous efforts have been taken by some Guatemalan legislators and human rights workers and families of the victims. They come here to Washington to try to end such atrocities by focusing attention on them.

There has been a continuous rise, however, in the brutal female deaths. There can be no rest of the weary as long as these things go on. We must come together to assist their effort and urge the government of Guatemala to take quick deliberative action to investigate the killings and prosecute those responsible and eliminate the tolerance, the tolerance of violence against women.

The women in Guatemala deserve to experience peace and prosperity within their nation and not constant fear of sexual assault and deadly mutilation, in just walking to and from work, as I said before.

I ask my colleagues to see the urgency of this bill, and to support it. Once again, Representative SOLIS, thanks for your hard work.

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

Mr. SIREES. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. I would like to thank the gentleman and also take this time to acknowledge the support of Chairman LANTOS, Subcommittee Chairman ENGEL, Subcommittee Ranking Member BURTON, who is here, and Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, who are the original cosponsors of House Resolution 100, for their tireless work on this

issue. I urge all my colleagues to support this bipartisan resolution.

Madam Speaker, I know that we have heard much this afternoon about this predicament that exists in Guatemala. It has been going on for many, many years. This resolution that I introduced earlier this year would acknowledge the murders of 2,500 or more young women and girls that have been mutilated, attacked, assaulted and killed in Guatemala.

The murder rate for women and young women continues to rise there. It's as though there's a blind eye on the part of the government in Guatemala, as well as ours. That is why I brought this measure to the floor here. I think it is important that when a crime against a woman is done in any part of the world, it's a crime against all of us and humanity.

Therefore, I want to acknowledge the support of our colleagues, and especially for the hard work of the advocates, the groups that actually help to bring this issue before the Congress. They could have, at any time in the past 10 years, come and spoken to any Member of Congress about the issue. But the time wasn't right. Perhaps the politics, the environment, just wasn't fit for that. But now that we have seen resolutions come out of this House, where we worked on a bipartisan basis to deal with the issues of the women of Ciudad Juarez, and now we bring forward this issue.

Now we have more support on both sides of the aisle to say that the violence has to stop. There must not be impunity. Everyone should be held accountable. There needs to be transparency in government on the part of the Guatemalan Government, and on the part of our government as well, provide technical support, and also help to seek some resolution to the violence against these women that continues to go on.

I want to thank those groups that especially have worked hard with us to combat this particular crime. I would like to mention their names, Amnesty International, the Washington Office on Latin America, the Guatemala Human Rights Commission, Human Rights First, and, also, a group from my home area, CARECEN, the Central American Resource Center advocacy group based in Los Angeles.

They are strong supporters of House Resolution 100. Did you know, in fact, in the City of Los Angeles, this has one of the highest concentrations of Guatemalans. So many of them know distinctly how important this resolution is. They thank the Congress for bringing up this measure.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD letters from CARECEN and 20 other advocacy groups that are also in support of this resolution.

DEAR CONGRESSMEMBER: We write to urge your support for H. Res. 100, which expresses sympathy to the families of women and girls murdered in Guatemala and encourages the Government of Guatemala to bring an end to these crimes.

Historically, the U.S. has offered asylum to those fleeing persecution based on race, religion, political opinion, national origin or membership in a particular social group. Only in the past decade have women and girls fleeing gender-based persecution (such as domestic violence, female genital cutting, human trafficking, "honor" killings, etc.) been recognized as refugees, but this remains an issue that is still widely debated.

There is no doubt that asylum is a life-saving form of protection, and recognition of gender-based claims is an important statement by the U.S. that it takes women's rights seriously. But asylum cannot be a solution to the underlying human rights problem. By definition, asylum seekers are forced to flee their home countries in order to save their lives and to escape persecution, but they leave behind many others who face the very same violations of their fundamental human rights—and who have no protection at all. Therefore, if we truly seek to address the problem at its source, we must examine the "root causes" of the violence and persecution that are forcing asylum seekers to flee in the first place. The story of Rodi Alvarado and Guatemala's femicides serve as a tragic case in point.

For more than a decade, Rodi Alvarado was brutalized by her husband, a former soldier in the Guatemalan military, and her repeated and desperate pleas for help from the police and courts were ignored. Ultimately, she had no other option but to flee for her life. Rodi's case—known as Matter of R.A.—has been pending for almost ten years, and although two successive Attorneys General—Janet Reno and John Ashcroft—"certified" the case to themselves, neither of them issued a definitive decision. In 2001, the immigration agency proposed regulations clarifying that domestic violence and other related harms could form the basis of an asylum claim. However, those regulations have yet to be finalized, and the lives of women like Rodi Alvarado, who have sought asylum in the U.S., continue to hang in the balance.

We ask you to strongly urge Attorney General Gonzales and Department of Homeland Security Secretary Chertoff to issue regulations which would clearly recognize that women in circumstances such as Rodi Alvarado qualify for protection as refugees. This would send a clear message that women and girls fleeing gender-persecution will find a safe haven in the U.S.

Advancing protective U.S. asylum law is critical, but equally important is addressing the root causes that force women to flee their home countries. In Rodi Alvarado's case, these causes are an epidemic of violence against Guatemalan women; more than 3,000 women and girls have been murdered since 2000. These gender-motivated killings or "femicides" are notable both for their brutality and for the virtual impunity of those responsible. The most recent available statistics reveal the abysmal failure of the Guatemalan government to effectively investigate, prosecute, and punish those who carry out these horrific crimes. Only 17 murders of women—of the thousands that have been committed—have been prosecuted.

Guatemala's femicides demonstrate the lack of any meaningful protection for women like Rodi Alvarado, who are left with no other choice than to flee for their lives. Unless and until the Guatemalan government reforms its justice system such that there is an end to impunity that exists for those who commit this violence, hundreds more women will lose their lives, while others will be forced to flee in order to save them.

As a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, we ask you to play a critical role in resolving the root causes of gender-

based violence and persecution in Guatemala by co-sponsoring H. Res. 100.

Sincerely,

The Center for Gender & Refugee Studies (CGRS); Central American Resource Center (CARECEN); Guatemala Human Rights Commission; Foundation for Human Rights in Guatemala; Network in Solidarity with the People of Guatemala; Movement of Guatemalan Immigrants in the United States (MIGUA); National Coalition of Guatemalan Immigrants (CONGUATE); Guatemala Solidarity Committee of Boston; National Alliance of Latin American and Caribbean Communities (NALACC); United Latinos in Massachusetts (LUMA);

Salvadoran American Nacional Network (SANN); Harvard Immigration and Refugee Clinic; University of Texas School of Law Immigration Clinic; Legal Momentum; STITCH; Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights; Florida Immigrant Advocacy Center, Inc.; Albuquerque Center for Peace and Justice; El CENTRO de Igualdad y Derechos; Casa de Esperanza; Asylum Access; and American Friends Service Committee Immigrant Rights Program.

While I close, I would like to say that while the violence may continue momentarily, I think we have caught the attention of policymakers, not just in Guatemala, but in other parts of the hemisphere, because not only are we looking at setting a standard here, but we are letting people know that we are on watch, and that America will take their place, as we always have, in providing leadership.

I thank our chairperson for this committee. I thank the gentleman. I thank our ranking member on the other side of the aisle and all of those groups that helped to support this resolution.

Mr. SIREŠ. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I would like to thank my colleague from California (Ms. SOLIS) for introducing this bill. I would like to thank Chairman LANTOS for working to bring it to the floor as quickly as he did.

Madam Speaker, one of the top priorities of this 110th Congress has been to protect women's rights and to prevent violence against them. That is why I am particularly proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution, H. Res. 100, a resolution that brings the same kind of commitment to the women and girls of Guatemala. The supporters of H. Res. 100 are speaking loudly against the systematic abuse and sexual violence that the women and girls of Guatemala face.

Since the year 2001, 2,000 women and girls have been murdered. We are saying that it's beyond time for the Guatemalan government to stand up against these inexcusable and inhumane acts. They are acts of violence, and they must punish the offenders. We want them to put the resources necessary toward providing for investigations and for DNA testing.

Today, with this resolution, this Congress stands up and offers more than our condolences. We offer our support. We stand with the women and the girls of Guatemala, and we pledge to bring

safety and justice to them. We want their government to work with us to that end.

Mr. SIREŠ. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey's 10th Congressional District, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health, my good friend DON PAYNE.

□ 1600

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, let me thank the prime sponsor, Ms. SOLIS, for introducing this very important House Resolution 100, expressing the sympathy of the House of Representatives to the families of women and girls murdered in Guatemala, and encouraging the Government of Guatemala to bring an end to these crimes.

Let me commend Ms. SOLIS from California, not only for the women in Guatemala but she has actually expressed concerns for the deaths of women in Mexico. We have had discussions with Ms. SOLIS about the murders on the border of the United States and Mexico where women have been killed and there are a tremendous number of unsolved crimes there, and she visited that community in Mexico to express our concern for the women of that region and that country. So this is simply an extension of the work that she has done so well on behalf of women not only here in this country but throughout the world.

As we know, since 2001 more than 2,000 women and girls have been murdered in Guatemala, often preceded by abductions, sexual assault, or brutal mutilation. The murder rate has continued to increase and has grown from 2001 where there were 303 reported to more than 500 in 2006. And so we have asked the Government of Guatemala and actually the United Nations, and they recently signed an agreement to establish the International Commission Against Impunity in Guatemala, which has a mandate to investigate and promote prosecution of illegal security groups and clandestine security organizations that function with impunity and are suspected of attacking human rights defenders and other crimes that have undermined the overall security in Guatemala.

So when we look to Guatemala and we express our sincerest condolences to the families of these women and girls, we must look at the condition of women throughout the world, even here in the United States. At a recent hearing last week of the Education and Labor Committee, we find that women make 82 cents on the dollar compared to what men make. And the sad part is that, as women progress in their years of work, the gap between men and women actually expands because they start at a lower base. Men's salaries go up, women's salaries remain stagnant, and the gap becomes even greater.

So as we remember the women of Guatemala, let's remember that there is still gender bias throughout the world.

Mr. SIREŠ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California's Ninth District, a member of the

Committee on Appropriations, BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for your leadership, and just say today that I fully support and am a cosponsor of this resolution, and want to thank Congresswoman SOLIS for staying on point and continuing to focus and make sure that this House of Representatives understands the type of torture and violence that is taking place with regard to Guatemalan women.

As the resolution says, the murders of Guatemalan women and girls have increased significantly, from 303 to more than 500 in 2006. Since 2001, unfortunately, more than 2,500 women and girls have been killed. So it is up to us, I believe, to make sure that we as a neighbor to Guatemala, as people who care about women and girls, that we urge the Guatemalan Government to do some of the things that have been put forth in this resolution.

First, of course, we extend our sincere condolences and deepest sympathies to the families of the women and the girls who have been murdered in Guatemala. But also we have to do more than just extend our sympathy and express solidarity. We have to do what this resolution says. Let me just mention a couple of those things that we need to do.

We need to urge the Government of Guatemala to recognize domestic violence and sexual harassment as criminal acts. Nothing less than that will do. We need to make sure that our Secretary of State works with the Government of Guatemala to hold those accountable for their crimes. We need to make sure that the ambassador continues to meet with the families and the victims of the women and girls. We also need to make sure, and this resolution calls upon our Secretary of State, to develop a comprehensive plan to address and combat the growing problem of violence against women in Latin America.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SIREŠ, because this is such an important effort for women and girls, not only in Guatemala and Latin America, but for women and girls throughout the world.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 100, to express sympathy to the families of women and girls murdered in Guatemala. The senseless atrocities being committed in Guatemala are a grim reminder of the injustices that plague women and girls throughout the world. It is imperative that we speak out as a nation against these malicious acts, which demonstrate an utter lack of respect for human life.

These irrational acts of violence targeted against women are not just a looming problem in Guatemala. Femicide has afflicted other countries in the world, but our attention turns to Guatemala as the most recent and serious case of negligence by government officials. According to reports, 40 percent of killings were never investigated or the investigations

were simply shelved. This pattern of impunity by the Guatemalan Government cultivates and perpetuates the cycle of violence.

It has taken pressure from the international community to highlight this gross violation of human rights and force the Guatemalan Government to take steps towards alleviating these problems. Guatemalan officials have recently created a special police commission and prosecutorial unit to solely focus on femicide crimes.

Although these are important and necessary steps, more must be done to address these issues.

It is necessary for this House to focus our attention to Guatemala's passive attitude. This is why I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on H. Res. 100.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LYNCH). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIREs) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 100.

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.

CALLING ON VIETNAM TO IMMEDIATELY AND UNCONDITIONALLY RELEASE POLITICAL PRISONERS AND PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 243) calling on the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to immediately and unconditionally release Father Nguyen Van Ly, Nguyen Van Dai, Le Thi Cong Nhan, and other political prisoners and prisoners of conscience, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 243

Whereas, on February 18, 2007, Vietnamese police raided the parish house of Father Nguyen Van Ly and confiscated computers, telephones, more than 100 mobile phone cards, and more than 200 kilograms of documents;

Whereas the police moved Father Ly to the remote location of Ben Cui in central Vietnam, where he is under house arrest;

Whereas Father Ly is a former prisoner of conscience, having spent a total of over 13 years in prison since 1983 for his advocacy of religious freedom and democracy in Vietnam;

Whereas Father Ly is an advisor of "Block 8406", a democracy movement that started in April 2006 when hundreds of people throughout Vietnam signed public petitions calling for democracy and human rights;

Whereas Father Ly is also an advisor of a new political party, the Vietnam Progression Party, and one of the primary editors of "Freedom of Speech" magazine;

Whereas, on March 6, 2007, Vietnamese police arrested one of Vietnam's few practicing human rights lawyers, Nguyen Van Dai, who

has defended individuals arrested for their human rights and religious activities, is the co-founder of the Committee for Human Rights in Vietnam, and is one of the principal organizers of the Block 8406 democracy movement;

Whereas, on March 6, 2007, Vietnamese police also arrested Le Thi Cong Nhan, a human rights lawyer, a member of "Block 8406", the principal spokesperson for the Progression Party, and a founder of the Vietnamese Labor Movement;

Whereas Father Ly, Nguyen Van Dai, and Le Thi Cong Nhan have been charged with disseminating propaganda against the Socialist Republic of Vietnam under article 88 of the Penal Code of Vietnam;

Whereas Father Ly was tried and convicted on March 30, 2007, and sentenced to 8 years in prison;

Whereas if convicted, Nguyen Van Dai and Le Thi Cong each could be sentenced to up to 20 years in prison;

Whereas Le Quoc Quan is a lawyer who traveled to the United States in September 2006 to research civil society development as a Reagan-Fascell Fellow at the National Endowment for Democracy;

Whereas Le Quoc Quan returned to Vietnam in early March 2007 and was arrested by Hanoi police on March 8, 2007;

Whereas Le Quoc Quan has been charged under Article 79 of the Penal Code of Vietnam which prohibits activities aimed at overthrowing the Government and carries extremely severe prison terms and even the death penalty;

Whereas in none of their activities have Father Ly, Nguyen Van Dai, Le Thi Cong Nhan, or Le Quoc Quan advocated or engaged in violence;

Whereas the arrest of and charges against Father Ly, Nguyen Van Dai, Le Thi Cong Nhan, and Le Quoc Quan violate Article 69 of the Vietnamese Constitution, which states that "The citizen shall enjoy freedom of opinion and speech, freedom of the press, the right to be informed and the right to assemble, form associations and hold demonstrations in accordance with the provisions of the law";

Whereas Father Ly, Nguyen Van Dai, Le Thi Cong Nhan, and Le Quoc Quan have been arrested and charged in contravention of the rights enshrined in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) to which Vietnam is a state party, specifically Article 18 (freedom of religion), Article 19 (freedom of expression) and Article 22 (freedom of association);

Whereas Vietnam recently has imprisoned, detained, placed under house arrest, or otherwise restricted numerous other peaceful democratic and religious activists for reasons related to their political or religious views, including Nguyen Binh Thanh, Nguyen Phong, Nguyen Ngoc Quang, Nguyen Vu Binh, Huynh Trung Dao, Nguyen Tan Hoanh, Tran Thi Le Hang, Doang Huy Chuong, Doan Van Dien, Le Ba Triet, Nguyen Tuan, Bui Kim Thanh and Tran Quoc Hien;

Whereas the United States Congress agreed to Vietnam becoming an official member of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 2006, amidst assurances that the Vietnamese Government was steadily improving its human rights record and would continue to do so;

Whereas the group of Asian countries at the United Nations have nominated Vietnam as the sole regional candidate for a non-permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council for the 2008-2009 biennium, and pursuant to the United Nations Charter, Vietnam would be required to discharge its duties in accordance with the purposes of the United Nations, including the promotion and

encouragement of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all; and

Whereas the arbitrary imprisonment and the violation of the human rights of citizens of Vietnam are sources of continuing, grave concern to Congress, and the arrests of Father Ly, Nguyen Van Dai, Le Thi Cong Nhan, and Le Quoc Quan are part of a trend toward increasing oppression of human rights advocates in Vietnam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the House of Representatives—

(A) condemns and deplores the arbitrary arrests of Father Nguyen Van Ly, Nguyen Van Dai, Le Thi Cong Nhan, and Le Quoc Quan by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and calls for their immediate and unconditional release and the dropping of all criminal charges, and for the immediate and unconditional release of all other political and religious prisoners;

(B) condemns and deplores the violations of the freedoms of speech, religion, movement, association, and the lack of due process afforded to individuals in Vietnam;

(C) challenges the qualifications of Vietnam to be a member of the United Nations Security Council, unless the Government of Vietnam begins immediately to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms for all within its own borders; and

(D) strongly urges the Government of Vietnam to consider the implications of its actions for the broader relationship between the United States and Vietnam; and

(2) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should—

(A) make a top concern the immediate release, legal status, and humanitarian needs of Father Nguyen Van Ly, Nguyen Van Dai, Le Thi Cong Nhan, and Le Quoc Quan;

(B) use funds from the newly created Human Rights Defenders Fund of the Department of State to assist with the legal defense and the needs of the families and dependents of Father Ly, Nguyen Van Dai, Le Thi Cong Nhan, and Le Quoc Quan;

(C) continue to urge the Government of Vietnam to comply with internationally recognized standards for basic freedoms and human rights;

(D) make clear to the Government of Vietnam that it must adhere to the rule of law and respect the freedom of religion and expression in order to broaden its relations with the United States;

(E) make clear to the Government of Vietnam that the detention of Father Ly, Nguyen Van Dai, Le Thi Cong Nhan, Le Quoc Quan, and other political prisoners and prisoners of conscience and other human rights violations are not in the best interest of Vietnam because they create obstacles to improved bilateral relations and cooperation with the United States;

(F) examine current human rights violations by the Vietnamese Government and consider re-imposing on Vietnam the "country of particular concern" (CPC) designation, which was removed on November 13, 2006, pursuant to the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998; and

(G) in order to advance these freedoms and rights, and to strengthen the long-term relationship between the United States and Vietnam, initiate new foreign assistance programs to advance the capacity and networking abilities of Vietnamese civil society, including—

(i) rule of law programs to train Vietnamese human rights lawyers, judges, academics, and students about international human rights law;

(ii) public diplomacy initiatives to inform and teach Vietnamese citizens about international human rights norms and responsibilities; and

(iii) projects that support organizations and associations that promote the freedom of religion, speech, assembly, and association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIREs) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I would first like to commend the distinguished ranking member of the Africa and Global Health Subcommittee, my friend, Chris Smith of New Jersey, for the introduction of this important resolution.

This year, Vietnam's program of economic liberalization and openness took its most dramatic and important step when it joined the World Trade Organization. Just over 30 years after the Communist takeover of Saigon, Vietnam is now looking to promote foreign direct investment and to become a full member of the global economic community.

The U.S.-Vietnam relationship has undergone a similar transformation. U.S. Presidents now regularly visit our once sworn enemy. United States' engagements with Vietnam can and should continue in order to promote a more open and prosperous Vietnam. This will better the lives of the Vietnamese people. Yet, as the U.S.-Vietnam relationship matures, the Government of Vietnam must understand that U.S. principles of democracy, freedom, and human rights will never soften by impressive economic growth rates.

The unacceptable arrest of four innocent Vietnamese citizens by the government for exercising their right of free expression is evidence of how far Vietnam must come before it can be considered a genuine friend of the United States.

The resolution we are considering today demonstrates our commitment to human rights, democracy, and the rule of law in Vietnam. It does this by calling for the immediate release of these political prisoners, urging the Government of Vietnam to comply with international standards of human rights, and considering the implication of its actions for the broader relationship between the United States and Vietnam.

I strongly support this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to manage the time on this side.

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

There was no objection.

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

Vietnam has long been known as a major violator of human rights. The U.S. House of Representatives went on record in the 109th Congress condemning and deploring the violations of human rights in Vietnam and strongly urging the Vietnamese Government to consider the implications of its human rights abuses for the broader relationship between the United States and Vietnam. I point out parenthetically that the House almost a year ago to the day passed a resolution that I sponsored similar to this one, H. Con. Res. 320, on April 6, 2006. There was some initial improvement. Regrettably, there has been a snapback to its original and even worsened situation when it comes to human rights observance. That is why I have sponsored H. Res. 243—calling on Vietnam to immediately and unconditionally release Fr. Ly, Mr. Dai, Mrs. Whan and other political prisoners and prisoners of conscience.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Department of State in its "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices" notes that the human rights record in Vietnam remains "unsatisfactory," and that government officials continued "to commit serious abuses." The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom stated in its 2006 annual report that Vietnam "continues to commit systematic and egregious violations of freedom of religion and belief."

However, in November 2006, pursuant to a boatload of assurances and solemn promises that the human rights situation would improve dramatically, Vietnam became the first country to be removed from the list of Countries of Particular Concern, so designated pursuant to the International Religious Freedom Act. Late last year, the U.S. Congress agreed to Vietnam becoming an official member of the World Trade Organization, and a group of Asian countries at the United Nations has nominated Vietnam as the sole regional candidate for a nonpermanent seat on the U.S. Security Council.

Despite this flurry of international recognition and tangible economic benefit, despite the hopes of many, including and especially the Vietnamese people, Vietnam has reverted to its repressive practices and has arrested, imprisoned, and imposed lengthy prison sentences on numerous individuals whose only crime has been to seek democratic reform and respect for fundamental human rights in their country.

The crackdown in Vietnam, Mr. Speaker, on religious and human rights activists is unconscionable and of course it is unnecessary. I have been to Vietnam, Mr. Speaker, on many human rights trips, and chaired several hearings on it as well. But on one of the most recent trips, I actually met with Father Nguyen Van Ly who recently got 8 years in prison; I also met with Nguyen Van Dai and about 60 other human rights activists and religious leaders and people who are pressing for reform in that country.

I was struck by how smart, talented, and kindhearted these people were. I believe they are Vietnam's best and brightest and bravest. I was amazed how they harbor no malice, no hate towards the government; nor do they hate the government leaders. They only want a better future for their country, and each and every one of the people I met with was committed, and is committed, to peaceful nonviolent reform.

But just one month ago, on March 30, the government sentenced Father Ly to 8 years imprisonment after subjecting him to a sham trial for distributing "antigovernment materials."

When I met with Father Ly he was under house arrest, he sounded just like the activists I had met and spoke to during the dark years of the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union. During those years of domination by communism, men like Vaclav Havel, Lech Walesa, and Anatoly Shcharansky—people who, like the folks in Charter 77 in the Czech Republic—only wanted freedom, democracy, and human rights. None of them wanted violence, and yet we see that men like Father Ly now get 8 years imprisonment on top of the 13 years he has previously served in the Gulag on trumped-up charges. Jailing dissidents is a window into the malice and evil of the government of Vietnam.

As I mentioned, attorney, Nguyen Van Dai, a tenacious campaigner for human rights who uses the law, international and domestic, to press his cause, nonviolently—he's totally nonviolent, hates violence, abhors it, stands up and tries to use the law to try to get remedies for his clients. He, too, is now awaiting a trial which will be another kangaroo court and a sham deal at that.

□ 1615

Another human rights lawyer, Le Thi Cong Nhan, is a labor activist. And according to reports, she too now will undergo another one of these bogus trials.

We know that Vietnam, due to our robust trade and recently enacted PNTR and their ascension into the WTO, we know that trade will increase between the United States and Vietnam. So when this lawyer seeks to be an activist for what the ILO and all of us in this room believe to be fundamental freedoms like collective bargaining, the secret police raids her office and drags her away. She is now awaiting another one of these kangaroo trials.

Another victim of the crackdown is Le Quoc Quan. Here's a person who just returned to Vietnam in early March after completing a fellowship right here in Washington at the National Endowment for Democracy. He was arrested on March 8, apparently for the crime of engaging in research on civil society development at NED. And all of us who know NED know what a great, completely transparent and human rights rule of law oriented organization NED is, a group funded, by this Congress and by the executive branch. It's a great organization. Quam goes back to victim and is basically arrested soon after his arrival and now he is awaiting a trial as well.

Mr. Speaker, a little over a year ago, a group called Block 8406 devised a statement of human rights principles. It reminds me of Charter 77. Brave men and women banded together united by a statement of principles, human rights concerns. We've seen such expressions in Cuba, we've seen it all over the world in despotic countries. These brave men and women sign on the dotted line, in a way not unlike our own forefathers who signed the Declaration of Independence. In Vietnam's case, they are pertaining for reforms. And openness. And I have read it. It is very, very simple and eloquent and to the point. It's all about human rights and democratization. And for being part of 8406, other activists are now being caught in this dragnet.

I would note parenthetically, Father Ly was also a signer of this Block 8406 a manifesto on Freedom and Democracy for Vietnam. The 8406 stands for April 8, 2006. That's when they founded this courageous organization.

H. Res. 243, the resolution before us, Mr. Speaker, is intended to send a critical and timely message to the Vietnamese government that these serious violations of basic human rights are absolutely unacceptable and bring profound dishonor on the government of Vietnam.

These human rights violations cannot be overlooked. They cannot be trivialized. These human rights violations which are ongoing, and they occur as we meet here today, cannot continue without equally serious consequences. It also urges our Government to make human rights a top priority in our bilateral relations with Vietnam. I do believe this recent snap back to human rights abuse underscores the unwitting naivete on the part of some who think if we just trade, if we just open our pocket books, dictatorships will automatically matriculate into democracies and freedom loving human rights respecting countries. It hasn't happened anywhere. Not in the PRC, it has not happened in Vietnam and it is not happening anywhere where that naive view is embraced.

So we've got to send some clear messages. Human rights do matter. And we will stand up for those who are mistreated. We will stand with the oppressed and not with the oppressor.

Finally, I've heard it from informed and very reliable sources that some of the recent jailees, the human rights activists that are now behind bars suffering torture and mistreatment, that they are being told that the United States really doesn't care about them; that we've walked away. I have heard this on a couple of occasions from people who have very good inside information. They are actually being taunted with that kind of mantra.

I want to tell the persecuted—you are not forgotten. It's a bipartisan expression today, you are not forgotten. We care deeply about these human rights activists and we will not forget you. And we will do all that is humanly possible, God willing, to effectuate your release and hopefully, some day, see a free and democratic Vietnam.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to include 8406—manifesto on Freedom and Democracy for Human Rights.

MANIFESTO 2006 ON FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY FOR VIETNAM BY 118 DEMOCRACY ACTIVISTS INSIDE VIETNAM—APRIL 8, 2006

DEAR COMPATRIOTS INSIDE AND OUTSIDE OF VIETNAM: We, the undersigned, representing hundreds of Vietnamese democracy activists inside Vietnam and all those Vietnamese citizens yearning for True Democracy for Vietnam, hereby unanimously proclaim the following:

I. THE CURRENT REALITIES OF VIETNAM

1. In the August 1945 Revolution, the entire Vietnamese nation made a choice for national independence and not socialism. Vietnam's Declaration of Independence on September 2, 1945 did not contain a single word about socialism or communism. The two mainsprings behind the success of that Revolution were the Vietnamese people's aspiration for national independence and also the desire to fill the power vacuum that existed after the Japanese surrender on August 15, 1945, following their overthrow of the French colonial administration on March 9, 1945.

It is thus clear that the Vietnamese communists had abandoned the main objective of the August Revolution. As a result, the Vietnamese peoples' aspiration for self-determination was disregarded. There have been two occasions, one in 1954 in North Vietnam and the other in 1975 in all of Vietnam, when there were good opportunities for the Vietnamese nation to set a new course towards a true democracy. Sadly, the Communist Party of Vietnam (CPV), failed to take advantage of those opportunities. This failure is due to the well-known fact, as propounded by Lenin, that once a dictatorship of the proletariat has been installed, its very first function is to foster violence and repressive terror!

2. On September 2, 1945 in Hanoi, Ho Chi Minh, President of the Interim Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, solemnly declared to the [Vietnamese] nation and the world that: "All men are created equal, endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, among them the Right to Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness," undying words taken from the U.S. Declaration of Independence of 1776. Interpreted broadly, this sentence can mean that all nations are created equal and that they are entitled to Life, Freedom and Happiness. The 1791 French Declaration on Human and Civil Rights also proclaims: "All people are born free and have equal rights, and they must re-

main free and equal in all rights." These are undeniable truths . . ." (This quote is taken directly from the September 2, 1945 Vietnamese Declaration of Independence).

Nevertheless, the communist government of Vietnam began to trample upon these sacred rights the moment they came to power.

3. By February 1951, the Vietnam Workers Party (VWP, now rechristened the CPV) proclaimed in a Manifesto at its Second Party Congress that: "The ideology of the VWP is Marxism-Leninism." This was something that was even more clearly expressed in the Party Bylaws, under the rubric of "Goal and Leading Principles": "The Vietnam Workers Party takes the ideology of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin and the thought of Mao Zedong in combination with the revolutionary realities of Vietnam to be its ideological foundation and compass for all Party activities.

Since then, especially in the North after 1954, and in the entire country after April 30, 1975, the specter of Communism has been imposed on the Vietnamese nation. For all practical purposes, this specter has been used to deprive the Vietnamese people of all their human rights. And even today, its overwhelming influence is evident in the spiritual as well as the material spheres of the Vietnamese nation.

II. UNIVERSAL LAWS AFFECTING ALL SOCIETIES

1. History has demonstrated that under every totalitarian regime, whether communist or non-communist, all democratic rights and freedoms are mercilessly repressed, the difference being only in the degree of repression. Unfortunately, to this day the Vietnamese nation is still one of the few that is under the rule of a totalitarian communist regime. This fact is unabashedly declared in Article 4 of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (SRV) Constitution, which says: "The CPV . . . follows Marxism-Leninism and the thought of Ho Chi Minh, and it is the leading force of the state and society." It is on the basis of this article that democratic rights and freedoms of the Vietnamese people have been extremely curtailed.

2. The power structure in Vietnam rejects competition and totally minimizes the possibility of its replacement by something else. This record has helped accelerate the degeneration of government, and its transformation from what it started out to be. Because there are no rules and principles regarding fair competition in the current political culture of the country, election after election, people have not been allowed to choose the most deserving individuals and political parties to represent them. For that reason the leadership, management and operational set-ups become ever more corrupt, and can now be compared to a creaky piece of equipment from the center down to the localities. As a result, Vietnam is now a nation that has fallen way behind other nations in the region and in the world. In the prevailing environment, this shameful national performance and other nation-wide problems are beyond correction. The problem of all problems, the source of all evils, resides in the fact that the CPV is now the one and only political force leading Vietnam! The realities of history have shown that any country, once it has fallen into the orbit of Communism, ends up in ruin and misery. The Soviet Union itself, the very cradle of world communism, has, together with other former Eastern European countries valiantly overcome its own weaknesses to rediscover the correct path leading them forward.

3. We all understand that no one can remake history, but it is possible to redirect its course. What is even more important is that through history's lessons, one can find the correct orientation for the nation's future. The path chosen by the CPV for the Vietnamese nation was designed in haste, and

thoughtlessly imposed. That is why today, it is necessary to choose once again a new path for our nation. And a path chosen by the entire nation must necessarily be better than the one chosen by just one person or one group of persons. Given that the CPV is, after all, only one component of the nation, it should not claim to speak on behalf of the entire nation! Considering that for almost half a century, from 1954 to 2006, the ruling party in Vietnam has usurped the voice of the nation, it is by no means a legitimate government! Why? Because there had simply not been a single free election during all that time in Vietnam.

On the basis of the above realities and the stated universal laws, being fully conscious of our responsibilities as citizens, and faced with the nation's fate, we would like to declare the following to our compatriots both inside and outside of Vietnam:

III. OBJECTIVE, METHODS AND SIGNIFICANCE OF OUR STRUGGLE

1. The highest objective in the struggle to fight for freedom and democracy for the Vietnamese nation today is to make sure that the present political regime in Vietnam is changed in a fundamental way, not through incremental "renovation" steps or, even worse, through insignificant touch-ups here and there. Concretely speaking, it must be a change from the monolithic, one-party, non-competitive regime that we have at the present time to a pluralistic and multiparty system; one in which there is healthy competition, in accordance with the legitimate requirements of the nation, including at least a clear separation of powers among the Legislative, Executive and Judicial branches of government. This would be in tune with international criteria and the experiences and lessons Mankind has learned from highly respected and successful democracies.

The concrete objective is to re-establish the following fundamental rights of the people:

The Freedom of Information and Opinion as defined in the United Nations' International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, ratified on December 16, 1966, and endorsed by Vietnam on September 24, 1982, Article 19.2: "Everyone shall have the right to freedom of opinion; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice." This means that political parties, organizations and individuals all have the freedom to express their opinions through the printed media, radio, television and any other mass media without having to wait for prior approval by the government.

The Freedom to Assemble, form Associations, Political Parties, Vote and Stand for Elected Offices as defined in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 25: "Every citizen shall have the right and the opportunity (a) to take part in the conduct of public affairs, directly or through freely chosen representatives; (b) to vote and to be elected in genuine periodic elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret ballot, guaranteeing the free expression of the will of the electors." This means that political parties of every orientation are allowed to fairly compete in a genuine pluralistic and multiparty democracy.

The Freedom to participate in Independent Labor Unions and the Right to Legitimate Strikes in accordance with the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights ratified by the United Nations on December 16, 1966, Articles 7 and 8: "The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to the enjoyment of

just and favorable conditions of work . . . , the right of everyone to form trade unions and join the trade union of his choice, subject only to the rules of the organization concerned, for the promotion and protection of his economic and social interests . . . [including] the right to strike . . ." These Labor Unions must be independent of, and in practice, not subservient to the state.

The Freedom of Religion as defined in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 18: "Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right shall include the freedom to have or adopt a Religion or Belief of his choice, and the freedom, either individually or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching." These religions must also operate independently; they cannot be made the instruments of the state.

2. The method of this struggle must be peaceful and non-violent. The Vietnamese nation must itself be actively engaged in it. Of course, we are extremely thankful for the warm and ever more effective support of all our friends in the world. Using modern information media and through ever larger international exchanges, we will seek in every way to help our compatriot to fully understand the issues involved. Once this has been achieved, they surely will know how to act appropriately and effectively.

3. This struggle is meant to make the Right Cause triumph over the Bad Cause, and, Progress over Backwardness. There are popular movements that are currently trying to use the laws of life and the tendencies of our time in order to defeat those evil forces that are trying to go against these tendencies and laws. Whether the CPV marches hand-in-hand with the Nation or not will depend on whether it is objective, fair, enlightened and modest enough to accept the principle of equality in a fair competition. The one-party political regime must be once and for all buried in the dustbin of history. From such a departing point, the Vietnamese nation will be able to find its best citizens and the most capable political organizations after each election to lead it. The "total triumph of the right cause" principle will be established, and one's individual life will become better, our society more humane, and our Compatriots will live together on more friendly terms.

We hope that this Manifesto would foster the positive contributions of our compatriots living outside of Vietnam and the support of our international friends. We are sincerely grateful and call on the United Nations, national parliaments, governments, international organizations and our friends all over the world to continue supporting enthusiastically and effectively this fully legitimate struggle. This will soon help bring our Fatherland, Vietnam, to stand shoulder-to-shoulder with civilized, moral, prosperous and free countries in today's community of Mankind—Unanimously declared in Vietnam on 8 April 2006.

Dr. Nguyen Xuan An, Hue; Teacher Dang Van Anh, Hue; Prof. Nguyen Kim Anh, Hue; Writer Trinh Canh, Vung Tau; Teacher Le Can, Hue; Teacher Tran Thi Minh Cam, Hue; Teacher Nguyen Thi Linh Chi, Can Tho; Teacher Nguyen Viet Cu, Quang Ngai; Writer Nguyen Duc Cuong, Phan Thiet; Teacher Tran Doan, Quang Ngai; Teacher Ho Anh Dung, Hue; Dr. Ha Xuan Duong, Hue; Attorney Nguyen Van Dai, Hanoi; Dr. Ho Dong, Vinh Long; Businessman Tran Van Ha, Da Nang; Dr. Le Thi Ngan Ha, Hue; (Mrs.) Vu Thuy Ha, Hanoi; Teacher Tran Thach Hai, Haiphong; Teacher Dang Hoai Anh, Hue; Dr. Le Hoai Anh, Nha Trang.

Prof. Nguyen Ngoc Anh, Da Nam; Rev. F.X. Le Van Cao, Hue; Rev. Giuse Hoang

Can, Hue; Rev. Giuse Nguyen Van Chanh, Hue; Prof. Hoang Minh Chinh, Hanoi; Dang Quoc Cuong, MA, Hue; Businessman Ho Ngoc Diep, Da Nang; Ms. Le Thi Phu Dung, Saigon; Prof. Truong Quang Dung, Hue; Ex-Col. Pham Que Duong, Hanoi; Kt (Architect?) Tran Van Don, Phan Thiet; Rev. Phero Nguyen Huu Giai, Hue; Teacher Le Thi Bich Ha, Can Tho; Teacher Le Nguyen Xuan Ha, Hue; Eng. Do Nam Hai, Saigon; Kt (Architect?) Tran Viet Hai, Vung Tau; Eng. Doan Thi Dieu Hien, Vung Tau; Teacher Phan Thi Minh Hanh, Hue; Writer Tran Hao, Vung Tau; Teacher Le Le Hang, Hue.

Nurse Che Minh Hoang, Nha Trang; Teacher Le Thu Minh Hung, Saigon; Rev. Gk Nguyen Van Hung, Hue; Teacher Le Thi Thanh Huyenh, Hue; Mai Thu Huong, MA, Haiphong; Candidate Nguyen Ngoc Ke, Hue; Nguyen Quoc Khanh, MA, Hue; Prof. Tran Khue, Saigon; Writer Bui Lang, Phan Thiet; Mr. Le Quang Liem, Head, Traditional Hoa Hao Buddhist Church, Saigon; Rev. G.B. Nguyen Cao Loc, Hue; Teacher Ma Van Luu, Haiphong; Rev. Tadeo Nguyen Van Ly, Hue; Teacher Cao Thi Xuan Mai, Hue; Writer Ha Van Mau, Can Tho; Writer Le Thi Thu Minh, Can Tho; Teacher Nguyen Anh Minh, Saigon; (Mrs.) Bui Kim Ngan, Hanoi; Rev. G.B. Le Van Nghiem, Hue; Rev. Dominic Phan Phuoc, Hue.

Rev. Giuse Cai Hong Phuong, Hue; Eng. Ta Minh Quan, Can Tho; Rev. Giuse Tran Van Quy, Hue; Dr. Tran Thi Sen, Nha Trang; Eng. Hoang Son, Haiphong; Prof. Nguyen Anh Tai, Da Nang; Dr. Ta Minh Tam, Can Tho; Pastor Pham Ngoc Thach, Saigon; Teacher Van Ba Thanh, Hue; Tran Manh Thu, MA, Haiphong; Writer Hoang Tien, Hanoi; Rev. Tephano Chan Tin, Saigon; Writer Ton Nu Minh Trang, Phan Thiet; Dr. Nguyen Anh Tu, Da Nang; Teacher Le Tri Tue, Haiphong; Businesswoman Nguyen Thi Hanh, DaNang; Prof. Dang Minh Hao, Hue; Writer Tran Manh Hao, Saigon; Rev. Giuse Nguyen Duc Hieu, Bac Ninh; Teacher Van Dinh Hoang, Hue.

Prof. Nguyen Minh Hung, Hue; Teacher Phan Ngoc Huy, Hue; Teacher Do Thi Minh Huong, Hue; Nurse Tran Thu Huong, Da Nang; Prof. Nguyen Chinh Ket, Saigon; Teacher Nguyen Dang Khoa, Hue; Ex-Major Vu Kinh, Hanoi; Teacher Ton That Hoang Lan, Saigon; Dr. Vu Thi Hoa Linh, Saigon; Rev. Phero Phan Van Loi, Hue; Teacher Nguyen Van Ly, Haiphong; Teacher Cai Thi Mai, Haiphong; Teacher Nguyen Van Mai, Saigon; Teacher Phan Van Mau, Hue; Teacher Ma Van Minh, Hue; Dr. Huyen Ton Nu Phuong Nhien, Da Nang; Dang Hoai Ngan, MA, Hue; Teacher Le Hong Phuc, Haiphong; Eng. Vo Lam Phuoc, Saigon; Pastor Nguyen Hong Quang, Saigon.

Rev. Augustino Ho Van Quy, Hue; Dr. Vo Van Quyen, Vinh Long; Hoa Hao Lay preacher Le Van Soc, Vinh Long; Rev. Phao Lo Ngo Thanh Son, Hue; Eng. Do Hong Tam, Haiphong; Prof. Nguyen Thanh Tam, Hue; Teacher Nguyen binh Thanh, Hue; Hoa Hao Lay preacher Nguyen Van Tho, Dong Thap; Prof. Dr. Tran Hong Thu, Saigon; Ex-Officer Tran Dung Tien, Hanoi; Teacher Nguyen Khac Toan, Hanoi; Teacher Che Thi Hong Trinh, Hue; Dr. Doan Minh Tuan, Saigon; Nurse Tran Thi Hoai Van, Nha,Trang; Teacher Ngo Thi Tuong Vi, Quang Ngai; Ho Ngoc Vinh, MA, Da Nang; Teacher Nguyen Le Xuan Vinh, Can Tho; Eng. Lam Dinh Vinh, Saigon.

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

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) who

has been a leader on global human rights for 27 years, and that especially relates to Vietnam.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SMITH, and for Mr. SMITH's faithfulness to be over here.

This institution is frankly changing. It is changing before our eyes. This institution, on both sides of the aisle, almost doesn't seem to care anymore on these issues of fundamental human rights. This institution needs a little bit of Ronald Reagan.

Many of you voted to give this government PNTR. Read the letter. The conditions have changed dramatically. They're worse today than when you gave them PNTR. And yet this place is almost empty. Nobody seems to care anymore.

Father Ly is in jail. The American Ambassador ought to be fired. This administration has done a horrible job.

Let me just read some of the things that have gone on since we gave them PNTR and the President went over there. February 18, 2007, the second day of Lunar, Father Ly was banished to a remote secluded area. Does the Congress care? Does the administration care?

March 5, 2007, security forces in Saigon told Mrs. Bui Ngoc Yen that they had an order to arrest her husband.

March 8, 2007, Reverend Nguyen Cong Chinch were brutally assaulted by the security forces.

March 8, 2007, two prominent human rights activists and lawyers, Mr. Nguyen Van Dai and Ms. Le Thi Cong Nhan were arrested in Hanoi, told they would be detained for 4 months.

March 9, 2007 Mr. Tran Van Hoa, a member of the People's Democracy Committee, summoned by the security forces and threatened with "immeasurable consequences," that's in quotes.

March 10, 2007, Do Nam Hai, an engineer writing under the pen name Phuong Nam, one of the leading members of the Alliance for Democracy told by security forces he could be indicted any time.

March 10, the same day, state security forces raided the home of Ms. Tran Khai Thanh, a writer.

March 12, 2007, do you get a pattern here? Can anyone see a pattern sort of developing here?

The Congress gave them MFN. Probably a majority on both sides gave them MFN. But do you see a pattern here?

March 10, state security forces.

March 12, lawyer Le Quoc Quan, a consultant on local government for the World Bank was arrested in his hometown.

April 5, 2007 the Vietnamese authorities in Hanoi rudely prevented Congresswoman LORETTA SANCHEZ, from your side of the aisle, from meeting with several dissidents' wives at a gathering organized at the Ambassador's house.

Now this Ambassador, frankly, and Mr. LANTOS, and we have a bill that's coming up, this Ambassador has failed

to turn the American Embassy into an island of freedom. During the days of Ronald Reagan, one of the greatest presidents we have ever had, not only in modern times, but in all times, turned the American Embassy in Moscow into an island of freedom that dissidents felt comfortable coming, and they were invited.

This Ambassador is just the opposite. He's silent. Dr. Martin Luther King said silence is the real danger. You expect the silence of your enemies, but you don't expect the silence of our friends.

Furthermore, the Hanoi government still has a large number of dissidents that are in jail.

Lastly, and I'm going to read a letter that I'm going to put in the RECORD that we sent to Secretary Rice the other day. The Vietnamese American community, a young but energetic group comprised of more than 1 million citizens, should be included in future dialogues with U.S. government officials. They know the history, the culture and the values of Vietnam. They also scrutinize the history and the tactics of communism and the Communist government's habits at the negotiating table.

I sincerely believe that the history of Vietnam must inform our approach to this and all other aspects of foreign policy. And the Vietnamese American community is a tremendous asset in this regard. Quite frankly, this administration, when Ambassador Marine leaves, ought to put a Vietnamese American in who understands these issues. So I'm going to submit this in the RECORD.

But these are important issues. This Congress just can't give these people human rights. And frankly, there is a whole shift taking place. I saw the other day, and if I'm wrong, I'll correct it for the record, that Steven Spielberg is now representing the Chinese government for the Olympics. One of Spielberg's greatest movies was the movie that he did with regard to what took place by Nazi Germany, Schindler's List.

Well, now there's a Schindler's list operation going on in China. There are 42 Catholic bishops that are in jail with China, with priests. And for those who might think it might be amusing, China is the one that's trying to do nothing with regard to the genocide in Darfur. 400,000 people have died. The head of China goes to Khartoum 2 months ago with a bold announcement. The announcement is they are going to build a new palace for the Sudanese that are bringing about genocide. Genocide in Darfur.

There are 46,000 house church leaders, leaders, committed leaders, house church leaders that are in jail in China today. In Tibet, it's against the law to have a picture of the Dalai Lama, and the Chinese public security police sent three public security police to my district spying on Rebiya Kadeer. If you read the Washington Post editorial last

week, spying on Rebiya Kadeer in Fairfax County. Her three kids have been arrested. She's a Muslim. Her three kids have been arrested. So I just see, and I want to thank Mr. SMITH for doing this, but frankly, for the Congress just to grant MFN to this fundamentally evil government, and for us to just sort of move on and just kind of not care anymore, it just is really troubling. When we fail to speak out for the least, we fundamentally fail to speak out for everyone. And so let me just say, I didn't know this was coming up, and I just caught it and came over here. I want to thank Mr. SMITH for his faithfulness in being involved. And frankly, any Member that voted to give these guys PNTR, on both sides of the aisle, man, you've got a great responsibility now to really do something on these people. These are dissidents that are in jail. They are being suffered.

And frankly, I end by saying we ought to do more the way that Ronald Reagan did in the 1980s. Speak out on human rights, religious freedom and those values. And with that, you ought to call a roll call vote on this because, frankly, this government is so dense that if they see a voice vote they won't even think it it's important. There ought to be a roll call vote so we can send a message on behalf of Father Ly, a Catholic bishop, a Catholic priest who's done nothing, and all these other people. And frankly, this ambassador ought to be shown the door. And we ought to put somebody in who represents the values of this country. Quite frankly, it ought to be a Vietnamese American who can go over there and advocate on behalf of those who are being persecuted.

DEAR SECRETARY RICE: I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the worsening human rights situation in Vietnam in recent months. After joining the World Trade Organization in January 2007, the politburo of the Vietnamese Communist Party (VCP) has carried out a large-scale brutal campaign of arrest against the nascent movement for democracy in Vietnam. Ignoring all international criticism and strenuous protests of the Vietnamese people, inside Vietnam and abroad, the communist regime in Hanoi has shamefully pushed ahead with its crackdown. The following events were particularly disconcerting to me:

On February 18, 2007, the second day of the Lunar New Year, which is the most sacred time in Vietnamese culture, the communist security forces raided Father Nguyen Van Ly's office within the Communal Residence of the Hue Archdiocese. Father Ly was later banished to a remote, secluded area in Hue.

On March 5, 2007, security forces in Saigon told Mrs. Bui Ngoc Yen that they had an order to arrest her husband, Professor Nguyen Chinh Kiet, who is a leading member of the Alliance for Democracy and Human Rights in Vietnam. Professor Kiet was in Europe at the time campaigning for democracy and human rights in Vietnam.

On March 8, 2007, Reverend Nguyen Cong Chinch and his wife were brutally assaulted by security forces of Gia Lai Province in the Central Highlands, who then arrested Reverend Chinch on undisclosed charges.

Also on March 8, 2007, two prominent human rights activists and lawyers, Mr. Nguyen Van Dai and Ms. Le Thi Cong Nhan,

were arrested in Hanoi and were told that they would be detained for four months as part of an undisclosed investigation.

On March 9, 2007, Mr. Tran Van Hoa, a member of the People's Democracy Party in Quang Ninh Province, and Mr. Pham Van Troi, a member of the Committee for Human Rights in Ha Tay, were summoned by security forces and threatened with "immeasurable consequences" if they do not stop their advocacy for human rights in Vietnam.

On March 10, 2007, Do Nam Hai, an engineer writing under the pen name Phuong Nam and one of the leading members of the Alliance for Democracy and Human Rights in Vietnam, was told by security forces that he could be indicted at any time for activity against the State.

Also on March 10, 2007, state security forces also raided the home of Ms. Tran Khai Thanh Thuy, a writer, on the grounds that she advocated for "people with grievances" against the government. They took away two computers, two cell phones, and hundreds of appeals that she had prepared for victims of the government's abuses.

March 12, 2007, lawyer Le Quoc Quan, a consultant on local governance for the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, UNDP, and Swedish International Development Agency, was arrested in his hometown, Nghe An, less than a week after he returned from a fellowship at the National Endowment for Democracy in Washington, D.C. His whereabouts are unknown at this time.

On April 5, 2007, the Vietnamese authorities in Hanoi rudely prevented Congresswoman Loretta Sanchez (D-CA) from meeting with several dissidents' wives at a gathering organized at the U.S. Ambassador's home. The police reportedly used very hostile and undignified manners to intervene in the meeting.

Furthermore, the Hanoi communist regime is still imprisoning many political dissidents and labor advocates such as Nguyen Vu Binh, Huynh Nguyen Dao, Truong Quoc Huy, Nguyen Hoang Long, Nguyen Tan Hoanh, Doan Huy Chuong, the religious leaders of the Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam, Cao Dai, Hoa Hoa, and more than 350 lay people of the Protestant churches in the Central Highland.

The Vietnamese-Americans in my district, as well as all across the country, are very angered and distressed by what they perceive as a new and aggressive plan of the Hanoi government to reverse the progress of human rights in Vietnam. They believe that Ambassador Marine and his staff are not doing enough to stop these blatant violations of human rights.

It seems to me that the Vietnamese government is conducting this crackdown on advocates of human rights and religious freedom because it believes that the U.S. has no further leverage in the region. Now that Vietnam has been admitted to the WTO, and met with the Holy See, they believe they can respond in this brutal fashion to supporters of democracy and freedom and we will not respond.

I hope that you will make clear to the Vietnamese authorities that we will not stand by while this violence and intimidation continues. I believe the State Department should consider putting Vietnam back on the list of Countries of Particular Concern, and perhaps also consider canceling the planned visit of the Vietnamese president and prime minister later this year if the human rights situation in Vietnam has not improved.

I appreciate the recent comments by Sean McCormack at Voice of America expressing deep concern about the March 30 trial and sentencing of Father Ly. I ask that you continue pressing these issues with the Vietnamese government, including the need to

respect the basic human rights of all Vietnamese citizens, especially the freedom of information, freedom of expression, and freedom of religion. The Vietnamese people should be able to choose their own leaders through free and fair elections and to use the Internet freely without any censures or restrictions.

I also ask that you encourage the Vietnamese authorities to release all political prisoners and religious leaders who are currently imprisoned because of their peaceful expression of their ideas or to fight for their religious beliefs. Among these prisoners are Father Nguyen Van Ly, Pastors Nguyen Cong Chinh and Hong Trung, lawyers Nguyen Van Dai, Le thi Cong Nhan, Le Quoc Quan, Messieurs Truong Quoc Huy, and Nguyen Hoang Lon.

Lastly, I believe the Vietnamese-American community, a young but energetic group comprised of more than one million citizens, should be included in future dialogues with U.S. government officials. They know the history, culture and values of Vietnam. They also have scrutinized the history and tactics of communism and the communist government's habits at the negotiating table. I sincerely believe that the history of Vietnam must inform our approach to this and all other aspects of foreign policy, and the Vietnamese-American community is a tremendous asset in this regard. I respectfully request that you invite a small representation of the Vietnamese-American community to join the U.S. delegation in next month's human rights dialogue.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

[From washingtonpost.com, Apr. 26, 2007]

INHERITED PERSECUTION: CHINA IMPRISONS
THE SON OF A HUMAN RIGHTS ACTIVIST

Last week China sentenced Ablikim Abdureyim to 9 years in prison. His crime? Having a human rights activist for a mother.

His mother, Rebiya Kadeer, a Nobel Peace Prize nominee, had been warned. When she was released from her imprisonment in 2005 to the United States, she was told to keep quiet about China's treatment of Uighurs, a Turkic-language Muslim minority. Or else. Instead, for the past 2 years this former entrepreneur has been shouting from the rooftops about China's oppression of her people. She has talked to Congress, the European Parliament and anyone else who will listen about the forced abortions, the harassment and killings, the thousands of Uighurs imprisoned for supposed treason or "terrorism." She herself was imprisoned for 6 years for mailing publicly available newspaper articles to her husband in America, an act China deemed "endangering of state secrets." Right now the Chinese government can't get its hands on her, so it is going after her children in China instead.

Ms. Kadeer's sons Alim and Kahar Abdureyim were convicted last fall of "tax evasion," which she says they confessed to after being tortured. Ablikim Abdureyim, the son sentenced last week, was officially convicted in January of "instigating and engaging in secessionist activities." According to the state-run news agency Xinhua, these "secessionist activities" chiefly consisted of asking Yahoo's "Uighur-language webmaster" to post articles on its site—a peculiar allegation considering that Yahoo has neither a Uighur-language webmaster nor a Uighur-language site.

The Chinese Embassy claims that Ablikim Abdureyim's "legal rights were protected during the trial" and that the trial was open to the public. But his family says that he

was denied a lawyer (against Chinese law) as well as any contact with his family since his arrest last August. His family was not even notified about his trial; relatives officially learned of it only when Xinhua ran an article about his conviction nearly 3 months after the fact. If, despite the evidence, China still wants to claim that Mr. Abdureyim's trial was "open" and fair, fine: Let it prove it by giving him an open and fair appeal.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I just yield myself 2 final minutes to close.

First of all, let me thank Mr. WOLF, Chairman WOLF for his very eloquent and passionate statement. And I think by injecting China into this debate as well, there is a modus operandi by both of those countries to talk a good game about human rights while doing absolutely nothing, as a matter of fact, by doing just the opposite. It is doublespeak. It is Orwellian, and unfortunately, it is what is happening on the ground today.

Let me also say that when I visited dissidents, several of whom were under house arrest in Ho Chi Min City, Hue and Hanoi, I was struck by the heart breaking vulnerability of those individuals and their families, because the secret police don't just go after the individual. They target their families, their kids, their brothers their sisters-in-law, their nephews and nieces. It is widespread. The bullies inflict maximum, they being the communist regime, maximum pain on the individual and his or her family.

I'll give you an example of just how it works. One of the individuals who downloaded "What is Democracy" from the Internet, which was on the U.S. embassy Web site, translated and then resent it out, got 5 years in prison. He was recently let out. But his wife Vu, who I met in a Hanoi restaurant with at least three bully boys sitting about 5-10 feet away taking her picture, from the secret police, told me again and again how fearful she was that she would be targeted—and hit. She rides a motor bike; she feared that they would run her down. Modus operandi, again, of the secret police.

□ 1630

Sure enough, just a few weeks ago, she was hit on the road by the police. Would you say that was an accident? If you think that is an accident, I will sell you the Brooklyn Bridge.

Mr. Speaker, human rights abuse is getting worse in Vietnam. It is widespread. It is pervasive. And it has got to be stopped. We need to speak out with one voice. The administration needs to speak out with one voice.

This resolution has a number of action clauses in it. I hope it is taken seriously both in Hanoi as well as down at Foggy Bottom.

We need to help those suffering individuals. We are their last best hope. Let's work for them because they deserve our—and Vietnam's—respect and protection.

Mr. SIREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from New Jersey for the time.

I rise in support of Mr. SMITH's resolution.

I was listening to another dear friend whom I greatly admire, Mr. WOLF, and I want to thank once again Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. WOLF of Virginia for consistently being the voices for the oppressed throughout the world.

Martin Luther King said, "An injustice anywhere is an affront to justice everywhere." And that is what this resolution is about. The men and women who are languishing in the prisons in Vietnam, those being tortured, the people being tortured because of their religious beliefs, because of their views on issues, because of their political aspirations for democracy, they are being tortured systematically; and that regime needs to be condemned not only by history but by the Congress of the United States. And that is why I support so strongly this resolution by Mr. SMITH.

And it is appropriate, as Mr. WOLF did, to bring out the torture also being committed by the regime in China, mainland China. That is also a fascist communist regime. These regimes continue to be communist, but by opening the economy, they manage to get massive investments from Big Business throughout the world.

And I heard Mr. WOLF talk about how now Mr. Spielberg apparently is lobbying for the Chinese communist regime. It doesn't surprise me, after having met for hours with Fidel Castro and having said that that was one of the greatest experiences of his life, comparable to the birth of his child. So it doesn't surprise me.

It doesn't surprise me about Big Business going into Vietnam and China and getting profits from the exploitation of the workers by the communist regimes.

So I want to simply thank the gentleman for the time, and I am in strong support of this resolution. It is consistent with the best traditions of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with our colleagues a letter I recently sent to Secretary Rice regarding the recent crackdown on advocates of human rights and religious freedom in Vietnam. Even now, Vietnamese authorities are continuing to harass these activists, including by blocking our ambassador's meetings with the wives of detained dissidents. We must speak out against this repression.

DEAR SECRETARY RICE: I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the worsening human rights situation in Vietnam in recent months. After joining the World Trade Organization in January 2007, the politburo of the Vietnamese Communist Party (VCP) has carried out a large-scale brutal campaign of arrest against the nascent movement for democracy in Vietnam. Ignoring all international criticism and strenuous protests of the Vietnamese people, inside Vietnam and abroad, the communist regime in Hanoi has shamefully pushed ahead with its crackdown. The following events were particularly disconcerting to me.

On February 18, 2007, the second day of the Lunar New Year, which is the most sacred time in Vietnamese culture, the communist security forces raided Father Nguyen Van Ly's office within the Communal Residence of the Hue Archdiocese. Father Ly was later banished to a remote, secluded area in Hue.

On March 5, 2007, security forces in Saigon told Mrs. Bui Ngoc Yen that they had an order to arrest her husband, Professor Nguyen Chinh Kiet, who is a leading member of the Alliance for Democracy and Human Rights in Vietnam. Professor Kiet was in Europe at the time campaigning for democracy and human rights in Vietnam.

On March 8, 2007, Reverend Nguyen Cong Chinch and his wife were brutally assaulted by security forces of Gia Lai Province in the Central Highlands, who then arrested Reverend Chinch on undisclosed charges.

Also on March 8, 2007, two prominent human rights activists and lawyers, Mr. Nguyen Van Dai and Ms. Le Thi Cong Nhan, were arrested in Hanoi and were told that they would be detained for four months as part of an undisclosed investigation.

On March 9, 2007, Mr. Tran Van Hoa, a member of the People's Democracy Party in Quang Ninh Province, and Mr. Pham Van Troi, a member of the Committee for Human Rights in Ha Tay, were summoned by security forces and threatened with "immeasurable consequences" if they do not stop their advocacy for human rights in Vietnam.

On March 10, 2007, Do Nam Hai, an engineer writing under the pen name Phuong Nam and one of the leading members of the Alliance for Democracy and Human Rights in Vietnam, was told by security forces that he could be indicted at any time for activity against the State.

Also on March 10, 2007, state security forces also raided the home of Ms. Tran Khai Thanh Thuy, a writer, on the grounds that she advocated for "people with grievances" against the government. They took away two computers, two cell phones, and hundreds of appeals that she had prepared for victims of the government's abuses.

March 12, 2007, lawyer Le Quoc Quan, a consultant on local governance for the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, UNDP, and Swedish International Development Agency, was arrested in his hometown, Nghe An, less than a week after he returned from a fellowship at the National Endowment for Democracy in Washington, D.C. His whereabouts are unknown at this time.

On April 5, 2007, the Vietnamese authorities in Hanoi rudely prevented Congresswoman Loretta Sanchez (D-CA) from meeting with several dissidents' wives at a gathering organized at the U.S. Ambassador's home. The police reportedly used very hostile and undignified manners to intervene in the meeting.

Furthermore, the Hanoi communist regime is still imprisoning many political dissidents and labor advocates such as Nguyen Vu Binh, Huynh Nguyen Dao, Truong Quoc Huy, Nguyen Hoang Long, Nguyen Tan Hoanh, Doan Huy Chuong, the religious leaders of the Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam, Cao Dai, Hoa Hao, and more than 350 lay people of the Protestant churches in the Central Highland.

The Vietnamese-Americans in my district, as well as all across the country, are very angered and distressed by what they perceive as a new and aggressive plan of the Hanoi government to reverse the progress of human rights in Vietnam. They believe that Ambassador Marine and his staff are not doing enough to stop these blatant violations of human rights.

It seems to me that the Vietnamese government is conducting this crackdown on advocates of human rights and religious free-

dom because it believes that the U.S. has no further leverage in the region. Now that Vietnam has been admitted to the WTO, and met with the Holy See, they believe they can respond in this brutal fashion to supporters of democracy and freedom and we will not respond.

I hope that you will make clear to the Vietnamese authorities that we will not stand by while this violence and intimidation continues. I believe the State Department should consider putting Vietnam back on the list of Countries of Particular Concern, and perhaps also consider canceling the planned visit of the Vietnamese president and prime minister later this year if the human rights situation in Vietnam has not improved.

I appreciate the recent comments by Sean McCormack at Voice of America expressing deep concern about the March 30 trial and sentencing of Father Ly. I ask that you continue pressing these issues with the Vietnamese government, including the need to respect the basic human rights of all Vietnamese citizens, especially the freedom of information, freedom of expression, and freedom of religion. The Vietnamese people should be able to choose their own leaders through free and fair elections and to use the Internet freely without any censures or restrictions.

I also ask that you encourage the Vietnamese authorities to release all political prisoners and religious leaders who are currently imprisoned because of their peaceful expression of their ideas or to fight for their religious beliefs. Among these prisoners are Father Nguyen Van Ly, Pastors Nguyen Cong Chinh and Hong Trung, lawyers Nguyen Van Dai, Le Thi Cong Nhan, Le Quoc Quan, Messieurs Truong Quoc Huy, and Nguyen Hoang Lon.

Lastly, I believe the Vietnamese-American community, a young but energetic group comprised of more than one million citizens, should be included in future dialogues with U.S. government officials. They know the history, culture and values of Vietnam. They also have scrutinized the history and tactics of communism and the communist government's habits at the negotiating table. I sincerely believe that the history of Vietnam must inform our approach to this and all other aspects of foreign policy, and the Vietnamese-American community is a tremendous asset in this regard. I respectfully request that you invite a small representation of the Vietnamese-American community to join the U.S. delegation in next month's human rights dialogue.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as chair of the U.S.-Vietnam Caucus, dedicated to strengthening the bilateral relationship between the United States and Vietnam, I strongly support efforts to help Vietnam improve its human rights record and I support this resolution. Nothing would do more for this important relationship that continued steps by Vietnam towards respect for free speech, human rights, religious freedom and democratization. I have raised this issue at the highest levels of Vietnam's government and continue to do so at every opportunity.

However, given that Vietnam has made significant progress over the last decade, I wish that we could have passed the version as introduced, which focuses on the steps Vietnam needs to take, rather than this Committee-passed version which now includes unhelpful language about placing certain sanctions and restrictions on the U.S.-Vietnam relationship. I

continue to believe that the path of engagement and honest dialogue will be a more fruitful avenue for the advancement of human rights and democracy in Vietnam.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIRES) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 243, as amended.

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. SMITH of New Jersey. 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 HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF CINCO DE MAYO

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 347) recognizing the historical significance of the Mexican holiday of Cinco de Mayo.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 347

Whereas May 5, or Cinco de Mayo in Spanish, is celebrated each year as a date of great importance by the Mexican and Mexican-American communities;

Whereas the Cinco de Mayo holiday commemorates May 5, 1862, the date on which the Battle of Puebla was fought by Mexicans who were struggling for their independence and freedom;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo has become one of Mexico's most famous national holidays and is celebrated annually by nearly all Mexicans and Mexican-Americans, north and south of the United States-Mexico border;

Whereas the Battle of Puebla was but one of the many battles that the courageous Mexican people won in their long and brave struggle for independence and freedom;

Whereas the French, confident that their battle-seasoned troops were far superior to the almost amateurish Mexican forces, expected little or no opposition from the Mexican army;

Whereas the French army, which had not experienced defeat against any of Europe's finest troops in over half a century, sustained a disastrous loss at the hands of an outnumbered, ill-equipped, and ragged, but highly spirited and courageous, Mexican force;

Whereas after three bloody assaults upon Puebla in which over a thousand gallant Frenchmen lost their lives, the French troops were finally defeated and driven back by the outnumbered Mexican troops;

Whereas the courageous and heroic spirit that Mexican General Zaragoza and his men displayed during this historic battle can never be forgotten;

Whereas many brave Mexicans willingly gave their lives for the causes of justice and freedom in the Battle of Puebla on Cinco de Mayo;

Whereas the sacrifice of the Mexican fighters was instrumental in keeping Mexico from falling under European domination;

Whereas the Cinco de Mayo holiday is not only the commemoration of the rout of the French troops at the town of Puebla in Mexico, but is also a celebration of the virtues of individual courage and patriotism of all Mexicans and Mexican-Americans who have fought for freedom and independence against foreign aggressors;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo serves as a reminder that the foundation of the United States is built by people from many nations and diverse cultures who are willing to fight and die for freedom;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo also serves as a reminder of the close spiritual and economic ties between the people of Mexico and the people of the United States, and is especially important for the people of the southwestern States where millions of Mexicans and Mexican-Americans make their homes;

Whereas in a larger sense Cinco de Mayo symbolizes the right of a free people to self-determination, just as Benito Juarez once said, "El respeto al derecho ajeno es la paz" ("The respect of other people's rights is peace"); and

Whereas many people celebrate during the entire week in which Cinco de Mayo falls: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes the historical struggle for independence and freedom of the Mexican people and requests the President to issue a proclamation recognizing that struggle and calling upon the people of the United States to observe Cinco de Mayo with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIRES) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

I would like to begin by applauding the efforts and the leadership of the author of the resolution, Congressman JOE BACA, who is also the chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, the Cinco de Mayo holiday commemorates the May 5, 1862, victory of a vastly outnumbered Mexican Army under the command of General Ignacio Zaragoza over Napoleon III's regiments at the Battle of Puebla.

The triumph of the Mexican people over the French in this battle has come to symbolize the fight for freedom and justice. To most of us in the United States, this holiday is expressed through the enjoyment of Mexican and Mexican American culture, the food, the music, and the customs. This resolution encourages continuing those

celebrations, but it also reminds us that Cinco de Mayo is a tribute to the contributions that the Mexicans and Mexican Americans have made and continue to make across our Nation.

We take pride in these achievements and in the continuing dedication of thousands of Mexican American men and women in uniform.

Cinco de Mayo reminds us that the foundation of the United States is built by people from many nations and diverse cultures willing to fight and die to make ours a stronger and freer world.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I want to congratulate Mr. BACA, my good buddy, for sponsoring this resolution. And I want to say very briefly that our side supports moving forward with this resolution of the gentleman from California, which recognizes the historical significance of Cinco de Mayo.

Our good neighbors to the south, Mexico, and we here in the U.S.A. have many things and values in common, and we ought to celebrate and share them together, as this resolution does today. Cinco de Mayo is an important holiday celebrated to commemorate May 5, 1862, the date Mexicans fought the Battle of Puebla to end their struggle for independence and freedom.

So let us recognize the historic struggle for independence and freedom of the Mexican people as symbolized by this important holiday and celebrate and rejoice together the holiday of Cinco de Mayo.

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California's 43rd District, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture's Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition, and Forestry.

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleagues and my friend ALBIO SIRES for yielding me the time. I would also like to thank Chairman LANTOS and Ranking Member ROSLEHTINEN and then, of course, my friend DAN BURTON and the leadership for their support and their effort in bringing this bipartisan resolution to the floor.

I rise today in support of H. Res. 347, a resolution honoring the significance and impact of Cinco de Mayo. This Resolution 347 recognizes the Cinco de Mayo holiday, which commemorates May 5, 1862, the date in which the Battle of Puebla was fought by Mexicans who were struggling for their independence and freedom.

While Cinco de Mayo commemorates the Mexican Army's victory over

France in this key battle, it was also but one of many battles for the courageous Mexican people who won their long and brave struggle for independence and freedom.

Today the Cinco de Mayo holiday is not only the commemoration of the defeat of the French foreign army, it is also a celebration of virtues of individual courage and patriotism of all Mexicans and Mexican Americans who have fought for freedom and independence against foreign aggressors.

Cinco de Mayo is also a day to celebrate the rich cultural heritage that Latinos have brought to the United States. Latinos are the fastest growing minority population in the country, representing 45 million people, 17 percent of the total population. The Latino community has made many important contributions in all aspects of life: the arts, sports, the business world, sciences. Latinos have also fought in all American wars beginning with the Revolutionary War, earning 41 Medals of Honor overall. In World War II, 500,000 Hispanics fought, 65 Puerto Ricans fought. Thirteen Medals of Honor, 11 Mexican Americans, one Puerto Rican. Today there are over 30 Latino Members in the United States Congress. This statistic points to what a driving force the Latino community has become in our country economically, socially, and politically.

Cinco de Mayo also provides us with a great opportunity to look back at our own heritage as Americans. We must remember that our country was built by people from different homelands with different diverse cultures held together by common bond with a willingness to fight and die for freedom.

Unfortunately for Latinos, there are many inequities that have put our communities at a social and economic disadvantage. My colleagues and I in the Congressional Hispanic Caucus are working together in a bipartisan basis to end these barriers to increase opportunities for Latinos, particularly in areas of education, health care, homeownership, and equal representation in corporate America. As Americans, we must unite to achieve these common goals.

In a large sense, Cinco de Mayo symbolizes the right of a free people to self-determination, just as Benito Juarez once said: "The respect of other people's rights is peace."

I ask my colleagues to support H. Res. 347.

Mr. SIRE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the 15th District in Texas, chairman of the Education and Labor Subcommittee on Higher Education, Lifelong Learning, and Competitiveness, and member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 347, and also I rise to honor a true hero who gave his life to free his country from foreign oppression.

Ignacio Zaragoza Seguin was born in 1829 near what is now Goliad, Texas, a

community in my congressional district.

In 1862 French troops began a march to capture Mexico City. They met the Mexican forces led by a courageous and well-trained 33-year-old general at the city of Puebla, Mexico, in a battle that lasted the entire day of May 5, 1862. Under General Ignacio Zaragoza's leadership, the vastly outnumbered Mexican Army forced the withdrawal of Napoleon III's army, the premier army in the world.

□ 1645

French Army losses were heavy, but Mexican troop casualties were few. The costly delay in Puebla, Mexico helped shorten the French intervention. It also helped preserve the American Union as it kept the French Army too busy to directly aid the Confederacy with troops during the U.S. Civil War.

General Zaragoza and his troops received a hero's welcome in Mexico City. While visiting his sick troops, Ignacio contracted typhoid fever and died on September 8, 1862 at the age of 33, only a few months after the great battle against the French.

President Juarez declared May 5, Cinco de Mayo, a national holiday in his country. Today, we celebrate Cinco de Mayo throughout Mexico and around the world, but I hope that as we celebrate it, we remember the courage and sacrifice of this true hero.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 347. I rise to recognize the historical importance of the Mexican holiday Cinco de Mayo. The fifth day of May, or Cinco de Mayo, is a special day because it represents the importance of freedom, liberty and determination for the people of Mexico and for Mexican-Americans. It was on that day, May 5, 1862, that untrained, outnumbered, and outgunned Mexican forces—determined to protect their land—successfully defended the town of Puebla against the French.

The quest for an independent Mexico started on September 16, 1810, when the people of Mexico, following the will to become a free nation, refused to submit to Spanish rule. The struggle went on for 10 years. Finally, in 1821, the first independent Mexican government was established.

But being an independent nation was not easy. Over the years, Mexico received economic support from several nations, France and England among them. Later on, even Spain supported the new country. Thus, Mexico became heavily indebted to foreign powers. Due to ongoing political unrest caused by many groups struggling for power, Mexico was not able to pay back the loans. On July 17, 1861, President Benito Juarez issued a moratorium in which all-foreign debt payments would be suspended for a period of two years, with the promise that after this period, payments would resume.

In 1862, France, Spain, and England dispatched their fleets to Mexican shores pursuing not only money but also land rights as payment for their loans. A government representative greeted them and explained that

Mexico acknowledge its debts, but had no funds to pay them. They were offered payment warrants in exchange.

The Spaniards and the British decided to accept the warrants and withdrew from the scene. But the French government's representative did not accept the offer and ordered his troops to invade the country and head toward Mexico City, the nation's capital. They had to cross through the state of Puebla to get to the capital.

Mexican President Benito Juarez reacted immediately and prepared the defense. He commanded Ignacio Zaragoza, a young and brave General, to fortify the City of Puebla and repel the French invaders.

The battle was by no means even. France, under Louis Napoleon's rule, had the world's most powerful army, and sent more than six thousand men to invade Mexico. But the courage and the love of freedom impelled the Mexican people to fight back.

General Ignacio Zaragoza led 5,000 ill-equipped Mestizo and Zapotec Indians called Zacapoaxtlan. On the 5th of May 1862, the forts of Loreto and Guadalupe, in the city of Puebla, became the scene of the historical defeat of the great European army. Against overwhelming odds, they managed to drive back the French army, achieving a total victory over soldiers deemed among the best trained and equipped in the world and embarking on the end of the European domination in America.

For Mexico, this day has come to represent a symbol of Mexican unity and patriotism in the history of Mexico. In our country, Cinco de Mayo is also a celebration of the rich cultural heritage Mexican Americans have brought to the United States.

Hispanics are the fastest-growing minority group in the United States. According to the most recent data available, the estimated Hispanic population in the U.S. is 42.7 million—constituting 14 percent of our nation's population.

Hispanics now own a record number of small businesses—1.6 million, with annual revenues of more than \$221 billion. Small businesses create two-thirds of American jobs, and the fastest-growing small business sector is Latino-owned firms.

Today, there are 30 Hispanic Members in the United States Congress, including 24 Democrats, many of whom are Mexican-American, representing constituencies in all regions of the country, from California to New York, from Arizona to Illinois, from Colorado to Florida.

These gains and numbers tell us that Hispanics are a driving force in our country—economically, socially and politically. Hispanics share the common goals with all other Americans of freedom, opportunity, and a chance to build a better life. In pursuing these aspirations, Hispanics have made important contributions to life in the United States in the fields of culture, sports, entertainment, business enterprise, science, politics and others.

On Saturday, May 5th, millions of Americans will join our neighbors to the south in celebrating Cinco de Mayo. On this day, we are reminded that all people—regardless of their race, color, or gender—have enriched cultures and are worthy of respect and self-determination.

I am happy to be here today to celebrate this momentous day and to recognize the values, traditions, and positive contributions of

the Mexican culture. I urge all members to join me in supporting H. Res. 347, and commemorate the historical significance of Cinco de Mayo.

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

Mr. SIREs. 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 New Jersey (Mr. SIREs) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 347.

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.

—————

CONGRATULATING THE CITY OF CHICAGO FOR BEING CHOSEN TO REPRESENT THE UNITED STATES TO HOST THE 2016 OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 118) congratulating the City of Chicago for being chosen to represent the United States in the international competition to host the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic games, and encouraging the International Olympic Committee to select Chicago as the site of the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 118

Whereas the City of Chicago has been selected by the United States Olympic Committee to represent the United States in its bid to host the 2016 Summer Olympic and Paralympic Games;

Whereas, by 2016, 20 years will have passed since the Summer Olympics were held in a city in the United States;

Whereas Chicago is a world-class city with remarkable diversity, culture, history, and people;

Whereas the citizens of Chicago take great pride in all aspects of their city and have a deep love for sports;

Whereas Chicago already holds a place in the international community as a city of immigrants from around the world, who are eager to be ambassadors to visiting Olympic athletes;

Whereas the Olympic and Paralympic Games will be played in the heart of Chicago so that athletes and visitors can appreciate the beauty of the downtown parks and lakefront;

Whereas Chicago is one of the transportation hubs of the world and can provide accessible transportation to international visitors through extensive rail, transit, and motorways infrastructure, combined with the world-class O'Hare and Midway International Airports;

Whereas the motto of the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games in Chicago would be "Stir the Soul," and the games would inspire citizens around the world, both young and old;

Whereas a Midwestern city has not hosted the Olympic Games since the 1904 games in St. Louis, Missouri, and the opportunity to

host the Olympics would be an achievement not only for Chicago and for the State of Illinois, but also for the entire Midwest;

Whereas hosting the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games would provide substantial local, regional, and national economic benefits and growth;

Whereas Mayor Richard M. Daley, Patrick Ryan, and members of the Chicago 2016 Committee have campaigned tirelessly to secure Chicago's bid to host the Olympic and Paralympic Games;

Whereas, through the campaign to be selected by the United States Olympic Committee, Chicago's citizens, officials, workers, community groups, and businesses have demonstrated their ability to come together to exemplify the true spirit of the Olympic Games and the City of Chicago; and

Whereas the Olympic and Paralympic Games represent the best of the human spirit and there is no better fit for hosting this event than one of the world's truly great cities: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) congratulates the City of Chicago on securing the bid to represent United States in the international competition to host the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games; and

(2) encourages the International Olympic Committee to select Chicago as the site of the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIREs) and the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend our colleague from Chicago, RAHM EMANUEL, for introducing this important resolution. His efforts to win our Nation the 2016 Olympic games are greatly appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, the 2004 summer Olympic games in Athens unfolded before the eyes of hundreds of millions of people around the world, with some watching in person, but many more on television every night. It is fair to say that the Athens games were a success, despite fears of terrorism or that key Olympic venues would not be ready. Athens was prepared to receive thousands of athletes and officials from around the world. The Olympic spirit thrived as athletes lived out their dreams.

This resolution before the House seeks to bring the summer Olympic spirit we witnessed in Athens here to America for the first time since 1996 in the Atlanta Olympic games. This measure urges the International Olympic

Committee to choose the United States entry of Chicago to host the 2016 summer Olympics.

Mr. Speaker, the Olympics bring together people from all over the world. And when they arrive in Chicago, they will find a culturally diverse city ready and willing to host athletes and spectators from every nation.

Chicago already has developed a public transportation infrastructure to ensure that visitors from the United States and abroad can easily get to the Olympic games. Once in Chicago, athletes and spectators alike will be able to move seamlessly through all Olympic venues and practice facilities.

The Olympic games will be held in the heart of Chicago so that everyone can enjoy Chicago's beautiful waterfront and park system. Hosting the Olympic games will also bring important economic benefits to Chicago and position it to hold important sporting events in the future.

Mr. Speaker, Chicago is a beautiful, thriving American city eager to carry on the Olympic tradition. When the International Olympic Committee meets to choose the site of the 2016 summer games, I urge committee members to choose Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this resolution, and reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, with this week being Olympic Week in America in our Nation's elementary schools, there is no better time for us to extend our congratulations to the City of Chicago for being selected to represent the United States in the competition to host the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic games.

Chicago is a world-class city, known for its culture, history, people and love of sports, and pizza, and the Bears and the Bulls.

In addition, it boasts renowned architecture and a significant transportation infrastructure and numerous venue options for major events such as the Olympic games.

This is the first step in the international process whereby the final selection for the site of the games will be made in October 2009. Chicago's likely rivals in the 2016 competitions include Rio de Janeiro, Rome, Tokyo, Madrid and Prague. Other than Miami, of course, I can think of no better city to represent the United States of America in its bid for the Olympics games than Chicago.

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

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the member of the Ways and Means Committee from the Fifth District of Illinois, RAHM EMANUEL.

Mr. EMANUEL. I thank my colleague from Miami. I can think of no other city if Chicago didn't have it than Miami. And also my colleague from New Jersey.

You know, both of you have mentioned something about Chicago's

physical beauty. The reason we are so proud, those of us from Chicago, of hosting the Olympics is not only our physical beauty, but I think you will see the character of our people in this greater part of Chicago, not just the city, but the suburbs, the entire metropolitan community, come together and host this Olympics and be the representation for the United States as we go forward in 2009 and try to win for Chicago and the greater Chicago area the ability to host these Olympics.

We do have a physically beautiful city. Its architecture is world renowned; its lakefront is known to everybody. In fact, Chicago is known as the third coast between both the Pacific on the west side and the Atlantic on the east side. It is known as the third coast in America, sitting on Lake Michigan and part of the Great Lakes. It has a great physical beauty, but its strength comes from the character of the people. And I cannot think of anything better for city that hosts, any time you go to one of its public schools we have across the city 50 some odd languages being spoken, Chinese being spoken in the school, Arabic being taught in the school.

Different languages from all over the world. People come to Chicago. It is the quintessential American city. There is no better place for us to have as our standard bearer for the United States than Chicago for 2016 to host the Olympics. And it is my hope, and great hope, that it would become the city and be the nominee in 2016 in the selection by the Olympic Committee.

You know, Carl Sandburg, the great poet, once said about Chicago, "Stormy, husky, brawling. We are the city of big shoulders." That is Chicago.

We have a great mayor, who is a great mayor of a great city with great people. And you can see it in the pride that everybody felt that we were selected by our colleagues from around the country to be the city to host the 2016 Olympics. Our sports teams, known as the Chicago Cubs, Bulls, Bears, the White Sox, Blackhawks, and the Sky and the Fire, our soccer teams. And I hope, as we go to 2009, that we do have and will receive from the international community the nod to represent the Olympics and show to the rest of the world what all of us know in Chicago and all of those who come to our city know, that we are a great city, with a great mayor, with a great people that will do right by the world in hosting the Olympics.

I want to thank my colleagues for letting me offer this resolution.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to our Speaker, Speaker HASTERT, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HASTERT. I thank the gentlelady from Miami.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the great opportunities that comes along once in a lifetime, the chance to host the Olympics and Paralympic games.

You know, the Olympic movement is something that I have been a part of most of my life, as a wrestling coach, as an honorary vice president of the American Olympics Games, and as one who worked in the trenches over the years to help fund USA Wrestling.

I have always said the Olympic movement is a bright light that brings people together through sports. The game celebrates the spirit of sportsmanship, a spread of a message of unity that inspire generations of children all over this world.

I had the honor and privilege of being at the Munich games and the Montreal games and the L.A. games. Chicago is a unique city. As the previous speaker said, it is the "city of big shoulders." It is a city of the crossroads of our Nation, a city of great architecture, of great beauty and of great people. And it is the commitment of people coming together to say we can do this; the will to succeed, the will to be the hosts to the world and showcase what this country is all about, what our athletes are all about, what the American spirit is all about.

We will see the Olympics coming up in places like China, in Beijing, we will see the Olympics in London, but this is our one chance to bring the Olympics back to this country, to be the host of the world and saying folks, we believe in the Olympic movement, we believe in this great opportunity, but we will do the best in the world to make this happen and to make it a success.

I ask also, ladies and gentlemen, that it is understood that this is the work of a lot of people. I want to congratulate our Mayor Daley and all of the others, Pat Ryan and others, who led up that committee to make sure that they can tell the story to the U.S. Olympic Committee so they would get this.

I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of those opportunities that comes along once during a lifetime—the chance to host the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

The Olympic movement is something I have been a part of most of my life—as a wrestling coach, as Honorary Vice President of the American Olympic Movement, and as one who worked in the trenches to help fund USA Wrestling.

I have always said that the Olympic movement is a bright light that brings people together through sports. The Games celebrate the spirit of sportsmanship, spread a message of unity, and inspire generations of children all over the world.

For the athletes, it is the ultimate level of competition—the opportunity to test themselves against the best the world has to offer in their respective sports.

A Midwestern city has not hosted the games since St. Louis in 1904, so it's a great honor for Chicago to be selected to represent the United States in the competition for the 2016 games.

And in a bit of irony, Chicago was actually chosen as the host city in 1904, but it was later moved to St. Louis to coincide with the World's Fair.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a more welcoming, diverse and inspirational place than

Chicago and the State of Illinois to serve as host for the 2016 games.

Over 30 million foreign and domestic visitors come to Chicago every year. It's a city with a rich immigrant history, and we all know what a great sports town it can be. In fact, The Sporting News named Chicago as the best sports city in the United States for 2006.

I want to congratulate Mayor Daley on all his hard work and I look forward to working with him and my colleagues in the Illinois delegation and the Congress to make this bid a reality.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I would like to yield as much time as she might consume to Mrs. BIGGERT from Illinois.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 118.

Last month, the United States Olympic Committee selected Chicago as the official U.S. candidate for hosting the 2016 Olympic games. It's been over 100 years since the Midwest hosted these games, and I am pleased to report that the Nation's heartland is ready, willing and able to do so again.

I have lived in the Chicago area my whole life and I can't imagine a better location for the summer Olympics. The people are welcoming and they are sporting spirit is high. A national hub of water, railroad and air, the "Windy City" has a diversity of culture and community that reflects the very best of America. And as host of the 2016 games, Chicago will serve as the Nation's emissary to the world, just as it did once during the World's Fair of 1893.

Director of Works for that historic fair, Daniel Burnham, once famously said, "Make no little plans. They have no magic to stir men's blood, and probably themselves will not be realized. Make big plans, aim high in hope and work."

From reversing a river to building the world's tallest tower, Chicagoans have a heritage of big dreams. And in keeping with its motto for the 2016 games, "Stir the Soul," Chicago's visions for the Olympics will be a dream the whole country can share in.

To Mayor Daley, Patrick Ryan, the chairman of the Chicago Olympic Committee and all its members, I would like to extend my personal congratulations. Without their hard work and dedication, securing this nomination would not have been possible.

I thank the gentleman from Chicago (Mr. EMANUEL) for sponsoring this resolution and the gentleman from Illinois, our former Speaker HASTERT, for his hard work in gaining such attention.

I would also like to thank the efforts of all of our friends on the Illinois delegation, every one of whom helped in this cause tremendously by letters of support and by cosponsoring the resolution before us today.

□ 1700

The International Olympic Committee will be making its final selection in 2009. I invite all my colleagues

from across the Nation to unite behind Chicago and commit to doing our part to bring the 2016 Olympic games back to America.

Mr. Speaker, I support H. Con. Res. 118, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. I am delighted that I managed to make it here.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and neighbor from the Fifth Congressional District of Illinois, Mr. RAHM EMANUEL, for introducing this resolution.

I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 118, congratulating the City of Chicago for being chosen to represent the United States in the international competition to host the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games, and encouraging the IOC to select Chicago as the site of the games.

I can speak with some authority on Chicago's qualifications to host those games because I am privileged to represent most of the proposed sites: Soldier Field, the United Center, U.S. Cellular Field, Navy Pier, McCormick Place, Grant Park, Douglas Park, Monroe Harbor, and facilities at Northwestern University and the University of Illinois.

The Olympic Village will rise on land in the Seventh District. And although the site of the future olympic stadium and currently home to the DuSable Museum of African American History, Washington Park is not in my district, it is right adjacent to it.

So with all due modesty, this assemblage of sports facilities is certainly one of the finest in the world. Then you add to that our infrastructure, our world-class architecture, our cultural and historical treasures and our matchless lakefront, and you have yourself the makings of a spectacular set of games.

Now, mix in our sports fan base. The Seventh District is home to the Chicago Bears, the Chicago Bulls, the Chicago White Sox, and the Chicago Blackhawks. Mix in the fact that for the 2006 Chicago Marathon, starting and ending in the district, we had 40,000 runners and 1.2 million spectators. Mix in the fact that Chicago hosted the 2006 International Gay Games. Mix in the fact that Chicago was the first host to the Special Olympics in 1968, and you will understand that our toddlin' town is for sure a sports town.

Mr. Speaker, the Olympic Games are about fierce, all-out athletic competition. But they are also about the greater goals of the Olympic movement: Fairness, peace, education, and friendship. The people of Chicago have a long and proud history of leadership in these struggles, nationally and internationally.

Mr. Speaker, Chicago is ready, willing and able to make America the proud host of the 2016 games. So I join with the mayor of the city, the Governor of the State, all of the business and community leaders in urging passage not only of this resolution, but in urging the Olympic Committee to select Chicago as the site for 2016.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 118, which congratulates Chicago for being chosen to represent the United States in the international competition to host the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games and encourages the International Olympic Committee to select Chicago as the site of the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games. I can not think of a better city than my hometown of Chicago to represent the United States in its bid to win the 2016 Olympics Games.

Chicago is a great American city that is rich in diversity, culture, tradition and history. The City is home to nearly 3 million residents that represent hundreds of different nationalities and ethnicities . . . a truly international city. Chicago's vibrant communities, sound infrastructure and extensive transportation network make it the perfect fit for the 2016 Olympics.

The Olympic Games are a great opportunity for the world to come together and put aside their differences to celebrate the achievements of athletes. The Olympics have been able to transcend cultural, religious and political boundaries by making all of us realize that there is more that unites us than divides us, which could also be said for the City of Chicago. The Games have also played a significant role in creating social and political change in the United States and across the globe.

I would also like to congratulate Mayor Daley and Governor Blagojevich for securing this victory on behalf of the City of Chicago and I wish them continued success in their efforts to win this bid in front of the International Olympic Committee in 2009. I am confident that the rest of the world will realize what we already know—that Chicago is the ideal city to host the 2016 Olympic Games. I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res 118.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIREs) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 118.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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. 334, by the yeas and nays;
- H. Con. Res. 112, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 298, by the yeas and nays.
The vote on H. Res. 243 will be postponed until tomorrow.

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

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 334, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 334.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 270]
YEAS—420

Abercrombie	Cardoza	Etheridge
Ackerman	Carnahan	Everett
Aderholt	Carney	Fallin
Akin	Carson	Farr
Alexander	Carter	Feeney
Allen	Castle	Ferguson
Altmire	Castor	Filner
Andrews	Chabot	Flake
Arcuri	Chandler	Forbes
Baca	Clarke	Fortenberry
Bachmann	Clay	Fossella
Bachus	Cleaver	Foxx
Baird	Clyburn	Frank (MA)
Baker	Coble	Franks (AZ)
Baldwin	Cohen	Frelinghuysen
Barrett (SC)	Cole (OK)	Galleghy
Barrow	Conaway	Garrett (NJ)
Bartlett (MD)	Conyers	Gerlach
Barton (TX)	Cooper	Giffords
Bean	Costa	Gilchrest
Becerra	Costello	Gillibrand
Berkley	Courtney	Gillmor
Berman	Cramer	Gingrey
Berry	Crenshaw	Gohmert
Biggart	Crowley	Gonzalez
Bilbray	Cuellar	Goode
Bilirakis	Culberson	Goodlatte
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Gordon
Bishop (NY)	Davis (AL)	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Davis (CA)	Graves
Blackburn	Davis (IL)	Green, Al
Blumenauer	Davis (KY)	Green, Gene
Blunt	Davis, David	Grijalva
Boehner	Davis, Lincoln	Gutierrez
Bonner	Davis, Tom	Hall (NY)
Bono	Deal (GA)	Hall (TX)
Boozman	DeFazio	Hare
Boren	DeGette	Harman
Boswell	Delahunt	Hastert
Boucher	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Boustany	Dent	Hastings (WA)
Boyd (FL)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hayes
Boyda (KS)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Heller
Brady (TX)	Dicks	Hensarling
Braley (IA)	Dingell	Herger
Brown (SC)	Doggett	Herseth Sandlin
Brown, Corrine	Donnelly	Higgins
Buchanan	Doolittle	Hill
Burgess	Doyle	Hinchee
Burton (IN)	Drake	Hinojosa
Butterfield	Dreier	Hirono
Buyer	Duncan	Hobson
Calvert	Edwards	Hodes
Camp (MI)	Ehlers	Hoekstra
Campbell (CA)	Ellison	Holden
Cannon	Ellsworth	Holt
Cantor	Emanuel	Honda
Capito	Emerson	Hooley
Capps	English (PA)	Hulshof
Capuano	Eshoo	Hunter

Inglis (SC) Mica Schmidt
 Inslee Michaud Schwartz
 Israel Miller (FL) Scott (GA)
 Issa Miller (MI) Scott (VA)
 Jackson (IL) Miller (NC) Sensenbrenner
 Jackson-Lee Miller, Gary Serrano
 (TX) Miller, George Sessions
 Jefferson Mitchell Shadegg
 Jindal Mollohan Shays
 Johnson (GA) Moore (KS) Shea-Porter
 Johnson (IL) Moore (WI) Sherman
 Johnson, E. B. Moran (KS) Shimkus
 Johnson, Sam Moran (VA) Shuler
 Jones (NC) Murphy (CT) Shuster
 Jones (OH) Murphy, Patrick Simpson
 Jordan Murphy, Tim Sires
 Kagen Murtha Skelton
 Kanjorski Musgrave Slaughter
 Kaptur Myrick Smith (NE)
 Keller Nadler Smith (NJ)
 Kildee Napolitano Smith (TX)
 Kilpatrick Neal (MA) Smith (WA)
 Kind Neugebauer Snyder
 King (IA) Nunes Solis
 King (NY) Oberstar Souder
 Kingston Obey Space
 Kirk Olver Spratt
 Klein (FL) Pallone Stark
 Kline (MN) Pascrell Stearns
 Knollenberg Pastor Stupak
 Kucinich Paul Sullivan
 Kuhl (NY) Payne Sutton
 LaHood Pearce Tancred
 Lamborn Pence Tanner
 Langevin Perlmutter Tauscher
 Lantos Peterson (MN) Taylor
 Larsen (WA) Peterson (PA) Terry
 Larson (CT) Petri Thompson (CA)
 Latham Pickering Thompson (MS)
 LaTourette Pitts Thornberry
 Lee Platts Tiahrt
 Levin Poe Tiberi
 Lewis (CA) Pomeroy Tierney
 Lewis (GA) Porter Towns
 Lewis (KY) Price (GA) Turner
 Linder Price (NC) Udall (CO)
 Lipinski Pryce (OH) Udall (NM)
 LoBiondo Putnam Upton
 Loeb sack Radanovich Van Hollen
 Lofgren, Zoe Rahall Velázquez
 Lowey Ramstad Rangel
 Lucas Rangel Vislosky
 Lungren, Daniel Regula Walberg
 E. Rehberg Walden (OR)
 Lynch Reichert Walsh (NY)
 Mack Renzi Walz (MN)
 Mahoney (FL) Reyes Wamp
 Maloney (NY) Reynolds Wasserman
 Manzullo Rodriguez Schultz
 Marchant Rogers (AL) Waters
 Markey Rogers (KY) Watson
 Marshall Rogers (MI) Watt
 Matheson Rohrabacher Waxman
 Matsui Ros-Lehtinen Weiner
 McCarthy (CA) Roskam Welch (VT)
 McCarthy (NY) Ross Weldon (FL)
 McCaul (TX) Rothman Weller
 McCollum (MN) Roybal-Allard Westmoreland
 McCotter Royce Wexler
 McCrery Ruppertsberger Whitfield
 McDermott Rush Wicker
 McGovern Ryan (OH) Wilson (NM)
 McHenry Ryan (WI) Wilson (OH)
 McHugh Salazar Wilson (SC)
 McIntyre Sali Wolf
 McKeon Sánchez, Linda Woolsey
 McNeerney T. Sanchez, Loretta Wu
 McNulty Sarbanes Wynn
 Meehan Saxton Yarmuth
 Meek (FL) Schakowsky Young (AK)
 Meeks (NY) Schiff Young (FL)
 Melancon

NOT VOTING—12

Brady (PA) Engel McMorris
 Brown-Waite, Fattah Rodgers
 Ginny Hoyer Ortiz
 Cubin Kennedy Sestak
 Davis, Jo Ann Lampson

1730

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.

Stated for:
 Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 270, H. Res. 334, I missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEAS OF A NATIONAL CHILD CARE WORTHY WAGE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 112, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 112.

This will be a 5-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 345, nays 73, answered “present” 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 271]
 YEAS—345

Abercrombie Cole (OK) Gonzales
 Ackerman Conyers Goodlatte
 Alexander Cooper Gordon
 Allen Costa Graves
 Altmire Green, Al Grijalva
 Andrews Courtney Gutierrez
 Arcuri Cramer Hall (NY)
 Baca Crowley Cuellar
 Bachmann Culberson Hall (TX)
 Bachus Baird Cummings
 Baird Baker Davis (AL)
 Baldwin Davis (CA)
 Barrow Davis (IL)
 Barton (TX) Davis, Lincoln
 Bean Davis, Tom
 Becerra DeFazio
 Berkley DeGette
 Berman Delahunt
 Berry DeLauro
 Biggert Dent
 Bilirakis Diaz-Balart, L.
 Bishop (GA) Diaz-Balart, M.
 Bishop (NY) Dicks
 Bishop (UT) Doggett
 Blumenauer Donnelly
 Bono Doolittle
 Boozman Doyle
 Boren Drake
 Boswell Dreier
 Boucher Duncan
 Boustany Edwards
 Boyd (FL) Ehlers
 Boyd (KS) Emanuel
 Braley (IA) Ellsworth
 Brown, Corrine Emerson
 Buchanan English (PA)
 Butterfield Eshoo
 Buyer Etheridge
 Calvert Farr
 Capps Feeney
 Capuano Ferguson
 Cardoza Finer
 Carnahan Forbes
 Carney Fortenberry
 Carson Fossella
 Castle Foxx
 Castor Frank (MA)
 Chabot Frelinghuysen
 Chandler Gallegly
 Clarke Garrett (NJ)
 Clay Gerlach
 Cleaver Giffords
 Clyburn Gilchrest
 Coble Gillibrand
 Cohen Gillmor

Langevin Nunes Shimkus
 Lantos Oberstar Shuler
 Larsen (WA) Obey Shuster
 Larson (CT) Olver Simpson
 Latham Pallone Sires
 LaTourette Pascrell Skelton
 Lee Pastor Slaughter
 Levin Payne Smith (NJ)
 Lewis (CA) Pearce Smith (TX)
 Lewis (GA) Perlmutter Smith (WA)
 Lipinski Peterson (MN) Snyder
 LoBiondo Peterson (PA) Solis
 Loeb sack Petri Souder
 Lofgren, Zoe Pickering Space
 Lowey Platts Spratt
 Lucas Pomeroy Stark
 Lynch Porter Stupak
 Mahoney (FL) Price (NC) Sullivan
 Maloney (NY) Pryce (OH) Sutton
 Manzullo Putnam Tanner
 Markey Radanovich Tauscher
 Marshall Rahall Taylor
 Matheson Ramstad Thompson (CA)
 Matsui Rangel Thompson (MS)
 McCarthy (CA) Regula Tiberi
 McCarthy (NY) Rehberg Tierney
 McCaul (TX) Reichert Towns
 McCollum (MN) Renzi Turner
 McCotter Reyes Udall (CO)
 McCrery Reynolds Udall (NM)
 McDermott Rodriguez Upton
 McGovern Rogers (KY) Van Hollen
 McHugh Rogers (MI) Velázquez
 McIntyre Ros-Lehtinen Vislosky
 McKeon Roskam Walden (OR)
 McNeerney Ross Walsh (NY)
 McNulty Rothman Walz (MN)
 Meehan Roybal-Allard Wasserman
 Meek (FL) Royce Schultz
 Meeks (NY) Ruppertsberger Waters
 Melancon Rush Watson
 Mica Ryan (OH) Watt
 Michaud Ryan (WI) Waxman
 Miller (NC) Salazar Weiner
 Miller, George Sánchez, Linda Welch (VT)
 Mitchell T. Weldon (FL)
 Mollohan Sanchez, Loretta Weller
 Moore (KS) Sarbanes Wexler
 Moore (WI) Saxton Whitfield
 Moran (KS) Schakowsky Wicker
 Moran (VA) Schiff Wilson (NM)
 Murphy (CT) Schmidt Wilson (OH)
 Murphy, Patrick Schwartz Wolf
 Murphy, Tim Scott (GA) Woolsey
 Murtha Scott (VA) Wu
 Musgrave Serrano Wynn
 Nadler Shays Yarmuth
 Napolitano Shea-Porter Young (AK)
 Neal (MA) Sherman Young (FL)

NAYS—73

Aderholt Flake Miller, Gary
 Akin Franks (AZ) Myrick
 Barrett (SC) Frangrey Neugebauer
 Bartlett (MD) Goode Paul
 Bilbray Granger Pence
 Blackburn Hensarling Pitts
 Blunt Herger Poe
 Boehner Hoekstra Price (GA)
 Bonner Hulshof Rogers (AL)
 Brady (TX) Inglis (SC) Rohrabacher
 Brown (SC) Johnson, Sam Sali
 Burgess Jordan Sensenbrenner
 Burton (IN) King (IA) Sessions
 Camp (MI) Kingston Shadegg
 Campbell (CA) Kline (MN) Smith (NE)
 Cannon Knollenberg Stearns
 Cantor Lamborn Tancred
 Carter Lewis (KY) Terry
 Conaway Linder Thornberry
 Crenshaw Lungren, Daniel Tiahrt
 Davis (KY) E. Walberg
 Davis, David Mack Wamp
 Deal (GA) McHenry Westmoreland
 Everett Miller (FL) Wilson (SC)
 Fallin Miller (MI)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Gohmert

NOT VOTING—13

Brady (PA) Dingell Marchant
 Brown-Waite, Engel McMorris
 Ginny Fattah Rodgers
 Cubin Hoyer Ortiz
 Davis, Jo Ann Lampson Sestak

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1739

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.

COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA GATORS FOR THEIR HISTORIC WIN IN THE 2007 NCAA MEN'S BASKETBALL TOURNAMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 298, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 298.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, answered "present" 4, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 272] YEAS—415

- Abercrombie Buchanan Davis, Tom Ackerman Burgess Deal (GA) Aderholt Burton (IN) DeFazio Akin Butterfield DeGette Alexander Buyer Delahunt Allen Camp (MI) DeLauro Altmire Campbell (CA) Dent Andrews Cannon Diaz-Balart, L. Arcuri Cantor Diaz-Balart, M. Baca Capito Dicks Bachmann Capps Dingell Bachus Capuano Doggett Baird Cardoza Donnelly Baker Carnahan Doolittle Baldwin Carney Doyle Barrett (SC) Carson Drake Bartlett (MD) Carter Dreier Barton (TX) Castle Duncan Bean Castor Edwards Becerra Chabot Ehlers Berkley Chandler Ellison Berman Clarke Ellsworth Berry Clay Emanuel Biggert Cleaver Emerson Bilbray Clyburn English (PA) Bilirakis Coble Eshoo Bishop (GA) Cohen Etheridge Bishop (NY) Cole (OK) Everett Bishop (UT) Conaway Fallin Blackburn Conyers Farr Blumenauer Cooper Feeney Blunt Costa Ferguson Boehner Costello Filner Bonner Courtney Flake Bono Cramer Forbes Boozman Crenshaw Fortenberry Boren Crowley Fossella Boswell Cuellar Foss Fox Boucher Culberson Frank (MA) Boustany Cummings Franks (AZ) Boyd (FL) Davis (AL) Frelinghuysen Boyda (KS) Davis (CA) Gallegly Brady (TX) Davis (IL) Garrett (NJ) Braley (IA) Davis (KY) Gerlach Brown (SC) Davis, David Giffords Brown, Corrine Davis, Lincoln Gilchrest

- Gillibrand Lynch Roybal-Allard Gillmor Mack Royce Gingrey Mahoney (FL) Ruppenger Gohmert Maloney (NY) Rush Gonzalez Gonzalez McCaul (TX) Ryan (OH) Goode Markey Ryan (WI) Goodlatte Marshall Salazar Gordon Matheson Sali Granger Matsui Sánchez, Linda Graves McCarthy (CA) T. Green, Al McCarthy (NY) Sanchez, Loretta Green, Gene McCaul (TX) Sarbanes Grijalva McCollum (MN) Saxton Gutierrez McCotter Schakowsky Hall (NY) McCrery Schiff Hall (TX) McDermott Schmidt Hare McGovern Schwartz Harman McHenry Scott (GA) Hastert McHugh Scott (VA) Hastings (FL) McIntyre Sensenbrenner Hastings (WA) McKeon Serrano Hayes McNehey Sessions Heller McNulty Shadegg Hensarling Meehan Shays Herger Meek (FL) Shea-Porter Herseth Sandlin Meeks (NY) Sherman Higgins Melancon Shimkus Hill Mica Shuler Hinchey Michaud Miller (FL) Hinojosa Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Hirono Miller (NC) Miller (NY) Hobson Miller, Gary Miller, George Mitchell Holdren Mollohan Moore (KS) Holt Moore (WI) Moore (VA) Honda Hoolley Moran (KS) Hoyer Hoyer Moran (VA) Hulshof Hunter Murphy (CT) Hunter Inglis (SC) Murphy, Patrick Inslee Israel Murphy, Tim Issa Israel Musgrave Issa Jackson (IL) Myrick Jackson-Lee (TX) Nadler Jefferson Napolitano Jindal Neal (MA) Neugebauer Johnson (GA) Nunes Oberstar Johnson (IL) Obey Johnson, E. B. Olver Johnson, Sam Pallone Jones (NC) Jones (OH) Pastore Jordan Kagan Paul Kagan Kanjorski Payne Kaptur Pearce Keller Pence Kennedy Perlmutter Kildee Peterson (MN) Kilpatrick Peterson (PA) Kind King (IA) Petri King (IA) Pickering King (NY) Pitts Kirk Platts Klein (FL) Poe Klein (MN) Pomeroy Knollenberg Porter Price (GA) Kucinich Kuhl (NY) Price (OH) Kuhl (NY) LaHood Pryce (NC) LaHood LaHood Putnam Lamborn Radanovich Langevin Rahall Lantos Ramstad Larsen (WA) Rangel Larson (CT) Rangel Latham Regula LaTourette Rehberg Lee Reichert Levin Renzi Reilly Lewis (CA) Reyes Reynolds Lewis (GA) Lewis (KY) Rodriguez Lipinski Rogers (AL) LoBiondo Rogers (KY) Loebstag Rogers (MI) Lofgren, Zoe Rohrabacher Lowey Ros-Lehtinen Lucas Roskam Lungren, Daniel Ross Young (AK) E. Rothman Young (FL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

- Barrow Linder Kingston Space

NOT VOTING—13

- Brady (PA) Davis, Jo Ann McMorris Brown-Waite, Engel Rodgers Ginny Fattah Ortiz Calvert Lampton Sestak Cubin Marchant Weller

□ 1748

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, I am required to be absent from votes this day, May 1, 2007, for a pressing engagement in my District. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the following bills: H. Res. 334, H. Con. Res. 112, and H. Res. 298.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. Res. 268

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 268.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1429, IMPROVING HEAD START ACT OF 2007

Ms. SUTTON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-116) on the resolution (H. Res. 348) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1429) to reauthorize the Head Start Act, to improve program quality, to expand access, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1867, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2007

Ms. SUTTON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-117) on the resolution (H. Res. 349) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1867) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010 for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1868, TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION AND MANUFACTURING STIMULATION ACT OF 2007

Ms. SUTTON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-118) on the resolution (H.

Res. 350) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1868) to authorize appropriations for the National Institute of Standards and Technology for fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. Res. 40

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.J. Res. 40.

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

There was no objection.

FLORIDA GATORS 2007 MEN'S
BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CORINNE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise first of all to thank the 415 "yes" votes for the Florida Gators, and we will continue to work on the four present, teaching them good sportsmanship.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my University of Florida basketball team for winning back-to-back NCAA basketball championships. The Gators basketball team is the first to successfully defend their basketball championship since 1992. Go Gators.

The Florida Gators teams that won those championships exhibit teamwork and sportsmanship rarely seen in college sports. This is the first time in the history that the exact same starting five was able to repeat the championship. No one left to be stars in the NBA. They came back to prove to the world that the University of Florida's win was no fluke, and the Florida Gators are a championship team that have made history.

Let's talk history. The Gators' win was the first time in college sports history that identical match ups and the results were the same. Florida's Lee Humphrey also set the all-time NCAA tournament record for three-point field goals made with 47, and Florida's Corey Brewer was the tournament's Most Outstanding Player. Coach Billy Donovan became the third-youngest coach at the age of 41 to win two titles. The Gators finished with a 10-game winning streak and haven't lost a post-season game in 18 tries, including sweeping the Southeastern Conference tournaments the last 2 years.

Coach Billy Donovan should deserve credit for building the team from scratch and teaching the players how to win and how to act like champions. This success at Florida opens other opportunities, but he has chosen to remain a Florida Gator. Coach Donovan is truly a great coach and a great leader. To close, I would just like to say, it's great to be a Florida gator.

A SAD ANNIVERSARY FOR THIS
COUNTRY

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in a few minutes, the President of the United States will veto the legislation to hold the Iraqi government responsible and accountable for the benchmarks that they promised their citizens and the citizens of this country. Tonight, after 24,000 U.S. soldiers have been wounded, 3,212 have been killed, and the country has descended into a bloody civil war, what we now see is the basis on which the President told this country he wanted the surge in the escalation was that he would hold the Iraqi government responsible.

In January, he said he would hold the Iraqi government to the benchmarks as announced, and that if no progress is made, they would lose the support of the American people. The fact is that no progress has been made, and the Brookings Institute has shown us that situation.

What we see now, as Secretary Rice says, that the administration believes that holding the Iraqis accountable to these benchmarks that they establish as the price of the surge "doesn't allow us the flexibility and creativity we need to move forward."

You can be creative all you want but unless the Iraqis know that there are consequences, and that is what this legislation said, that if you can't reach these benchmarks, if you can't establish a civil society, then we will withdraw our troops.

Right now, under President Bush's proposal under Secretary Rice's proposal, what we see as the only people paying the price are the American soldiers. Those are the only people paying the price tonight.

Today marks a sad anniversary for this, country.

Four years ago today, President Bush declared that the mission in Iraq was accomplished and that major combat operations in Iraq were over.

Since that time, 24,270 U.S. soldiers have been wounded, 3,212 have been killed, and the country has descended into a bloody civil war that we cannot stop nor should we refer.

It is time for America to redeploy its troops from Iraq.

That's why today, Congress sent a bill to the President's desk that would do just that: to redeploy from Iraq.

It's what a majority of the American people want, and it's what a majority of the United States Congress wants.

But instead of ending the war, the President is pursuing a war with no end in sight.

He refuses to hold the Iraqi government accountable for the benchmarks it promised to achieve: to establish a government supported by its people that can provide for its own security.

In January, the President said that "If the Iraqi Government does not follow through on

its promises, it will lose the support of the American people."

Well Mr. President, the Iraqis have not followed through, and your war has lost the support of the American people and a majority of the United States Congress.

According to a study by the Brookings Institute, there has been "no progress thus far" achieving the administration's benchmarks.

Yet, despite the President's promise in January to "hold the Iraqi Government to the benchmarks it has announced," the administration has flip flopped.

On Sunday, Secretary Rice said the administration believes that holding the Iraqis accountable "doesn't allow us the flexibility and creativity that we need to move this forward."

You can be creative as you want, but unless the Iraqis know that there are consequences to not living up to their end of the bargain, American Soldiers, taxpayers will continue to make all of the sacrifices and bear all the costs. And that is unacceptable.

Optimism is not a strategy. Ignoring the facts and misleading the country is not a path to victory.

It is time for the Iraqis to be held accountable, and to take charge of their own country.

And it is time that the President yield to the will of the Nation, and end our occupation of Iraq now.

MISSION ACCOMPLISHED
ANNIVERSARY

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, President Bush stood on the deck of the USS *Abraham Lincoln*, in front of a banner that said "Mission Accomplished," and told us that a major combat operation had ended. Since then, 3,200 United States troops have died in Iraq, and almost 25,000 have been wounded, and countless Iraqis.

The President has said that he will veto a bill very shortly that sets a goal for ending the occupation of Iraq signaling his insistence on an open-ended commitment to a failed policy. Rather than change course, the administration offers only increasingly desperate rhetoric about victory and surrender.

The fact is, you cannot win an occupation just as there is no way that the United States can win a civil war. The American people recognize that this failed policy is making our Nation and the world less safe, even if the Bush administration refuses to recognize this.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are squarely behind our efforts to end the occupation of Iraq and to bring our troops home, and history will record the President's veto of those efforts with the same ridicule as it does his remarks 4 years ago.

INCREASED TERRORIST ATTACKS
AND THE WAR ON TERROR

(Mr. BISHOP of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Country Reports on Terrorism

released by the State Department yesterday indicate that terrorist attacks increased by 25 percent last year, and more than 40 percent more people were killed. In these most dangerous times, this tells us we can't afford to take our focus off the global war on terror. Still, exactly 4 years after the President proclaimed mission accomplished aboard the USS *Abraham Lincoln*, his failed Iraq policy persists in overextending our armed forces and in refusing to compel Iraq to take responsibility for their own security and future.

Today, when the President vetoes withdrawal provisions supported by a majority of Americans, he places another's obstacle in the way of what should be our priority mission, winning the global war on terror. We know the administration's stay-the-course policy in Iraq is a failure. We know it has taken our eye off the war on terror.

Now we have the numbers to back up that statement and the proof we need to stop the President from compounding this Nation's single greatest foreign policy mistakes. I encourage my colleagues to consider the hard and irrefutable evidence by the State Department, thereby advancing our withdrawal from Iraq.

OUR TROOPS NEED FULL FUNDING

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, the Senate gave overwhelming unanimous consent for General Petraeus to implement his strategy in Iraq. We all agree, on both sides of the aisle, he is the best we have. In fact, he has written a manual dealing with terrorists.

So why do the Democrats want to withdraw funds to support him starting the first of July? Even as we speak, the troops have to reallocate funds and prioritize their missions, because they don't have the full funding. In fact, they will run out of money shortly. So why do the Democrats not allow General Petraeus to do his job? General Petraeus intends to report back in September with a complete report on how we are doing. That is a very short amount of time, in fact, 5 months away.

He deserves a chance, and he deserves full funding for this Congress through the fiscal year 2007. So I urge Congress, after the President vetoes this bill, to come back and give a clean bill so that the President can get full funding for our troops, at least through fiscal year 2007.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN DOESN'T WORK, SIGN THE BILL

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, that's the value of this great

country, it is that the will of the people can be heard by those of us who represent them. The will of the people always will be to bring our soldiers home.

It's interesting that our colleagues are talking about funding that doesn't exist when they know full well that there is funding until July of 2007 minimally. But, really, the message of the Democrats, the legislation of the Democrats, is not to micromanage, it is a bill that this President, who declared victory 4 years ago on an aircraft, should sign, because it leaves the logistics of the war to the generals, but it indicates that the people have spoken, it's time to bring our troops home.

Does this body recognize that the Maliki government has begun to purge generals trained by this United States military, who have shown themselves to be balanced and fair, who have shown them themselves to fight against insurgents. The Maliki government is a complete collapse, it is a failure.

It is time now to reorder the government to allow allies that are in the surrounding areas to work. It is important for Secretary Rice to be in Iran, to talk to those in Iran and to make sure that we have a plan that works. The President's plan doesn't work. Sign the bill.

□ 1800

HONORING JACK VALENTI

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

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to say farewell to a great friend and a great American, Jack Valenti, who passed away last Thursday.

When Jack spoke, people listened. His soaring eloquence and remarkable intellect made this town a better place and all of us better legislators. How lucky we were to know him and to have him as a resource and a friend.

Jack served in President Lyndon Johnson's administration, and made his name and reputation early. Jack quickly became known as a hard worker, making friends with both Democrats and Republicans alike. When Jack resigned his White House position and became president of the Motion Picture Association of America, his star really began to shine.

We are going to miss Jack Valenti, a person that had the ability to bring people together, a person that had the ability to let people understand that we all need each other.

Jack, we are going to miss you, but I am certain you will be screening pictures in heaven.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania).

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.

LISA BEAULIEU—TEXAS POLICE OFFICER

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, peace officers are the last strand of wire in the fence between the law and the lawless. They do society's dirty work for us. They are a cut above the rest of us because of who they are and what they do.

For Lisa Beaulieu, becoming a police officer was her life's ambition. She wanted to protect and serve the citizens of the community that she loved. Lisa worked hard at becoming a peace officer, and it didn't come easy for her. To gain experience, she worked as a jailer in Dayton, Texas while putting herself through the police academy at Lamar Institute of Technology. And when she graduated, Lisa got a job as a dispatcher at the Beaumont Police Department. To gain more experience as a law enforcement officer, Lisa became an unpaid part-time reserve officer with the Kountze Police Department in Texas. After years of determination, Lisa was hired by the Beaumont Police Department as a patrol officer in 2001.

For 6 years, Officer Lisa Beaulieu was, as many officers are, the first line of defense between the good and the evil of our community. She was dedicated to her job, and she took it seriously. Friends of Lisa stated that, when off duty, she was a girly girl. She loved the color pink, she always had manicured nails and pedicured toes, and had a closet full of shoes. Lisa had a smile that could light up a room and a great sense of humor, often telling men that would hit on her that she was just a driver's education instructor. She was dedicated to the family she had and her friends, and she cherished the moments she spent with them. She was also an avid animal lover, housing two dogs that she adopted from the animal shelter.

During the devastation of Hurricane Rita, Lisa took care of the citizens of Beaumont and her law enforcement family. She worked long, tireless 12-hour days, patrolling the hurricane's aftermath and caring for the residents of Beaumont. For her fellow officers, she turned her own garage into a makeshift shelter, offering them a place to come and get some rest before heading back into the disaster zone.

Friends stated that when she put on her uniform, however, she was all business. She was fearless and Texas tough, invincible when she wore the badge of a peace officer. Known as the type of officer who would set an example for others, Lisa's police file was filled with commendations from Chief Tom Scofield.

Around 1 a.m. Friday morning, April 27, the seasoned Officer Beaulieu responded to the scene of a motorcycle accident on the Eastex Freeway in Beaumont. She began directing traffic around the accident, allowing motorists to pass. While controlling the accident scene and out of the darkness of the night, a car driven by 24-year-old Willie McCray slammed into Officer Beaulieu, knocking her over the guard rail and onto the road below, killing her. She became the first female police officer in Southeast Texas killed in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, this is a photograph of Lisa Beaulieu. The Beaumont Texas community was stunned by the loss of this veteran peace officer. Some news reports, however, have tried to portray the person who ran over Lisa as the victim instead of her. McCray was not the victim, he was the offender. McCray's driver's license was suspended and he had no liability insurance. He had been arrested eight times for minor crimes. And the worst part, McCray was allegedly drunk and believed to be high on marijuana when he was blasting down the road. McCray has been charged with the intoxicated manslaughter in the death of this peace officer of Texas. He robbed the Beaumont community and Officer Beaulieu's family of a dedicated law officer.

Yesterday, I had the honor to attend her funeral, where over 1,000 citizens, law enforcement officers, firefighters, emergency personnel throughout Southeast Texas were all in attendance showing their support for their fallen comrade. The peace officers present wore a black ribbon of sorrow across their badges as they paid a last farewell to Lisa Beaulieu.

Mr. Speaker, Officer Beaulieu exemplified what it meant to be a peace officer. She was a protector of the innocent, the community, and her fellow peace officers. Officer Beaulieu wore the badge with pride, honor, and courage. The people and peace officers of Texas are saddened by the loss of one of their dedicated servants.

As a former Texas judge, I have known a lot of peace officers in my day, and some of them were superior peace officers. Lisa was one of those superior officers. Officers like Lisa Beaulieu serve us well and are on duty in the middle of the night so that the rest of us can sleep with safety and security.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING JACK VALENTI

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

Mr. CONYERS. Members of the House, I rise today to express my gratitude for having known and worked with Jack Valenti, who passed away last week after a lifetime that included serving as a pilot in the United States

Army Air Corps, flying 51 combat missions as the pilot commander of a B-25 attack bomber, a man who was a senior aide in the Lyndon Baines Johnson White House, serving as the first special assistant to President Lyndon Johnson, and as president of the Motion Pictures Association of America.

In 2004, Mr. Valenti reflected on his extraordinary career when he said, "I'm the luckiest guy in the world, because I spent my entire public working career in two of life's classic fascinations, politics and Hollywood. You can't beat that," he said.

Nothing about Jack Valenti was average. He started his adult life as an Army B-25 pilot in World War II, flying many combat missions over Italy. He returned from the war with numerous decorations, including the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Air Medal with four clusters representing additional awards.

After the war, while working full time, Jack Valenti earned a Bachelor of Arts from the University of Houston, and then went on to Boston where he earned a Master of Business Administration from Harvard University.

Known as one of the most influential lobbyists in Washington, he headed the Motion Picture Association for 38 years. During that time, I had the opportunity to work with him on a number of projects, including the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, which ensured protection for intellectual property in order to allow the rollout of digital technology. Mr. Valenti is also well known for creating the film rating system which assigned for the first time a rating to films. In other words, he created a system that would let them voluntarily categorize their films rather than requiring that we do it by legislation.

His political career was by no means mundane, either. Before he went to the Motion Picture Association, he served as the first special assistant to President Johnson, and was in the motorcade on November 22, 1963 when President Kennedy was assassinated in Dallas. He then boarded Air Force One with President Johnson and was there for the famous picture of President Johnson being sworn in, and he became President Johnson's special assistant.

After a lifetime of achievement, while most people would be more than ready to retire, Jack Valenti turned his energy toward a cause he had been concerned about for many years, and began leading in the fight against HIV and AIDS. He became president of the nonprofit Friends of the Global Fight, whose main goal is to support the global fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. Thankfully, we will all be able to read about Jack's enormous accomplishments and fascinating life, because he just finished his memoir before passing, which is entitled, "This Time, This Place: My Life in War, the White House and Hollywood." It will soon be published.

While most people with this amount of influence may be too busy for many,

Jack Valenti defied this stereotype by continuing to be both a mentor and friend to almost everyone with whom he came in contact. He kept his promises, promptly returned phone calls, and is described as generous, loyal, and honest by those who knew him. It is an understatement to that say Jack Valenti will be sorely missed.

FORMER U.S. BORDER PATROL AGENTS RAMOS AND COMPEAN

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, today is the 105th day since a great injustice took place in this country. On January 17 of 2007, two U.S. Border agents entered Federal prison to begin serving 11-year and 12-year sentences respectively. Agents Compean and Ramos were convicted last spring for shooting a Mexican drug smuggler who brought 743 pounds of marijuana across our borders into Texas.

These agents never should have been prosecuted; yet, the U.S. Attorney's Office prosecuted the agents and granted immunity to the drug smuggler. The illegal drug smuggler, who received full medical care in El Paso, Texas, was permitted to return to Mexico and is suing the Border Patrol for \$5 million for violating his civil rights. Mr. Speaker, that is a joke. He is not an American citizen, he is a criminal.

The same U.S. Attorney's Office in Western Texas also prosecuted another law enforcement officer, Deputy Sheriff Gilmer Hernandez, who was doing his job to protect the American people.

□ 1815

This makes no sense. Mr. Speaker, citizens across this country, and many of us in Congress want to know why does a Federal prosecutor in Western Texas choose to go after law enforcement officers while protecting illegal aliens who commit crimes?

The American people have not forgotten Agents Ramos and Compean, who should have been commended instead of indicted. I am encouraging citizens across this Nation to continue calling the White House and ask the President to use his authority to immediately pardon these two heroes.

Many of us in Congress are concerned about the Federal prosecutor in this case and the justification for the criminal charges brought against these agents.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Judiciary Chairman PATRICK LEAHY has already approved Senator DIANE FEINSTEIN's request for an investigation of this case. And in recent testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Attorney General Gonzalez promised to fully cooperate with an oversight hearing on the agents' case.

I want to thank Mr. Greg Barnes on the staff of the House Judiciary Committee for taking time last week, at

my request, to meet with Mrs. Monica Ramos, the wife of Agent Ramos and his father, her father-in-law, Mr. Joe Loya.

I also appreciate that Chairman JOHN CONYERS took time to say hello to Ms. Ramos and her father.

Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged that the House Judiciary Committee is seriously looking at holding hearings to investigate the injustice committed against these border agents. And that is why it is so important, Mr. Speaker, that the House look seriously at what happened to these men, who should be rewarded for trying to protect the American people, not serving time in a Federal prison.

Mr. CONYERS. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Yes, sir, I'd be delighted to yield to the chairman.

Mr. CONYERS. First of all, I wanted to congratulate the gentleman on the persistence and integrity with which he has followed this matter.

I have had this brought to my attention. I did have an opportunity to meet with some of the family, and I want to assure you that we are coordinating our activities with the Senate Judiciary Committee with those of my House Judiciary Committee; and I promise to keep you fully apprised as this matter moves forward.

I congratulate you, not just for what you have done for these two officers, but what you have done for law enforcement officers across this country. It's important that the kinds of concerns you have raised are known to all of our men and women who carry badges and weapons defending us, not just at borders, but in every State in the Union.

I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I thank the chairman. You are very generous, and thank you so much.

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

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

MISSION NOT ACCOMPLISHED

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, tonight I rise to commemorate an important event in the ongoing occupation of Iraq. On May 1, 2003, 4 years ago today, President Bush, the Commander in Chief, strode across the deck of the USS *Abraham Lincoln* and declared that the United States mission in Iraq was accomplished.

Mission accomplished. Mission accomplished? I don't think so. Let's re-

view what has and what has not happened in Iraq since May 1, 2003.

American troops were not met in the streets with flowers as welcoming liberators. Instead, they've met with sniper attacks and IEDs. 3,351 American servicemen and women have given their lives, and nearly 25,000, probably more, have returned home seriously wounded.

This administration has hidden the caskets of those who have perished, and forced the wounded to rehabilitate in mold-infested, rotting facilities. Are those actions of a grateful Nation? Does this mean mission accomplished?

What about the weapons of mass destruction? Where are they? Nobody knows. Even former head of the CIA, George Tenet, is now backing away from his "slam dunk" comment.

Yellow cake? Aluminum tubes? Al Qaeda ties to Saddam? An ousted CIA agent and a jail term for a senior administration official? It is as if this administration has been living in Alice's world of Wonderland.

The mission is yet to be accomplished. An accomplished mission would have brought peace and democracy to the Iraqi people. Neighborhoods would be free, not walled off, and a bomb would not have been set in the Iraqi Parliament building.

Estimates range upward from 50,000 Iraqis killed and tens of thousands of refugees fleeing to neighboring countries like Syria. This is not how to promote peace and democracy.

Let's see. Thousands, tens of thousands of refugees, and the United States allowed 7 or 8 Iraqi refugees into our country last month. We've made all those refugees happen, and we are doing nothing to help them.

It takes a small protection force to go to the market in Baghdad, and the Secretaries of State and Defense must make surprise visits to Iraq because their security might not be insured otherwise.

So I have to ask, Mr. Speaker, what mission was accomplished? The destruction of the Iraqi infrastructure? The mass exodus of the educated and wealthy from Iraq? The mission of alienating the United States on the global stage? The rise of hatred in countries who might have been our ally?

This is unacceptable, and the American people know it. They sent that message loud. They sent it clear last November, and it echoes unheard in the White House.

What is clear, Mr. Speaker, is that this mission is not accomplished. The ultimate mission to be accomplished is to bring our troops home. Then we can say, "Mission Accomplished."

HONORING THE LIFE OF CHIEF PETTY OFFICER GREG BILLITER

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, it's the most solemn duty that I have to honor those who have served our Nation, those who have answered the call of this generation, as us in prior generations have, to answer to that call to be ready to serve and to deploy.

I rise today to honor a great American, Navy Chief Petty Officer Greg Billiter. Greg was a native of Villa Hills, Kentucky, a graduate of Covington Latin, and a true fan of his hometown teams, the Cincinnati Bengals and the Cincinnati Reds.

Greg was tragically killed in action in Northern Iraq during combat operations. He leaves behind his young son, Cooper, a caring wife, loving family and a legacy that will be honored for generations to come.

For Cooper, as you grow into a man, know that your dad loved you. He was a great American. He cared about you and he answered the call of this Nation.

I had the opportunity to visit with his family, and they all conveyed similar sentiments of a brave, dedicated and heroic sailor.

When I asked his wife, April, about Greg she told me that he truly loved what he was doing. April said, "He was extremely patriotic, and felt that it was important for him to be part of the war and to help the other soldiers who were serving there." His bravery and ultimate sacrifice remind us that they were all part of a larger mission.

His parents told a local newspaper that he really felt he was helping to make Iraq a safer place, especially for the children. As an explosive ordnance demolition specialist, he made a tremendous difference in the lives of many, many civilians, military personnel, and especially those children. We wonder today how many will grow up in the future and have a future because of Greg's call and his willingness to answer that call and to go and serve. Indeed, his mother said that he loved what he was doing. He felt that he was doing was right, and he knew that he made a difference.

I stand here today to honor his heroic work in Iraq and in the United States Navy, and to thank him and his family for making that ultimate sacrifice. We've lost a great American in Greg, but his work will live on. Thank you, Greg. Thank you April, Cooper, Pat, and Barry, for sharing your husband, father, and son with our Nation. We are forever indebted to him.

As Jesus spoke in John 15:13, no greater love has a man than this, that he lay down his lives for his friends. Indeed, Greg literally did that every day in his work to protect other service members, to protect civilians, to make a difference.

Greg's reputation as a chief was quite clear. Many of his fellow shipmates came into the funeral and showed a strength of solidarity that was impressive and moving to this old soldier.

I have spent many years in uniform and been with thousands and thousands

of soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines, and one thing spoke out clearly to me was that Greg epitomized the warrior ethos of the civilian who went into the military, who answered the call of the Nation, who grew in character, and was an exemplar in all that he did, representing the will of the founders of this Nation.

Indeed, it was clear to me, from his sailors, from his family, that he was a leader, that he was a mentor, that he was a friend, that he was a proud son, that he was a loving husband and father. He was the epitome of all that we call dear and great and honorable in this land.

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

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

WALL STREET LEAVES MAIN STREET BEHIND

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, tonight the President of the United States says he will veto funding for our troops, for veterans health care, and even for victims of Hurricane Katrina. He still refuses to work with Congress to do what is necessary to resolve the quagmire in Iraq, and to win the hearts and minds of people across the Arab and Islamic world.

His policies are breeding terrorism. His policies are forcing higher gasoline prices in our country. His policies are forcing the import of a billion more barrels of petroleum every year into our country from the most undemocratic regimes in the world, and his foreign policies are a total failure.

Meanwhile, here at home, our economy seems to be moving in opposite directions at the same time. On Wall Street, things have never been better. The stock market has record to all time records. Last week the Dow Jones Industrial Average surpassed 13,000 points for the first time in history. The Standard & Poors index has climbed at an annualized rate of 13 to 14 percent for the first four months of this year. Everything's coming up roses for the investment class.

But it's a different story on Main Street. Yes, it's a different story in the real world, where our constituents see gasoline prices just challenged the \$3 a gallon mark again.

The stock market might be soaring, but consumer sentiment is in the dumper. The Conference Board reported last week that consumers confidence fell to its lowest level since last August.

Economic growth has slowed. The Gross Domestic Product, we learned

last Friday, increased at a weak 1.3 percent annual rate for the first quarter of this year.

Traders on the floor of the New York Stock Exchange might be irrationally exuberant, but families in the Midwest are increasingly worried. Chances are, they won't make ends meet this time with a home equity loan.

The National Association of Realtors reported today that sales of existing homes fell unexpectedly in March to their lowest level in 4 years. New construction down sharply in the first quarter of this year, and late payments on subprime mortgages increased by 35 percent in the first quarter of this year.

The foreclosure crisis that has hit Ohio and Michigan very hard threatens to spread to other parts of our economy. So much is clear, the housing bubble has burst.

Paul Krugman, the economist and New York Times columnist wrote about this "economic disconnect" between Wall Street and Main Street in yesterday's edition. He started by quoting Edward Lazear, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisor who says what's good for corporations is good for America.

□ 1830

And workers will benefit from this growth in productivity. The problem with that is it's not true. High profits haven't led to high investment. Rising productivity hasn't led to high wages. And I might add free trade agreements haven't led to free trade.

Even the investment banking company, Morgan Stanley, unwittingly acknowledged this brutal fact. In a recent newsletter, Joseph McAlinden, their chief global strategist, bragged with a laughable chart that wages have soared 4 percent at an annual rate. Well, when wages soar at 4 percent, barely keeping pace with inflation, what happens when you discount for prices? I doubt that if stocks were soaring by 4 percent that he would say it is a great thing. I guess it all depends on your perspective. Median workers' earnings adjusted for inflation have been static since this President took office, and the economy feels anything but great to most Americans. They would say, "Show me the money." The fact is, on Main Street, wages have barely kept pace with inflation, and workers, if they are lucky enough to hold on to their benefits, have to pay increasingly larger costs for them. Meanwhile, corporate profits have more than doubled since 2000. And according to Krugman, corporate profits as a share of national income reached their highest levels in American history last year.

That is what happens when productivity increases while wages remain static. Corporate profits soar and stock prices follow but not workers' wages. Wall Street reaches record heights because companies are turning around and reinvesting those profits not in

new machinery and jobs, but in making more money on our outsourced jobs.

It is time that Main Street holds Wall Street accountable.

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

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

SALUTING HOLLYWOOD, FLORIDA'S PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK AND RECOGNIZING NATIONAL SAFE KIDS WEEK

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, public service is among the most noble and demanding of professions, and excellence in the delivery of public service helps to keep the city of Hollywood, Florida, strong and prosperous and a wonderful place in which to live and work.

The effectiveness and efficiency of government depends, in large measure, on public employees whose task it is to provide, on a daily basis, a broad range of services of the quality required and expected by the public. Quite often the importance of the public service that is rendered by public employees and the exemplary manner of their performance are often forgotten or overlooked.

Public employees and volunteers, through their commitment to excellence and diversity of skills, have made great contributions to the City of Hollywood in areas such as public safety; recreational activities; neighborhood revitalization; and the delivery of water, sewer, and solid waste services.

The City of Hollywood recognizes the contributions made by public employees as well as volunteers at all levels of city government and finds it fitting to set aside a special time to honor and thank these dedicated individuals who perform such vital roles.

Public Service Recognition Week is being celebrated from May 7 through May 13, 2007, and salutes approximately 1,700 City of Hollywood employees who devote their time and talents to public service and who "do whatever it takes" to help citizens attain a high quality of life, and the numerous volunteers who contributed approximately 22,632 hours of volunteer service.

To provide even better service to the public, the City of Hollywood has committed to an organizational cultural change to enhance customer service and employee involvement and has initiated this process through the employee-guided strategic plan created by Hollywood City Manager Cameron D. Benson, a wonderful man, I might add.

With that said, Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to the City of

Hollywood, Florida, in its celebration of Public Service Recognition Week.

Now, Mr. Speaker, additionally, I also rise today to recognize National Safe Kids Week. This is an issue that is near and dear to my heart as a mom with three young children. This year National Safe Kids Week will be held from April 28 through May 6, 2007. That is the week that we are in now. National Safe Kids Week is a joint partnership between Safe Kids Worldwide and its founding sponsor, Johnson & Johnson. This week of public education activities has been held annually for 19 years and draws much-needed attention to accidental childhood injury, a leading killer of children 14 and under.

This year's National Safe Kids Weeks' theme is "Make it a Safe Kids Summer." The start of summer is known by emergency personnel as "trauma season" since accidental deaths and serious injuries to children increase dramatically. An average of 17 children a day, or 2,143 children in total, died from May to August, 2004, due to injuries, many of which could have been prevented.

Safe Kids Worldwide research indicates that five of the most common causes of children's accidental injury deaths in summer are drowning, which increases 89 percent in the summer over the monthly annual average; biking, which increases 45 percent; falls, which increase 21 percent; motor vehicle passenger injuries, which increase 20 percent; pedestrian injuries, which increase 16 percent.

In fact, almost 60 percent of total children's accidental injury deaths from May to August from 2001 to 2004 came from these risk areas. Events led by Safe Kids coalitions are taking place in more than 300 communities across the Nation in order to educate parents and families about how to keep kids safe during the summer, especially when participating in these activities. As my home State of Florida, drowning prevention is an important concern of mine as a parent and as a legislator. In fact, drowning is the leading cause of unintentional injury-related death to children in the summer months in Florida.

My most rewarding victory, Mr. Speaker, came from the passage of the Florida Residential Swimming Pool Safety Act. I was honored to sponsor this law as a State legislator, which has helped to save countless numbers of children from accidental injury and drowning in Florida pools. As the majority of drownings and near drownings occur in residential swimming pools and in open water sites, I hope that more States work to address water safety in their communities.

Recently I introduced similar Federal legislation here in the House of Representatives. My legislation, the Pool & Spa Safety Act, would provide grants to States that pass such comprehensive safety laws and also support drowning prevention educational programs, among other provisions. Along

with my colleague Representative FRANK WOLF, we hope this bill will be passed before another "trauma season" occurs for our Nation's children. I encourage my colleagues to lend it their support.

I also urge my colleagues to support National Safe Kids Week and to work with your State or local Safe Kids coalition to prevent these accidental injuries to children not only in the summer months but throughout the year.

INTRODUCING THE DALIT RESOLUTION

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I introduced a resolution calling for the United States to address the ongoing problem of untouchability in India. Last December Prime Minister Manmohan Singh recognized the similarities between untouchability in his country and Apartheid in South Africa. It is now time for this Congress, Mr. Speaker, to speak out about this ancient and particularly abhorrent form of persecution and segregation, even if it is occurring in a country many consider to be one of America's closest allies. This Congress must urge an end to the social discrimination and injustice faced by the nearly 250 million people known as Dalits and Tribals in India.

Although the Indian constitution guarantees fundamental rights and freedoms for all Indians, the untouchables continue to face widespread social and caste injustices. Article 17 of the Constitution outlaws untouchability. However, despite numerous laws enacted for the protection and betterment of the Dalits and Tribals, they are still considered outcasts in Indian society and are treated as such.

At best, untouchability involves social segregation, including separate educational facilities and drinking water and restaurants. This is a sad and familiar tune to many of us familiar with the history of our own country. At worst, untouchability entails widespread violence against untouchable women, especially in the form of rape with impunity, being targeted for abortions, and comprises the majority of temple prostitute and women trafficked from India.

The untouchables are poor, Mr. Speaker. Their most basic needs are not fulfilled, and they face great difficulties in accessing employment, education, food, and health care. Most are among the poorest people on the face of the Earth, living on less than \$1 per day. Moreover, Dalit women are often sold into bondage, prostitution, and there is an increasing religious persecution against the Dalits and untouchables who change their faith. In 2005, USAID stopped funding an organization after it was revealed that they were preventing many of these women

from leaving prostitution. In a recent instance, a whole Dalit village was forced to leave their tribal land because they had converted to Christianity in a state that had laws against conversion.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a direct statement by the United States Congress that untouchability is an unacceptable practice on the part of America's largest trading partner and close ally. We appreciate that Prime Minister Singh and many others have recognized that this is a serious social problem that needs to be confronted, and we urge the rest of Indian society and American diplomats, aid workers, and businesses working in India to do the same and to work toward the eradication of caste discrimination in India.

This resolution encourages our government to work with India to find new approaches to an age-old problem. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, this resolution will ensure that we as a government and we as an American people in no way encourage or enforce caste discrimination and untouchability through our policies with India or through foreign aid or direct aid in any way.

And I urge my colleagues to join me in calling on the Indian government and the world community to look with compassion upon India's untouchables and reach out to one of the poorest and most oppressed peoples on the face of the Earth.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE DEMOCRAT LEADERSHIP'S
PLAN FOR FAILURE IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate so much the opportunity that my leadership has provided in me in allowing me to come and share some comments this evening on the floor on what is truly a momentous and historic day for our Nation.

Within the last hour, as you know, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the President has fulfilled the promise that he made to the American people. That is to uphold and preserve and defend the Constitution of the United States; and in so doing, he has vetoed the legislation that was passed by the Democrat majority recently, last week, to provide not just funding for our troops in harm's way but also to make 535 commanders in chief here in Congress and to spend an extra 20-odd billion dollars on what was supposed to be a clean, clear definition of the amount of resources needed by our troops to keep themselves safe and out of harm's way in both Iraq and Afghanistan. So within the last hour the President has vetoed that legislation, and this Congress will take up that veto tomorrow.

Curiously, today we have had Members of the majority party come to the floor over and over and over again and express a peculiar amount of glee, glee that is highlighting their policy of failure and their policy of defeat. Frankly, I don't understand it, Mr. Speaker. Many of my constituents talked to me this past weekend when I was home and said they didn't understand it either. It was peculiar from their standpoint to understand and difficult to understand how the majority party in this Congress could believe that abandoning our troops in harm's way was an appropriate thing to do. And, consequently, I am as perplexed as they with the policy that this majority party has put in place.

The policy that they have put in place, as is clear to everybody and we will talk about that a bit this evening, is to ensure defeat and to ensure failure of our troops. And it seems to be all, all, for politics, which is probably as sad and distressing as anything, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1845

The Democrat leadership continues to be committed to a plan for failure in Iraq, and they seem to be doing it, as I say for political points, scoring political points, political partnership, political grandstanding, whatever you want to call it.

And some might ask, well, how can you be so certain of that? Well, Mr. Speaker, we get example day after day after day. And the most recent example is what happened today, and that is, that the bill that this Congress passed,

this majority passed last week to provide artificial timelines and specific benchmarks for our troops on the ground and to add incredible billions of dollars of pork to the war supplemental, the bill was passed last week, and they did not send it to the White House until today. Now, the President took his responsibility seriously and he vetoed that and turned that bill around rapidly.

But why, why, the American people are asking, why did it take nearly a week to send that bill to the White House? Every day that goes by, every day that is added on to our troops and our military not having the resources that they need to be able to protect themselves, to be able to continue the mission that they have defined, every day that goes by that makes it so that they have to rob from Peter to pay Paul, every day that goes by that makes it so that they are unable to repair munitions and armaments, every day that goes by is costly to our men and women in the military, and costly in a way that costs lives. And so every day that goes by, by design, is a flawed policy, is a policy for failure, and is clearly a policy that is grounded in politics only.

So the question has to be asked, Mr. Speaker, well, why did it take 5 days to send that bill to the President? Well, what we have seen today is the answer to that question; and that is, that the other side, the majority party, clearly wanted to score their political points, to take advantage of a May 1 anniversary that they would define, to distort that terribly, but to take advantage of that anniversary for political points. It is sad, Mr. Speaker, it is truly, truly very sad.

I came to the floor last Wednesday, when this House passed the bill, and I talked about it being a sad and a sobering day for America, and a shame. And I talked about it being a shame because the policy that this majority party has adopted is a policy that sends the wrong message to our troops, it sends the wrong message to our allies, and yes, Mr. Speaker, it sends the wrong message to our enemies. Because to our troops it says that we don't believe in you. We don't believe you can accomplish your mission. We don't believe that you have the ability to do what you say you can do. We don't believe in our general that we supported and endorsed by unanimous vote in the Senate just this year. The message to our troops says, "We don't believe in you."

To our allies, the message is one that, I think if you look at it seriously, Mr. Speaker, is one that nobody would want to send. Because what it says to our allies is, with this majority party you can no longer trust the commitment and the word of the United States of America. That is what it says to our allies. I don't think that is the message, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to be sending around the world in this dangerous time.

But probably the most important message is the message that it sends to

our enemies. To our enemies it says, if you happen to have a difference with the United States of America and you believe that the destruction of the United States of America is at the core of your belief, then all you have to do is wait, all you have to do is wait; America will give up. That is the wrong message, Mr. Speaker. That is the wrong message. And it will ultimately end up in a more dangerous world if it is allowed to succeed.

If that message is allowed to succeed by the policies of this Nation, it will ultimately end up in a more dangerous world. It will certainly end up in a more dangerous Middle East. And it will end up, I believe, and many scholars and experts in the military believe that it will end up causing greater amounts of casualties for the American people, and certainly for our military who will have to engage in a way and in a manner that is almost incomprehensible to us right now.

Most of us in this Chamber, who we are privileged to serve, but most of us have members of the military who have come from our district; all of them have sacrificed to serve. They have recognized the importance of service to our Nation. They have stood up and they have said, I hear the call. If you talk to them, most of them will say that they are not in favor of the kind of policy that has been adopted by this majority party. One of them has been very open about that in this letter that I am going to read. It comes from a Lieutenant Jason Nichols, United States Navy, who is serving currently in Baghdad, in Iraq.

The statements by the majority leader in the United States Senate recently about the war being lost have hit a nerve, they have struck a cord on the part of our men and women in the military. They have struck a cord across this Nation, Mr. Speaker. And the cord that they have struck is one that says, how on earth can we have a majority party, a majority leader who makes that kind of statement in the middle of conflict when our men and women are in harm's way? What kind of leader is that?

This letter, as I say, comes from Lieutenant Jason Nichols, United States Navy, it is addressed to Senator REID. And he says, "Senator REID, when you say we've lost in Iraq, I don't think you understand the effect of your words. The Iraqis I speak with are the good guys here, fighting to build a stable government. They hear what you say, but they don't understand it. They don't know about the political game, they don't know about a Presidential veto, and they don't know about party politics. But they do know that if they help us, they are noticed by terrorists and extremists, and they decide to help us if they think we can protect them from those terrorists. They tell us where caches of weapons are hidden. They call and report small groups of men who are strangers to the neighborhood, men that look the same to us but

are obvious to them to be a foreign suicide cell.

“To be brief, your words are killing us. Your statements make the Iraqis afraid to help us for fear we will leave them unprotected in the future. They don’t report a cache, and its weapons blow up my friends in a convoy. They don’t report a foreign fighter, and that fighter sends a mortar onto my base. Your statements are noticed, and they have an effect.

“Finally, you are mistaken when you say we are losing. We are winning, I see it every day. However, we will win with fewer casualties if you will help us. Will you?”

Respectfully, Lieutenant Jason Nichols, United States Navy.

Do you hear that, Mr. Speaker? The message that we are sending to our enemy, as I said, is all you have to do, if you oppose the United States, is just wait. But it is more than that, isn’t it, Mr. Speaker? As Lieutenant Nichols said, quote, “To be brief, your words are killing us.” Mr. Speaker, who is “us” in that letter? Who is “us”? “Us,” Mr. Speaker, are the brave men and women who stand up and fight on behalf of the United States of America, who stand up and defend our liberty and our freedom.

Mr. Speaker, there are some people in my district who wonder why the action of Members of Congress who will make those kinds of statements, why that isn’t defined as treason. I get asked those questions at home. They are tough to answer. They are tough to answer. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, why? Why? Why do we have leaders that make those kinds of statements?

It is not just members of the military that are saying that this policy that’s being adopted and the kind of language that’s being used are detrimental to our Nation and to our alliances and to our men and women in harm’s way. There are all sorts of press reports and press opinions, editorials across this Nation that say what on earth are the Democrats doing? What on earth is the majority party doing?

The Chicago Tribune described the Democrat surrender bill as “Self-Defeating.” They had in an editorial on the 27th of April, just 4 or 5 days ago, “Establishing a timetable now would be self-defeating. A new defense secretary and a new commander on the ground should have time and flexibility to see if they can succeed where their predecessors failed,” which is exactly what Americans believe. But there is this peculiar glee on the other side of the aisle that they are accomplishing something for political gain; however, that something puts America at greater risk.

The Chicago Tribune goes on to say, “President Bush will veto the spending bill approved by Congress this week because it contains a timetable for withdrawing U.S. combat troops from Iraq. He is right to do so.” Mr. Speaker, this isn’t a paper that is known to be terribly supportive of this President, but

they understand the consequences of the actions of this majority party, they understand that they put us at greater risk.

And finally, the editorial from the 27th of April from the Chicago Tribune goes on to say, “Establishing a congressionally mandated timetable for withdrawal would straitjacket the ability of General Davis Petraeus, the top commander on the ground, to pursue the stabilization of Iraq as events and conditions warrant.

“Senator HARRY REID said recently the war is lost. This legislation would all but guarantee it.”

So in addition to having a certain amount of glee with the actions that are occurring, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the Democrat leadership in both the Senate and the House is vested in the defeat of the United States in Iraq. They are now on record as being in favor of the defeat of the United States. It is a very peculiar strategy, Mr. Speaker. And the only way it makes sense is if you believe that this Congress ought to act for short-term political gain by a given political party; that is the only way it makes sense. No other way could it be deemed as being appropriate for the policy of this Nation to hamstring, to handcuff, to tie the ability of our generals on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan to make decisions. It seems truly that failure and defeat are the goal of the majority party. How sad, how sad for a once proud party in this Nation to have failure for the United States be their new strategy.

The Wall Street Journal sees it similarly. They say that Washington Democrats are taking ownership of the defeat in Iraq. In an editorial on April 25, just last month, they say, “In calling for withdrawal, Mr. REID and his allies, just as with Vietnam, may think they are merely following polls that show the public is unhappy with the war. Yet Americans will come to dislike a humiliation and its aftermath even more, especially if they realize that a withdrawal from Iraq now will only make it harder to stabilize the region and defeat Islamist radicals. And they will like it even less should we be required to re-enter the country someday under far worse circumstances.”

It is peculiar, when you think about it, Mr. Speaker, because what you hear from the other side, what you hear from the Democrat majority in all of their discussion and all of their points, their political partisan points that they make about this, all that you hear is about this issue of failure. You never hear about what the next step is.

We are going to talk about that a little bit tonight, about what the next step ought to be, about the consequences for failure. Because it is important that the American people appreciate that the decisions made in this Congress will affect this Nation for a long period of time if the decisions aren’t made in the light of day and with eyes wide open about what the

consequences of failure in this day and time in the Middle East will be.

The Wall Street Journal also went on to say, “At least Mr. Bush and his commanders are now trying to make up for previous mistakes with a strategy to put Prime Minister Maliki’s government on a stronger footing, secure Baghdad and the Sunni provinces against al Qaeda, and allow for an eventual honorable U.S. withdrawal. That’s more than can be said for Mr. REID and the Democratic left, who are making the job for our troops more difficult by undermining U.S. morale and Iraqi confidence in American support.”

□ 1900

It gets to the issue of what kind of message, Mr. Speaker, we are sending to our allies.

The San Diego Tribune was another paper that weighed in on this issue. They went on to describe the Democrat surrender bill as “a sham that is detrimental to our efforts.” They said, “The Democratic campaign is a textbook lesson in why the war cannot be managed by a committee of 535 bitterly divided lawmakers. The Constitution gives Congress control of the Federal purse strings, to be sure, but this authority has never been an effective instrument for directing forces in a combat zone. The Constitution gives that authority to the commander-in-chief alone.”

This brings up the interesting issue, Mr. Speaker, of how this Congress can believe that it ought to be having 535 commanders-in-chief. It doesn’t make any sense, because it puts every one of the Members of Congress who believe that they know better what ought to go on on the ground in a position that ties the hands of our generals.

It is not unusual for the Democrat party to believe that Congress knows best. Oftentimes their decisions affect people in kind of peripheral and tangential ways. In this decision, Mr. Speaker, it affects our military men and women who are putting themselves in harm’s way very directly and adversely.

Now, I want to be clear that those of us in the Republican Party believe that this is an appropriate debate for Congress to have. It is appropriate for Congress to say, as the paper that I just cited says, that Congress has the power of the purse string, and it is appropriate for Congress to say, if it so desires, if the majority party so desires, that we ought not fund the troops anymore in Iraq or in Afghanistan or wherever else this majority party deems that it is not appropriate for us to fund troops. That is an appropriate debate. That is a clear debate, that is a clear vote, which is why we asked for a clear vote, a clean vote, on the war supplemental. Because, Mr. Speaker, when that happens, then it is very clear what people are voting upon. That, yes, we believe there ought to be resources available for our men and women in harm’s way; or, no, we do not. That is a clear vote.

We muddy the waters and we confound the issue and we do a disservice to our Constitution and we do a disservice to our men and women in the field, certainly, when we put arbitrary timelines and benchmarks in a bill that clearly, clearly, is not appropriate, and makes it so that the Constitution becomes undermined.

The San Diego Union Tribune goes on to say more on April 26. General Petraeus was here, who is the Commander of American forces in Iraq on the ground. He visited this Congress last Wednesday and was not given the opportunity to speak to the House of Representatives as a whole in this Chamber. In fact, it is curious, Mr. Speaker, because the Speaker of this House went out of her way to visit the President of Syria on a visit recently to the Middle East, but she didn't go out of her way to visit with the American commanding general when he visited Congress.

So, the San Diego Tribune last week said, "Yesterday's pleas to lawmakers by General David Petraeus, the top commander in Iraq, not to micro-manage the war were brushed off without serious consideration in the House's partisan stampede. Meanwhile, essential funding for the troops has been sidetracked by the phony legislative exercise playing out on Capitol Hill."

That is what I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that the only rational conclusion that one could come to about why we are going through this process, why we are going through this "sham bill," as the San Diego Union Tribune calls it, why we are going through this exercise and putting the American people and our troops in harm's way through this exercise, is all about politics. It is all about politics. How sad, Mr. Speaker. How sad.

The Union Tribune concludes, "And even though this sham bill is merely a political show, the Democratic majorities in the House and Senate managed to lard it up with nearly \$25 billion in wasteful pork, most of it entirely unrelated to war funding."

So, Mr. Speaker, it is not just our men and women in the field who say that this is a wrong-headed policy. It is not just those of us on the minority side of the aisle who say that this is a wrong-headed policy and it sends the wrong message to our troops and to our allies and to our enemies. It is cogent individuals across this Nation who have come to that same conclusion.

The opportunity to come to the floor is a true privilege and a great opportunity to share with the American people what our belief is about this supplemental war bill, and I am pleased to be joined by a colleague, the gentlelady from Tennessee, Congresswoman BLACKBURN, who is a true leader in this House and has been a true leader on this issue, because she understands and appreciates the importance and the consequences of the decisions that we make as they relate to our troops in

the field and as they relate to our Nation and to our future liberty and our future freedom.

I am so pleased you would join us this evening. I look forward to your comments.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia so very much. I appreciate his diligence on the issue.

Mr. Speaker, as we have been through this issue and with our troops, I have got a letter with me tonight that I received from one of our men and women that is in Baghdad who is thanking me for the support and thanking so many Members of the House for their support in standing with them and their families and supporting our troops. I think it is so interesting how they have viewed this and kind of the filter they view this issue of our troop funding from.

As I read that letter and as I have been home over the weekend and talked to so many of my National Guard families, talked to so many of the military families that call Tennessee's Seventh District home, one of the things that has been mentioned repeatedly is, "Marsha, I hope that people in Washington look at this debate and that they take a little bit of a historical view to this and focus on what should be some lessons learned." Because there are lots of lessons learned, or should be lots of lessons learned in this, Mr. Speaker.

One of the ones that was highlighted for me by one of my constituents is that we have to realize when you go back and you look at the decade of the nineties and look at the view that then President Clinton took of the military, saying, well, the wall has come down. Well, we have survived these threats. Well, let's reduce funding to the military. Well, let's reduce funding on intelligence. Let's put it into domestic programs, social service programs.

Then the unintended consequence, I am sure he would say, is when you look at what happens when you have to go back through that rebuilding process. When you hear from those in our intelligence agencies and in the FBI and the CIA that say, my goodness, it takes 5 years for us to develop an asset in these countries. When you hear from our men and women in uniform about the importance of maintenance, maintenance on those posts, maintenance on that equipment, R&D and how that should have been continued. When they point to equipment and artillery that didn't get developed. We have to look at that as a lesson learned and realize, yes, indeed, you do get peace through strength, and you maintain it by being certain that you are ever-vigilant and that you are always making certain we fulfill the constitutional duty to provide for the common defense.

There are lessons learned, and I hope that this body does take it seriously, and I hope that our friends across the aisle will join us and say let's be fair to our military, to those families and to

those troops, because for the debate that has taken place, for the rhetoric that has been spewed, for some of the statements that have been made, there are many of them that can look at this and say they are not being fair to us and they are not being fair to the job that we would do.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments. I am struck by the general sense by the majority party, or seeming sense by the majority party, that their actions don't really make any difference to date. In fact, the delay we have already had, I have heard from some folks in the military that they are not able to keep up some of the repair of some of the equipment in other areas, not in the field of war right now, but in other areas, which makes us less safe as a nation.

I was wondering if you had anybody you talked with who was giving a similar story?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Yes, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Yes, indeed, we hear this regularly, not only from our Guardsmen, but we also hear it from those that are on active duty, that are moving forward and readying for another deployment. They talk about how they work to make ends meet, and they talk about how deeply it hurt the ongoing progress of developing different equipment and protocols as funding was cut through the nineties.

I think another thing that we have to remember, and this has been highlighted by a couple of my constituents who are so wonderful and love keeping up with the issue, is we have to remember on September 11, 2001, we were not under a George Bush budget. We were still under the last Clinton budget. The focus was shifting for that budget that was going into place on the first of October in 2001.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, I think everybody realizes that prior to September 11, this Nation had responded to acts of terrorism as civil disobedience. September 11, all of that changed and we called it what it is, and that is a war. Because no one can deny, and I do think it is foolhardy to stand and say, oh, there is no such thing as a global war on terror. Everybody knows there is, because they know we have a very dedicated, very focused enemy. You can listen to their own words. They want to annihilate us and end our way of life.

I think it would not be wise for us to let that go unattended. We are right to respond with diligence and tenacity and focus to make certain that we defeat the radical Islamic jihadists who want to tear our Nation and our communities apart by the very fabric that holds them together.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate those comments, because it is an incredible privilege and honor to represent a nation where we have men and women who are willing to stand up and serve, to volunteer to stand up and

serve to protect the freedoms that you describe, which is why in my district people are so confounded by the kind of policy that is being pushed by the majority party at this point. Because what they see is a majority party now that is saying to our troops, we don't believe in you, we don't believe you can accomplish your mission. It is saying to our allies that you can't believe in the commitment of the United States. And it says to our enemies that all you have to do is wait. It is very strange policy.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, indeed, we see that. The message that it sends, actions do speak louder than words. We heard that as children growing up, "your actions are going to say more about your intent than the words that you speak." And we know that.

The message that it is sending by the actions is one that does not serve us well, in my opinion. It is one that causes our intent to be called into question, because we know what the enemy would do with us if they were given the chance. We have to realize that we have to be vigilant and we cannot let down our guard, not for a minute, not for an hour, not for a day. We have to continue to work to defeat this enemy.

So many of my constituents have called about the bill. I brought a copy of the bill today to the floor with me, and here it is. It is I think 93 pages when we printed the whole thing out. It is not that difficult to read. I can even read parts of it without my reading glasses, the print is big enough, and I like that. It makes it a little bit easier to focus on.

□ 1915

For constituents who are watching tonight and want to follow along through the debate with us, I would encourage them, go to thomas.loc.gov. That is all you have to enter in your search engine. When you get in thomas.loc.gov to query the site, enter "H.R. 1591." That is the number on this bill. I do encourage individuals to go in and pull this down so they can see what is contained in here.

Now some of the comments that I have had, and you mentioned this earlier, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Democrat majority, ran railing against pork spending. From so many of our families I have heard: How in the world could they have drafted a bill that had money for all of these different interests? It sounds like a grocery list when you talk about beef and cheese and dairy products and spinach and shrimp. And when you look at the intent or what we have come to believe that they want to do, which was not put it through PAYGO rules, not put it through regular order, but slide it in here because they felt this was something Members couldn't refuse to vote for.

How unfair to our troops and our military families, to put this on their back and saddle them with this \$24 billion worth of pork barrel spending. It is not what they said they were going to do; and quite frankly, I don't think that is the kind of change that the American people wanted to see.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate you bringing up the extra \$20-plus billion in the bill. And I am not often struck by the candor of some of our friends in the Democratic Party, but I was moved and struck by the candor of the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL, who was on one of the Sunday shows. I think it was "Meet the Press" with Mr. Russert. And Mr. Russert said: Why did you put all of that money in the bill? And Chairman RANGEL, to his remarkable credit of candor said "because we needed the votes."

So it is clear that the reason that the extra \$20-plus billion of pork spending is in that bill is because, exactly as you said, they believe that people won't be able to vote against the bill if that kind of pork spending is in it.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. That is right. It is so unfortunate. What we need is a clean bill that allows a good debate over how we are moving forward in Iraq.

I think it has been striking to see the Senate confirm and give a vote of support for General David Petraeus who is commanding our efforts in Iraq, a very scholarly general. He truly is a leader for our men and women and for the Iraqis. He has great respect from them.

But then to turnaround and say we are going to second guess or Monday morning quarterback your decisions and we are not going to give the funding and we are not going to give it in a timely manner. As the gentleman from Georgia was so eloquently stating earlier, there comes a time when you have to look at it and talk about what their intent is, and if they even trust the troops, if they even trust the commanders in the field to have the flexibility that they need to respond.

Certainly today we have seen and have noted the demise of al-Masri who is the head of al-Qaeda in Iraq. Now I know that it is probably a subject that the majority doesn't want to talk about, that al-Masri was killed in Iraq, had been found there and had been working there. So it leads one to ask the question: What was he doing in Iraq? Why was he in Iraq? And why was it that he met his death in Iraq?

Well, the answer to that question is he was there because he and the other terrorists and the other terrorist groups all tell us the central front of the global war on terror is in Iraq. This is where they are fighting it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank you once again for pointing out this incredibly prescient and clear perspective on this issue, if people in the majority party would just step back and take a look. And that is why it is important that you pointed out that the bill num-

ber is H.R. 1591 and how to find it online at www.thomas.loc.gov, and I urge people to look at the area in the bill that has the artificial time lines and benchmarks. What we oftentimes hear from our friends on the other side of the aisle is there is no specific time line; but the bill is very specific. It says by October 1, we will begin to bring the troops home.

So it is clear that their mission is politics. The majority party's mission is politics. There can be no other reason for the remarkably foolish, if you want to support the United States, the remarkably foolish policy that they put on the table. The only reason can be politics, and short-term politics at that.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. One of the things that is so disappointing to me, having as many veterans and as many military families and members of the military as I have in my district, one of the things that is disappointing to me is they may want to do this over and over and over and delay the funding that gets to those troops.

One of the things that it always brings to mind, if you don't want to get the money to them and you don't want to get it to them in a timely manner, and you want to push benchmarks on our troops, then you have to be able to answer some questions. You've got to answer the question: What is going to happen if we leave?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Absolutely.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. What is going to happen if we leave Iraq? What are the Iraqi people going to do if we leave Iraq? What is going to happen in the Middle East?

Somebody asked me earlier today, asked me, how many more people have to die? I said that is the question to ask the terrorists: How many more people have to die?

But what we do know is that we cannot let down our guard. We do have to continue to fight. We have to realize terror and the war on terror is a new enemy. They do not have a headquarters. They do not show allegiance to a country. They do not wear a uniform. They are an illusive enemy.

Right now they are saying the central battle front is Iraq. September 11, 2001, we know where that central battle front was.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Exactly.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. We know. And what we have to do is be certain that we meet our obligation to our men and women in uniform and that we send a message to every terrorist that is breathing on the face of the earth that we will not stop.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentlelady because it is the question that needs to be asked, and it is a question that our friends on the other side of the aisle asked all the time about what the President asked once Saddam fell, what next? What we ask them now, given our current situation: Where is your strategy? If you succeed with your policy of ending the funding

for the troops and ending our involvement in Iraq, what next? What happens then?

There are some very good scholarly individuals who have looked at this, and they have said what they believe will happen next. In fact, the chart that I have here shows what the National Intelligence Estimate, the NIE, says will happen if we fail in Iraq. That is important because that group, the National Intelligence Estimate, is the group that our good friends cite all of the time, incorrectly, I might add oftentimes, but they cite them as the source for information about what ought to be done in Iraq.

But what the National Intelligence Estimate has said that the consequences of failure in Iraq would be: "Coalition capabilities, including force levels, resources, and operations remain an essential, stabilizing element in Iraq." Essential stabilizing element in Iraq.

Last week when General Petraeus was here and what he said, and it was so distorted by our friends on the other side of the aisle, but what he said on April 26 was: "As I noted during my confirmation hearing, military action is necessary but not sufficient. We can provide the Iraqis an opportunity, but they will have to exploit it."

He also said: "And again I note that we are just really getting started with the new effort."

He went on to say: "Success will take continued commitment, perseverance and sacrifice, all to make possible an opportunity for the all-important Iraqi political actions that are the key to long-term solutions to Iraq's many problems. And because we are operating in new areas and challenging elements in those areas, this effort may get harder before it gets easier."

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of information that is imperative for this Congress to appreciate and recognize and utilize in its formula for where we go from here. If we ignore that kind of information from our general that was unanimously approved by our Senate, if we ignore that kind of information, we do so at our peril.

So what happens if we have failure in Iraq, according to the National Intelligence Estimate, well, one, Iraqi security forces would be subject to sectarian control. What does that mean? That means in essence the nation breaks into three warring factions, three warring factions, and some would say that is what is happening right now. The difference is there would be no stabilizing influence whatsoever, and the estimates are that ten of thousands if not hundreds of thousands of Iraqis would be slaughtered. Mr. Speaker, that is a sobering assessment. That is a sobering assessment.

Secondly, interference by neighboring countries in an open conflict is what the National Intelligence Estimate says is likely with failure in Iraq. What does that mean.

Mr. Speaker, as you well know, what that means is that the conflagration,

the battles, the war in Iraq becomes a war in the larger Middle East in a way that can only be described as a nightmare not just for the Middle East but for peace in the world, for peace in the world.

The National Intelligence Estimate went on to say there would be massive civilian casualties and population displacement, as I mentioned before. The estimates range from tens of thousands to hundreds of thousands of individuals slaughtered, killed, murdered, in sectarian violence that would put the kind of violence that we are seeing right now, which is horrendous, but it would make it seem like just a prelude, just a prelude.

Fourth, the al Qaeda in Iraq would plan increased attacks inside and outside Iraq.

This is important because if al Qaeda, if in the larger war on terror which we sometimes or oftentimes in this Chamber seem to lose sight of, but if in the larger war on terror the terrorists, the Islamic terrorists whose stated desire is to wipe Israel off the map and to end our way of life, that is their stated desire, not my opinion, that is their stated desire. If we fail in Iraq, what results is a haven of significant size and significant ability to attract terrorists in a way and to allow them the opportunity to plot for significant violence and attacks both inside and outside Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, as we saw outside Iraq doesn't just mean next door. It means around the world. As we saw on September 11, around the world can mean violence and horrendous activities visiting our shores when we least expect it.

Finally, the National Intelligence Estimate says there will be spiraling violence and political disarray, including Kurdish attempts at autonomy in Kirkuk. What that means is the nation breaks apart. And if Iraq breaks apart in the way that the National Intelligence Estimate has stated would be the likely outcome of failure in Iraq, if that nation breaks apart, what happens is it becomes a magnet for terrorism and a terrorist haven in the Middle East, a less stable Middle East, a more endangered Middle East, an emboldened enemy, a likely scenario that would bring about significant violence upon our shores once again.

□ 1930

So, Mr. Speaker, the consequence of the actions that have been adopted by this majority party, by this bill that the President has vetoed this evening, the consequences of moving forward with that same kind of legislation, which the majority party has threatened to do, and "threatened" is the right term because it threatens to place, Mr. Speaker, at greatest risk and in greater harm's way, if we continue along that path, what we do is bring about a less stable Middle East, certainly a less stable Iraq, a greater threat to Israel and other Nations in

the Middle East and certainly a greater threat to the United States.

I was quoting earlier, Mr. Speaker, from some news reports and newspapers from around the Nation on what they believed was the essence of this bill that the President has appropriately vetoed this evening.

The Washington Times said that, "The Democrats' lack of interest in the real-world impact of their legislation is reflected in their shabby treatment of the commander of U.S. forces in Iraq, Lieutenant General David Petraeus. Last week, House Democratic leaders initially declined General Petraeus' invitation to brief Members, reversing themselves only after coming under fire from Republicans. And by tying funding for the war to a surrender bill that the President will veto, the Democrats are showing studied contempt for our troops in the field."

Studied contempt, Mr. Speaker, which brings me back to the original letter that I read from Lieutenant Jason Nichols, who clearly appreciates this studied contempt, but also takes it to the next step and describes what that studied contempt does. I quote Lieutenant Nichols once again, "To be brief, your words are killing us."

A powerful statement, Mr. Speaker, and we ought to be listening. We ought to be listening to the brave men and women who stand up to defend our liberty.

The Washington Times went on to say on April 26, "When it came to the 150,000 U.S. troops now fighting in Iraq, lawmakers included enough poison-pill language to ensure a presidential veto which will in turn delay much-needed support for military operations in Iraq."

In another paragraph in that same article on April 26, "To satisfy the MoveOn.org types, particularly in the House, the bill stars the pullout as early as nine and a half weeks from now. In an effort to provide political cover for House 'Blue Dogs' from more conservative districts who want to vote with Mrs. Pelosi, it contains troop-withdrawal language that sets a 'goal' for pulling out rather than a deadline."

However, Mr. Speaker, if you read the bill H.R. 1591, what it states, indeed, is a hard and fast deadline.

I want to quote one more individual who has stood tall and taken a lot of heat for it, and this is Senator JOSEPH LIEBERMAN who last week wrote in the Washington Post that the Democrat surrender bill is "dangerously wrong."

He went on to say, "And today, perversely, the Senate is likely to vote on a binding timeline of withdrawal from Iraq. This reaction is dangerously wrong. It reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of both the reality in Iraq and the nature of the enemy we are fighting there. What is needed in Iraq policy is not overheated rhetoric but a sober assessment of the progress we have made and the challenges we still face."

He went on to say on April 25 of this year, "Indeed, to the extent that last

week's bloodshed clarified anything, it is that the battle of Baghdad is increasingly a battle against al Qaeda. Whether we like it or not, al Qaeda views the Iraqi capital as a central front of its war against us."

Finally in that article, Mr. Speaker, Senator LIEBERMAN said, "In the two months since Petraeus took command, the United States and its Iraqi allies have made encouraging progress on two problems that once seemed intractable: tamping down the Shiite-led sectarian violence that paralyzed Baghdad until recently and consolidating support from Iraqi Sunnis, particularly in Anbar, a province dismissed just a few months ago as hopelessly mired in insurgency."

So, Mr. Speaker, where do we go from here? Well, I think that it is time for the majority party to regroup, to reassess, to appreciate that what they have done is spent four months on a policy that is candidly shameful; that brings about a discredit and a disservice to our troops; that sends the wrong message to our allies saying that you cannot trust the United States of America; and certainly sends the wrong message to our enemies saying that if you oppose the United States and you are in a conflict, all you have got to do is wait because the United States will not live up to its commitment.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we need to do from here, the President has vetoed this bill this evening. I would challenge the leadership in the majority party to bring the House together. I would challenge the Senate to work together in a bipartisan way and come up with a bill that the President can sign and to do so in very rapid fashion. Every day that we delay makes it more harmful for our troops, makes it so they know not whether or not they will get the resources that they need to carry on their mission, makes it less predictable, continues to erode their morale because of the comments like the ones by the Senate majority leader last week. So we must in short order come together and pass a bill that the President can sign.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of what you believe, what one believes about the nature of this battle and whether or not it is indeed the central front of the war on terror, it is incumbent that we live up to our responsibilities, to our oath as Members of the United States House of Representatives, that we live up to the responsibility and the duty that we have. That primary responsibility is to preserve and to protect and to defend the United States.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that one of the issues about preserving and protecting and defending the United States is making certain that the men and women who stand up and volunteer to protect our liberty and our freedom deserve all of our support and the resources that they require to protect themselves and to carry out their missions.

So, Mr. Speaker, I challenge the leadership of the House and the Senate to

make certain that this week we act to bring forth a bill that will pass both chambers of this Congress, and that the President can sign, that does a credit and honors our troops; that sends the correct message to our allies, and that is, that you can count on the word of the United States of America; and sends the correct message to our enemies, and that is, that if you engage the United States in military battle, that you have met an enemy that you cannot defeat.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COHEN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to come before the House once again, especially this evening.

As you know, the 30-Something Working Group, we come to the floor to bring forth the truth on behalf of the American people, not just Independents or not just Democrats, not just Republicans, but on behalf of the American people.

I am so glad to be joined once again by my good friend from Niles, Ohio, Mr. TIM RYAN, and I am always excited about being on the floor with him. I am excited by the fact that, Mr. Speaker, today that there was a conference report signed to support our men and women that are in harm's way in Iraq, Afghanistan, and in areas where they are staging to move into theater, one that brings about the equipment and support, going above and beyond what the President called for, but it also had benchmarks to bring about the kind of standards that the American people are crying out for.

It happened today at 3 p.m., and I am very proud of not only the Speaker but Majority Leader HARRY REID over in the Senate, Senator REID. I think it is also important for us to realize that in both chambers it passed by a bipartisan vote. I think it is also important to note that as soon as we were able to get that conference report signed, that the President, one of his first actions was to announce officially his veto of that legislation, saying tomorrow that Democrats and Republicans will come together at the White House to discuss where we can compromise.

Let me just say this before I yield to Mr. RYAN. I understand that there is a discussion that is going on about who is right and who is wrong, but I think it is very, very important to understand especially on the date that Mr. RYAN is going to address in a minute, some 4 years ago, where there was a great announcement of accomplishment and now to continue to move on under that light of saying trust me, that everything is going to be okay, I think that those days are over. I am not saying they are over. The American people are saying they are over.

One time here on the floor, Mr. RYAN went down a litany of things, and actually I was checking out some of your work on YouTube recently, and it had the one when you came and you said, forgive me for questioning what the President says or what the Republican majority at that time had to say about the fact of liberators and paying for the war and on and on and on.

It continues, but the American people are now saying, Mr. Speaker, that we understand this Commander in Chief but we need the Congress to stand up and be the Congress, asking for accountability.

So, with that, I know that we have a number of things to talk about here this evening, and we also have some fresh quotes from former brass because, of course, if you are enlisted or you are inside, you cannot speak truth to power or speak your mind. This information has just been released not only publicly but to those of us here in Congress. We want to share that with the Members.

Also, I want to add that the death toll in Iraq is 3,351; wounded in action, returned to duty is up 13,875; and wounded in action and not returning to duty is 11,215. That is the latest at 10:00 a.m. today. As you know, when we come to the floor, we give that report of that information because I think the Members need to understand that this is not a political issue. This is a serious issue that is facing the country and also facing the men and women in uniform and their families.

So I do know that the American people are, and a super majority of them are, 100 percent behind accountability and also oversight. I think it is important that we have that, and the President is asking for a blank check.

The thing that I am disappointed about is that the President had an opportunity to share something great with the country about a dialogue, but he decided to misrepresent what is in the legislation. I think that as we continue to talk about this tonight, that we continue to share with the Members, because every time we take a vote, the vote gets greater on behalf of accountability. I am hoping that we can meter up enough on both sides of the aisle to make sure that we hang in there with the men and women in harm's way and those that may be placed in harm's way and not wince to the President on some sort of floating politics that is going on right now.

I hope they have a true dialogue. I am not about the political part of this. I am about the action part of this and making sure that our men and women have what they need.

Mr. Speaker, we have done what we said we would do: make sure that they are funded; make sure that they have the equipment that they need; make sure that the men and women that went over into harm's way, that the Department of Defense regulation as it relates to the downtime that they are supposed to have with their families,

that they will have it and that if the Department of Defense was going to exit from that, then there has to be a reason why they were going to exit, for not holding their end of the deal when these men and women signed up as volunteers.

So it is very, very important that those of us here in Congress make sure that within this democracy that many of these individuals are fighting for and making sure and those before them, the veterans, making sure we can salute one flag, that we honor them through our courage and integrity when it comes down to this very issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. RYAN.

□ 1945

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I appreciate that, and I think you are exactly right. There was a misrepresentation of the facts of the legislation that was put forth to the White House. I think it's important for us, for us to go over in a snapshot of what the supplemental bill did that the President just vetoed.

What this bill did was increase by \$1.7 billion the amount of money that was going to defense health care for the troops. What it did was it increased veterans spending by \$1.7 billion above what the President wanted. We tried to make law the benchmarks that the President set up for progress in Iraq on January 10, his benchmarks, and he vetoed that.

Now, the President is vetoing his own statements, if that is not confusing enough. The key component of this piece of legislation is the piece that says that our troops can't leave here and go to Iraq if they don't have the proper body armor, if they don't have the proper equipment, if they don't have Humvees that are up armored, and if they don't have the amount of rest that they need. That is what the President just vetoed.

I think this is a pretty sad day in American history when you have the President of the United States trying to win a PR battle and using the troops as hostage. Those are not my words, those are the words of General Paul Eaton, who just said, after the statement, this is what he is saying on the President's veto, "This administration and the previously Republican controlled legislature have been the most caustic agents against America's Armed Forces in memory. Less than a year ago, the Republicans imposed great hardship on the Army and the Marine Corps by their failure to pass the necessary funding language. This time, the President of the United States is holding our Soldiers hostage to his ego. More than ever apparent, only the Army and the Marine Corps are at war—alone—without their President's support."

Terrorism around the globe is up 25 percent. Stop doing what you are doing to make terrorism increase by 25 percent. Enough of the scare tactics that if we don't fight them there, they are going to come here and get us. The

same scare tactics that they have been trying to employ for the past 5 years, this is the same group of people who told us, as was stated earlier, that the oil money would be used for reconstruction, it would only cost \$50 billion, and now we are upwards of some \$500 and some billion after the 2008 budget, going to be greeted as liberators. All of the statements that have been made in the past 5 years have been wrong, colossal mistakes.

The same people that said the mission was accomplished are the same people that are now telling us we don't want any timetables, we don't want any deadlines, we don't want any goals for when we maybe should possibly, at some point, get out of Iraq and redeploy out. We don't want any of that. They expect, after all these mistakes, all of these blunders, that somehow we are going to trust them.

I am sorry, but you know what? Between now and when the President decides it's time to get out, how many more soldiers are we going to lose? How many more kids are we going to go up and see at Walter Reed who have brain injuries and post-traumatic stress?

That's the difference between today and a year from now. That's the difference between a deadline and an open-ended war, kids getting killed and innocent Iraqis getting killed. You know, I think that this is the height of arrogance that this veto showed by the President.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Let me just add to what you just said. Members may be in their office watching, or walk here on the floor and say, what's Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK talking about, like we are independent individuals that just come to the floor just to say that we are upset.

I must say that a number of Americans live through the people they respect in government, be it Republican or Democrat. Sometimes they lead into this political process. People they get involved in government for different reasons. Some folks say I am going to latch on to this individual, or I am going to latch on to that individual. It might have been John F. Kennedy for someone else. It might have been Ronald Reagan for another lady, or whatever the case may be.

It may be Speaker of the House, who knows. But they get involved in government for whatever reason. We got involved in government because we are the same folks that went and signed up at the supervisor of elections to run for office, because we wanted to do something about what was happening here in Washington D.C. and represent the people, not just Democrats, not just Republicans, not just independents, but the people, and those that are yet unborn.

I think it's also important, when we start looking at these issues, we can just open today's Washington Post, May 1. This is May 1, and this is Tuesday. Front page, April, toll, is the

highest of 2007 for U.S. troops, 100 U.S. troops in a month.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Can I interrupt you and just make a highlight? In the President's speech today he said that the incident levels are down.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I hear what you are saying.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I hear you too.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. What is so very important for everyone to understand here, that this is above and beyond politics right now. For the President to say, the President is making a political statement, he is making a political statement because he once said, as long as I am President, we are not going to pull back any troops from Iraq. Just because he made that statement doesn't necessarily mean that should be the case.

We live in democracy, last I checked. No one stopped me walking down the street. No one kicked in my door, because I have rights. I think it's important that the President understands that we live in a democracy. So, really, in my opinion, it's hard to talk directly to the President about something when he has made a statement, and he has said, I am going to stick by it.

This is not stick by your guns, you know, stick by whatever, however the song goes. It's not appropriate to use when you talk about the man, but it's stick by whatever statement you made. I think it's important that people understand that we are going to the table of compromise, which the President said we were going to compromise, he didn't sound like someone who really wanted to compromise in this statement at 6:10 today.

He sounded like a person saying I am going to veto this, and they can come to the hill and the bottom line is the Congress is trying to do this, this and this. That is not looking at compromise, that is looking at keeping some sort of word that he has made. If you want to talk about word, I think it's important.

The good thing I like about the 30-Something working group members is the fact that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and past statements are so very, very important to today's reality.

The President said, in his comments, that he didn't believe the time lines, and he spoke out very forcefully against them. Yet in 1990, on June 5, then Governor Bush said about President Clinton, I think it's important for the President to lay out a timetable as to how long they will be involved and when they will be withdrawn, talking about another conflict.

It's good enough for President Clinton. It's not good enough for him. It's one thing for you, it's an old saying, it's one thing for you to ask somebody, you tell someone to do something when you are not willing to do it. I think it's important, after all of this death, after all of the conflict that is going on in Iraq, in the middle of the winter, in the

middle of the civil war, the American people are crying out. If it was political, and men and women weren't losing their lives, and Walter Reed didn't get a plane load of injured soldiers and Marines and airmen and the Coast Guard and sailors, then I would say, well, let's play the political role.

As far as I am concerned, when I talked to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, I share with them, because I think there is some good Members that are there that want to speak their mind. When they see me in the hall or see in the cafeteria, they say, Kendrick, you know, you were on the floor the other day, you made a lot of sense.

I say, why don't you vote differently. Why don't you vote in the emergency supplemental to send the troops the money? Because the more bipartisan votes we have, the harder it will be for the President to do what they are doing.

Listen, to the Republican minority, you guys are on your way to a permanent minority in the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate following the President on this issue of don't ask any questions, just give me a blank check. The American people, unelected a number of Republican Members of the House and Senate last Congress. Why? Because they were rubber stamping everything that the President of the United States wanted.

You have witnessed this. We have seen the difference. Now we have the opportunity to lead in a bipartisan way. We send a bill to the President, he says he is going to veto it because he doesn't like it, and he misrepresents what the bill does. I think it's important, as we go through this whole discourse of how we are going to carry out for the next, how we are going to carry out the mission in getting the men and women what they need, I think it's important that we have a little truth that rises up out of all of this misinformation.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I totally agree with you. I think the first step for most people who find themselves in a massive hole and going in the wrong direction, or following someone who continues to lead them down the wrong road, is to not follow that person any more.

What the Democratic Congress has provided is what the American people sent the majority of the Democrats down here for in November, and that is to take this war in another direction, take our foreign policy in another direction. That is what this supplemental bill has done. The American people wanted us to take care of the veterans, and we increased \$500 million for post-traumatic stress disorder, \$500 million additional for brain injuries, that is what the American people wanted, for us to fix the veterans's problem.

They wanted to make sure, they got tired of hearing about kids over there without body armor. So we made sure

that no kid could go over there, or soldier or adult who is going to Iraq will not be over there without the proper equipment, body armor, up-armored Humvees, the proper rest when they get back, for over a year, let them rest. We gave the American people what they wanted, and what the troops deserved.

To have that vetoed by a President who has been wrong on every single major foreign policy and domestic issue over the past 6 years doesn't make any sense to the American people, and it certainly doesn't make any sense to us. You look, and it's getting better. You hear this all the time, it's not getting better.

It's not. If it was getting better, do you think you would have this uproar from the American people? Do you think you would have all of these new Members of Congress if things were getting better?

In a report that just came out, National Counterterrorism Center, terrorist incidents in Iraq rose by 91 percent from 3,468 in 2005 to 6,630 in 2006 and getting worse. Innocent Iraqis are getting killed all the time, and they believe it's because the American soldiers are there, because the American presence is there. That is what they believe, and we are saying we need to re-deploy out of these major centers and stop policing a civil war. That is exactly what's happening.

One of the things we wanted to do in the supplemental that the President just vetoed is hold the Iraqi government accountable for training their own soldiers. You know, the President has always said, when they stand up, we stand down. Then they keep telling us that the Iraqi soldiers are standing up, but we are not standing down, which means they are not standing up.

We wanted to put benchmarks in there so that the Iraqi soldiers would have to meet them or were leaving. Now, you can't give people open-ended situations in which they can get out of. All we are trying to do is hold the Iraqi government responsible.

I don't like saying it, because I didn't support this war from the beginning. To go in there and knock everything around and then say you are not doing what you are doing, but the bottom line is, if you do not get yourself trained, if you do not, as a country, get your police force ready, and your military ready, we can't stay here forever.

□ 2000

And, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that is too much to ask. And the response from the President through his Secretary of State, Secretary Rice, signaled Bush's opposition to, "Any war spending bill," check this out, "that penalizes Iraq's government for failing to make progress." We are not going to punish them for failing to make progress. Are we in a therapy session here?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You know, a mayor of a U.S. city has to carry out accountability for Federal money; State governments have to account for the dollars and the progress of programs, block grant dollars, that we send to the States. Here on U.S. soil, they have to be accountable to the Federal Government. If they are not accountable, they may very well lose, what? Federal funding.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And what the President is saying, and this blank check; you know, Mr. RYAN, I really think that the President thinks that he has a rubber stamp Congress. I think that is what he is thinking, because that is what he is used to.

It is almost like having a situation if you are a small business owner and you come in and you have a shop in one county and you spend most of your time over in the other county, you come over to your other shop and you notice the way they are doing business and there aren't any accountability measures on productivity, there are no accountability measures on spending. And you are wondering why this shop, the shop in the opposite county that you are very seldom at is running on time or being cost effective, and then you come in and you say that there should be change; but then, better yet, the manager of that shop says, well, why should we change? I know we are not doing things the way you want us to do it and we know that we are spending a lot of money over here. Why should we change? Well, that is what we have right now.

The President is saying that the Iraqi elected officials and the Iraqi government don't have to be accountable and their feet should not be held to the fire. But, better yet, we have mayors, governors, State legislators, county commissioner, parish, what have you, they have to be accountable or they lose their funding or don't get their funding when you are in a war that is costing \$500 billion and counting.

When you look at these issues, Members, you can't help but say something is not right here. These are the people that are here in the United States of America, States, cities, counties that have to be accountable through Federal law and Federal appropriations. And over here, we have the Iraqi government. 3,351 of our men and women that have died, over 26-plus thousand that have been injured. And wasted money. And 100 soldiers that died last month alone. And we don't want accountable measures over here. We want to trust the administration on it, and we just want to say don't put any benchmarks there, don't even put any real goals there, don't do anything, don't ask any questions, just send us the money; you don't know what you are doing.

Well, I tell you this much. As long as this majority is here in this House of

Representatives that passed a bipartisan bill, sent it to the White House, that had accountability measures in it, my prayer tonight is going to be for those that will be there at the negotiating table there in the White House come tomorrow morning that, on both sides, that they hold the interests of the American people before you hold the interests of someone that made a promise in Iraq, in a foreign land, to say that we are going to have as much flexibility that we are going to have, and accountability measures don't need to be in place.

It couldn't come at a worse time, Mr. RYAN. The newspaper is full and the media is full of how the American people have not been told the truth. It is sickening. I feel that it is something that I didn't do in the minority. Maybe I didn't understand something in the last two Congresses that I was a part of, of watching all of this lack of information that has been given to Congress and how the administration has gotten away with this, and they have gotten away with saying, "I am sorry, that is all. What do you want from us?" We lost e-mails, CIA agents have been outed, clandestine operations abroad have been jeopardized. Men and women, there have been cover-ups. I am talking about testimony before Congress just weeks ago, things have been covered up with friendly fire of certain individuals that signed up to defend this country. Meanwhile, we are sitting here being nice guys and nice ladies and not standing and hold their feet to the fire.

This is the reason why we have a U.S. House of Representatives, the reason we have a U.S. Senate, the reason why there are three branches of government, where we don't have kingdom politics where one just says this is the way it is going to be, like it or not.

Well, I have got a message for the White House and I have also got a message from the American people. The bottom line is we live in a democracy. We would love to sit down at the table of compromise so that we can come out with a work product. But don't sit there saying what you are not going to do and what you are going to do before you sit down at the table. At least the leadership here is saying that we are going to make sure that there is accountability and that there are benchmarks there for progress, and make sure the U.S. taxpayer dollars are being sent, not just some sort of slogan of saying, well, you know, I am trying to command from over here. I mean, it didn't make sense, Mr. RYAN. But the bottom line is, the thing that is good about this whole thing is that if this was a year ago, it wouldn't even be a debate. It wouldn't even be discussed. Accountability? Oh, no. The majority would say, we wouldn't do that. And now we have the accountability, we have the strength of the majority in the Senate and the strength of the majority here in the House.

But if there was a political question, like I said before, and one would sit

back and just let it play out and say, well, one day we will get to that point. We cannot afford to get to that one day. We have to do this now. Not several months from now, now. The American people demand it, the U.S. troops deserve it, our veterans deserve it.

There are dollars in this emergency supplemental that fix Walter Reed and start to fix the veterans services in this country. There are dollars in here that help make sure that the men and women have the proper training and the equipment before they get to the field. Wow, Mr. RYAN, there is a revelation there, that we will have equipment and that we would make sure that striker forces have what they need of making sure they have a commander and a gunner and a driver, the essentials, that are trained in those categories before that striker vehicle pulls out of Camp Victory. Wow, there is something, that we are actually going to do what we said we are going to do, and we are going to take the Department of Defense's own regulations, Mr. RYAN, and put it into Federal law in this emergency supplemental; of saying that if you are going to spend these dollars, this \$124-plus billion, that you are going to be accountable in these ways, Department of Defense.

The reason why the President doesn't like this, Mr. RYAN, is the fact that it is actually doing what it said that he would do, and he doesn't want his words to actually come to fruition when it comes down to the way he described it. He came here at this podium, Mr. RYAN, we were sitting right out here. He came to that podium and said: We are going to hold the Iraqi government accountable. We are going to make sure that they train the troops. All of these things that he said, we took note as the Congress and put it into the emergency supplemental. And I think it is important that everyone understands what that is.

One other thing, Mr. RYAN. The bill provides \$21.1 billion for military health care, more than what the President requested; \$900 million of that for posttraumatic stress disorder, \$661 million to prevent health care fees increasing on our troops, \$20 million to address the problem at Walter Reed. It provides \$1.8 billion for more veterans health care, more than what the President has called for. I want to add again, \$595 million to address the backlog maintaining the VA health care facilities, \$250 million to hire additional personnel for the administration for VA health care, for the health care system, \$229 million for treatment for the growing number of Iraqi and Afghanistan veterans, \$100 million for mental health care in veterans assistance, \$83 million to speed up the processing of claims for veterans returning back from Iraq and Afghanistan. It also provides other additional above what the President calls for as it relates to supporting of the troops.

And I think it is important that people understand, \$2 billion for more stra-

tegic reserve readiness funds, which \$1 billion is for Army National Guard equipment shortfalls. This is very, very important. \$1.1 billion for more military housing and \$3 billion more for making sure that there is mine resistant ambush protection, what we call MRAPs, for troops in Iraq.

Mr. RYAN, the reason why the President is talking about additional spending, I want to make sure that every veteran in the United States of America understands that he is talking about the money that I just described and then some.

So, Mr. Speaker, I know that the President is used to having bills come to his desk that he can't even wait for it to get through the door before he signs it in tax cuts for the billionaires and those super wealthy. But this time he had legislation that's before him or he had legislation before him that he vetoed it that would have helped everyday Joe and Sue that signed up to serve this country in the way that this country asked them to serve. And, doggone it, if we can't stand behind them, then something is really wrong.

And I am really glad, Mr. RYAN, that I am not just speaking on the behalf of the "if we could, we would." But I can tell you this. What the majority leader is doing when he sits down in the Senate with the President tomorrow and the Speaker of this House what she is doing when she sits down with the President of the United States tomorrow, I want them to feel that they are wearing the breastplate of righteousness to be able to go to the President and say, these are average people, they are not sons and daughters of millionaires and billionaires. And, you know something? They are going to have rights, too. They have rights. And they have the right to be represented, and they will be represented. And I am so happy that we are going toe to toe with the President of the United States, not for politics, but for the country and for the folks that their mom and dad, they may only own one pickup truck, some of them wanted to go to college but couldn't afford to go to college, some might have gone to college and went into the Marines or to the Army or to the Navy or to the Air Force or into the Coast Guard. Those that are serving in theater as officers, we owe it to them. That is the bottom line. They deserve the representation.

I know that the President is used to getting a blank check so Halliburton can spend all the money they want to spend and burn trucks and then get paid by the Federal Government. That will no longer happen, not under this watch, not as long as we have a Democratic majority in this House and a bipartisan spirit that is willing to send him the bill.

I don't want to challenge the President to veto another bill. I want to challenge the President to come to the table and sit down, and let's have a sensible conversation and let's come up with a work product that we can all

live with. It is not going to all be that he wants, it is not going to be all that we want. But doggone it, Mr. Speaker, when they rise from that table and we get the report, the rest of us, Members of Congress, the integrity of what we have sent to the White House when it comes down to accountability, when it comes down to performance, and when it comes down to holding the Iraqi government accountable and assisting our men and women that have served and those that are coming back from theater when they need veteran services, that must be there. That has to be there. And if the President doesn't allow it, then I would say our leadership should not allow him to have his way.

As far as I am concerned, it is a no-brainer; and that is the reason why the American people overwhelmingly support our position, Mr. RYAN. When I say our position, I am not saying the Democratic majority's position, I am saying the position of the bipartisan legislation that we passed through House and Senate.

I want to thank you for your patience, sir, because I thought it was very, very important that we talk a little bit about what the President did veto and what's in the legislation so that folks don't get the misrepresentation that has been given to them over the last hour or so from the White House.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And let's be clear about this whole issue of deadlines. There was a deadline that came out of the House version, for the political junkies that are paying attention, Mr. Speaker. There was a hard deadline that came out of the House version, not in the Senate version. And the compromise that just went to the President had the goal, just the goal of maybe getting out of Iraq. No hard deadline, just the goal, because we knew that he would veto a hard deadline. And as much as we don't like it, he is the President of the United States. But there is the goal of leaving. This President, Mr. Speaker, can't even think about the goal of getting out of Iraq. He doesn't even want to talk about it.

There is no deadline in this supplemental that he just vetoed, no hard deadline at all. The language said, the goal of getting out. So let's be very, very clear.

Now, when people ask, well, why do we need to get out. People I think feel why. There's a lot of really good examples, not just from Democrats as some of our friends may like to think, but from a variety of others.

□ 2015

Here's what is happening in Iraq, as the Washington Post reported, "A department of the Iraqi Prime Minister's Office is playing a leading role," this is the Iraqi Prime Minister's Office, playing a leading role "in the arrest and removal of senior Iraqi Army and National Police Officers, some of whom

had apparently worked too aggressively to combat violent Shiite militias, according to U.S. military officials in Baghdad. Since March 1, at least 16 Army and National Police Commanders have been fired, detained or pressured to resign. At least 9 of them are Sunnis."

So now they are removing police and military people that are cracking down on the wrong, somehow the wrong group of terrorists. And some folks say this is not like Vietnam.

How about Senator HAGEL, leading Republican, conservative. I read today he had an 85 percent rating from a conservative think tank. So he is clearly a conservative Republican. He just got back from Iraq. Here's what he says in Mr. Novak's column of yesterday, or 2 days ago. "This thing is coming undone quickly, and Maliki's government is weaker by the day. The police are corrupt, top to bottom. The oil problem is a huge problem. They still can't get anything through the parliament. No hydrocarbon law, no deBaathification law, no provincial elections."

That's CHUCK HAGEL, our friend in the Senate, our colleague in the United States Senate. Republican from Nebraska; 85 percent conservative rating from a conservative group here in Washington.

We're saying that we need to change direction, Mr. Speaker. We're saying that the Iraqi government has had over 4 years to try to piece this thing together, and that we've done all that we can do. And the American people do not want to lose any more soldiers to this war. And we want a deadline. We want to get out. We want to get out with respect. We want to get out with dignity, we want to get out and protect our troops.

But it turns out that the presence of the United States in Iraq is inciting violence. We're inciting the civil war. We're the ones being attacked, as well as others around. And in April, it's been the sixth highest month of American soldiers getting killed in the entirety of the war.

Let's fix this. Let's go in a new direction. This is not time for bravado. This is not time for ego. This is time for the American people to come together and the Congress to come together, the President to recognize that this has not worked, and for us to try to re-establish some level of credibility in the world. And this President needs to listen to the will of the American people.

And I want to make one final point, because we have this tremendous debate in the country that is not always framed the right way. But I want friends who we run into in the street, and someone says I'm pro-choice and I'm pro-life, and I think we're all pro-life. But the debate has been framed as such that pro-life Americans take their role and their issues very seriously.

And I find it extremely ironic, as a pro-life Democrat who voted for the partial birth abortion bill, that this President has two vetos. His one veto

is on stem cell research, because that's a pro-life issue. And his second veto is to continue a war in which thousands of American soldiers have been killed and injured, and in which tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of Iraqi citizens, innocent, many of them, have been killed. And by keeping this open-ended, by keeping this open-ended, we know that there will be more death and destruction.

So I find it ironic that this President has two vetos; one pro-life, supposedly, and the other pro-war. And how they reconcile that on the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, I'll have no idea. But I think it is important for us to recognize how sometimes dysfunctional the philosophy, Mr. MEEK, of this President and this administration has been.

And so, let's, on the anniversary of "Mission Accomplished," and recognizing the failures of the past, let's do what Americans do, and that's fix the problem. Americans are full of problem solvers, and that's what we do in this country. We fix things, whether it's the car or the computer, or the truck, we fix things.

And I hope that the President will find it in his heart to sit down with Speaker PELOSI, to sit down with Leader REID and the leadership from this Congress, and draw on the knowledge of IKE SKELTON, the Chair of our Armed Services Committee, who's been in this institution, I think, over 30 years. Draw on the knowledge of JACK MURTHA, who's been in this Congress almost 40 years on the Defense Appropriations Committee. And stop listening to those people who got us in this situation.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You know, Mr. RYAN, it's interesting. You mentioned Chairman MURTHA. Chairman MURTHA was fine with the administration as long as he was voting with the administration in the minority, being the ranking member on Defense Appropriations. They didn't have a problem with him. As a matter of fact, he was held up as a hero, decorated veteran, long-standing member of the Defense Appropriations Committee in the House, ally, called to the White House for his advice.

As soon as Mr. MURTHA figured out that, not only was the intelligence that the Congress was given was inaccurate, and as soon as he figured out that we could not win "war militarily," and he went through a long assessment in figuring this out, and talking with professionals and talking with generals, talking with those that are still enlisted, going into theater, that's what you're supposed to do as an appropriator, making sure the American taxpayer dollars are being spent appropriately; making sure that what they're telling you here on Capitol Hill is actually reality, is the actual reality out in the field.

A lot of folks look to the Middle East when they think of the war. Well, the

effects of the war are felt right here in this country. You go to the military bases and you talk to these families. It's hard to go to many of these military bases because you see the children, you see the husband or the wife that's left behind. You see those that have lost their loved one, or those that are now, have their loved one coming back without an arm or a leg, or mentally affected by going into theater without the necessary time back home to recover mentally and physically from being in the middle of a civil war. I think it's important for us to realize that and understand that there's great gravity on this issue.

And the President may believe, in his own mind and also within his advisors that are standing around him, that he has to stick to his guns, he has to, you know, it's a fight at the OK Corral or here in the Capitol city. It's not a fight. We're all Americans. We're all on the same side. We salute one flag.

I think it's important for us to understand that there are some folks here, some of them wear blue jeans, some of them wear, you know, shop at big box stores and small stores in the small town, some folk never walked in a mall before, and if they walked in a mall they couldn't afford many of the things that are in the mall. These are a number of our, a super majority of the folks that are represented within the Armed Services. They aren't the only ones that serve their country, but many of them are financial challenged. And their voice is just as strong as the next person, or should be.

And so when we talk about just the simple things on behalf of the men and women in uniform and making sure that we bring some sense to this, because if the President had his way, we would be there, my children's children will have an opportunity to see this war continue.

And I think it's very, very important that we talk about accountability; not talk about it, act on it. And that's what we're doing. We're acting on it.

Let's look at what the President is all concerned about. The President must determine that substantial progress, I must add, is made on security, political and reconstruction benchmarks by July, 2007. Well, the President can just say, well, you know, I think that's fine. I think we're making progress.

If the President cannot certify progress, redeployment must start by July with a goal of being completed, and it has to be certified, that if in July, certification is made, redeployment of U.S. troops may begin by August 1 of 2007, with a goal to be complete within 180 days, by March 31, 2008.

This is sending a message to the Iraqi government that they have to whip themselves in shape; they have to make sure that we train the troops. Now, this is combat, this is not cutting off training. Training will continue. The things that will take U.S. troops out of harm's way will continue.

We're patrolling the streets of Baghdad. We're patrolling the streets of Tikrit and other places. You hear reports of security forces, Iraqi security forces, it's very slim. But you hear an uptick in U.S. troops that are taking place, I mean, that are taking place right now. And so I think it's all important that we understand that accountability measures are in place.

Now, Mr. RYAN, when we talk about accountable. It's interesting. On the prescription drug plan there were benchmarks. You had to be enrolled by a certain date. And if you weren't enrolled by a certain date then there would be penalties for not enrolling by a certain date.

It's very, very important that Americans and the Members of this Congress understand that anything, to bring about progress, has to have benchmarks and goals.

To kind of just say, well, hey, here's \$1 million. Don't worry about it. We don't care if you provide what you say that you're going to provide. We don't care how you spend it. You use your own discretion. You spend it. We're not going to say anything.

Well, that's been the case for about 4 years in this Iraq war. And now we're saying that we want to march by a different drummer's beat, one of accountability, one of making sure the integrity of what we tell the American people is actually, you actually see it, you actually are able to follow through with that, what you said that you were going to do, that you actually do it, Mr. RYAN.

And the problem is that the President is finding himself having to be accountable. And I can tell you right now that the political question, it's not an issue here, because the election took place last November. The people have spoken, so we don't even need to get on that issue.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Can I share with the American people and our colleagues one more? First, I thought it was interesting, and our crack staff here, the President gave his speech in front of the Jefferson Memorial. We've got a great quote, 1789, when Jefferson wrote a letter to Madison talking about war. "We have already given one effectual check to the dog of war, by transferring the power of letting him loose from the Executive to the Legislative body, from those who are to spend to those who are to pay."

And I think it would be appropriate, if Mr. Bush is going to use President Jefferson as a backdrop, that he should recognize at least his philosophy on some of these issues.

But a quote from General John Baptiste, retired general. Today, and this is on his response to the President's veto. "The President vetoed our troops and the American people. His stubborn commitment to a failed strategy in Iraq is incomprehensible. He committed our great military to a failed strategy in violation of basic principles of war. His failure to mobilize the Na-

tion to defeat worldwide Islamic extremism is tragic."

□ 2030

"We deserve more from our Commander in Chief and his administration." That is Major General John Baptiste, retired general.

It has been a pleasure being here with you today. I hope this week, with the leadership of Leader PELOSI, that we continue to stand strong behind the American people. And you can be assured, Mr. Speaker, that when Ms. PELOSI and Mr. REID are there tomorrow negotiating that they will be representing the will of the American people, the 65 percent of the American people that want a deadline to get us out.

30somethingdems@mail.house.gov for any e-mails that the Members may want to send us. The charts that we have here, some we showed tonight and some we didn't, are all on our Web site www.speaker.gov/30something. And, again, the e-mail address is 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Reclaiming my time, Mr. RYAN, I thought you made some very good points when you read the comments from the general, when you talked about the Jefferson backdrop and all today.

General Petraeus, whom I know and I have seen in theater, which I have been to Iraq twice, yes, he is a man that we all feel very good about. We know that he is carrying out a mission on behalf of his country. But we should not ride on the back of his accomplishments as a general and a commander in the field to justify the policy that is being carried out by this administration.

I tell you this, Mr. RYAN, that historians, in the very near future, are going to look back at this time and are going to wonder where the leaders were when this war and this moment right now that we are speaking in was taking place. When I used to play football, we used to have a saying, "The blind leading the blind and the two shall fall in the ditch." The bottom line is if you know that the policy has been wrong, the intelligence has been inaccurate, and that everyone that has left the administration has just about written a book about when the lie was told and how they heard it first and when it was said, I think it is important that people understand and that the Members of this House understand how history will reflect on your vote and your lack of leadership or your leadership. One of the two. If you want to listen to someone else, and I talked to my friends on the minority side, the Republican side. There are some of their former colleagues right now watching us in this debate here on the floor and wishing that they could take their vote back and stand up to the administration. Maybe, just maybe, they would still be in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I will close on this point: The bottom line is that it is time for leadership. It is time for Members on both sides of the aisle and especially on the minority side of the aisle,

the Republican side of the aisle, to go see the wizard, get some courage, and come back to this floor and back the will of the American people for accountability for our men and women in harm's way and making sure that we hold to the integrity of what the President said he would do and making sure that we hold the Iraqi government's feet to the fire as though we would hold the mayor of Youngstown, Ohio's, feet to the fire or Sioux City, Iowa. We are going to hold their feet to the fire for Federal dollars. Why can't we hold Iraqi government's feet for Federal dollars? And the President is saying don't hold their feet to the fire and don't hold my words, whatever I have said in the past, as though I meant what I said. And the bottom line is that we have a responsibility.

So as we carry out that responsibility tomorrow morning at the White House, I hope that we are at the table of compromise but also holding to the integrity of what we originally sent to the President.

There has already been compromise. The language changed from when we passed it here on the floor and it went to the conference committee. Some language was changed then because the President didn't like it, and then it came to the floor and we voted for that. And now it is to the White House, and the President says he still doesn't like it. Now we are about to sit down again with the President to talk about these issues. And then maybe, just maybe, there may be another vote here on the floor and the President may say he still doesn't like it.

So when it comes down to the speech of who is letting the troops down, I think it is going to become more and more evident to the American people and to the Congress that we have a problem on the executive branch end of not being at the table of compromise for real on behalf of our men and women in uniform. We are doing our job. Let's continue to do it.

With that, Mr. RYAN, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the leadership for allowing us to come here to address the American people in the U.S. House once again. It was a great honor.

THE BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT AND PEAK OIL

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COHEN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I want to spend the first few minutes this evening talking about oral arguments that were recently made before the Supreme Court. It was on the Wisconsin Right to Life, Incorporated, versus the Federal Election Commission.

Now, it is not clear from that title what we are talking about. What we are really talking about is a test of the constitutionality of a clause in the Bi-

partisan Campaign Reform Act that prohibits any issue advocacy advertising, electioneering they call it, 30 days before a primary and 60 days before a general election.

Now, in the State of Maryland in a nonpresidential year, our primary is in September, and it is, as a matter of fact, less than 60 days before the general in November. So we are prohibited from issue advocacy ads 30 days before the primary, which are added immediately to the 60 days before the general. So for 90 days, 3 months, before the election, we cannot communicate with our constituents.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that few people are seriously considering the next election 90 days before it occurs. So for all practical purposes, we in Maryland, and many other States like us that have primaries close to the general election, are almost completely prohibited from communicating with our constituents through issue advocacy ads.

This is political speech, and what this Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act does is to deny political speech 30 days before a primary and 60 days before a general election.

I think to put this in context to see how really important this is, we need to go back to the founding of our country and to understand why our Founding Fathers came here.

Most of them came for one or both of two reasons to escape tyrannies in the country that they lived in. One of these was the tyranny of the church. In the British Isles it was the Anglican Church, and on the continent it was the Roman Church. And in most of the country there was a state church. And these state churches, the Anglican Church in England and the Roman Church on the continent, could and did oppress other religions. So our Founding Fathers came here to escape that tyranny.

They also came here to escape the tyranny of the crown. And it is incredible to us. We can't understand it because we live in a whole different culture. But almost every country from which our Founding Fathers came had a king or an emperor which claimed and was granted divine rights. What that said was that the rights came from God to the king and the king would give what rights he wished to his people. Some magnanimous rulers gave considerable rights to their people; others gave very few. So our Founding Fathers came here intent on escaping those two tyrannies.

So it is no accident that after writing the Constitution in which it was very clear that this was to be a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, as Abraham Lincoln said four score and seven years later, and that the government was to reflect the wishes of the people, that the people through collective government would govern themselves. That was really quite implicit in the Constitution because article I, section 8 of the Con-

stitution gave very few rights to the Federal Government.

But the ink was hardly dry on the Constitution before they wondered if people would really understand that what they wanted was a very limited Federal Government and that they wanted most of the rights to belong to the people. So it is no accident, I think, that in that first amendment, which they wrote, that they addressed both of these tyrannies. From the very beginning, they wanted to make it crystal clear that we were to have freedom of religion, and they say it very simply, that they wanted to avoid what they came from, what they came here to escape, and that was an established religion, a religion established by the government. So they said very simply "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."

I don't know why we have trouble understanding that, Mr. Speaker. It is just plain English. It has nothing to do with a wall of separation between Church and State. Indeed, our Founding Fathers were deeply religious people, and they believed that we should have religious people running our government. President Adams said that our Constitution was written for a religious people which serves the purposes of no other. So it is no surprise that in the first amendment they addressed both tyrannies actually. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." Don't establish any State religion. And, furthermore, let everybody worship freely. They said "or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

And then they addressed the tyranny of the crown. And I have here an article that was written by James Bopp, who was the primary person to argue this case before the Supreme Court. He said that the American government was to be an act of self government by the people and the first amendment was to ensure the people's participation in their own government by protecting the four indispensable democratic freedoms of speech, press, assembly, and petitioning the government. Thus the first amendment was intended to deprive the government of the power to silence criticism of official actions, which is precisely what this well-intentioned but, unfortunately, otherwise directed Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act does. It limits the criticism of the people who are making our laws, of anybody in the government or anybody running for government.

The first amendment says it this way: "or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important case before the Supreme Court. It is just not an issue of political speech, which, by the way, was the speech that our Founding Fathers most wanted to protect. And how ironic that a law that

concerns elections is a law which strikes down the very speech freedom that our Founding Fathers most wanted to protect.

But this is significant beyond that, Mr. Speaker, because if our Congress can deny this right to the American people, what else can it deny? We are a great, free country, 1 person out of 22 in the world and we have a fourth of all the good things in the world. How did we get here? I think it is very instructive to ask that question and to have it answered for my satisfaction. You may come to different conclusions. But I think there are two major reasons that we are this very unique country, this 1 person out of 22 in the world, less than 5 percent of the world's population that has a fourth of all the good things in the world. And I think that both of the reasons that we are this great, free country are addressed in this first amendment. Our Founding Fathers believed that God sat with them at the table when they wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution and the amendments, and I think they were right. And I think we put at risk who we are when we deny the religious role in the establishment of our country.

□ 2045

And the 10 commandments are coming down from the court house walls. Nativity scenes appear less and less frequently in public places. And we are now, of all things, going to debate whether it's okay to say "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. Mr. Speaker, I reread the Declaration of Independence recently, I think it is well to read that every so often, and I noted that God is mentioned four or five times there. I wonder if our courts might declare the Declaration of Independence unconstitutional.

There is, on a lighter side, a really great clause here. I have no idea what the king had done, but I think that there could be no better description of our regulatory agencies, and I don't know how our Founding Fathers could have been so prophetic in describing our regulatory agencies; this is what they said, Mr. Speaker. "He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance." They had a way with words, didn't they? And I think that there could be no more concise definition of the unfortunate frequent application of our regulatory agencies and their limitation of the rights of the American people.

Well, I would encourage Americans everywhere to listen, to watch for the report of the Supreme Court. They promise to hand down their decision sometime before the end of the court's term in June. This is a very important decision, it goes beyond just this case of "Washington right to life." Just what was that case? The right to life people were sending out educational information. And unfortunately, one of

the Senators was running, and since always right to life, abortion and so forth are issues in political campaigns, the FEC decided that this was prohibited advertising, although I don't think that either Senator was even mentioned in the advertising. And so the right to life committee there, I think very appropriately, has decided to make this a Supreme Court test.

Indeed, when this law was passed many people thought that it was unconstitutional. The President thought that it was unconstitutional and said so, that the court would strike down this provision. Indeed, I think those who wrote the law thought that this provision was probably unconstitutional because they put into the law language that said that if any one part of the law was struck down, that the rest of the law was still applicable. That appears in very little of our legislation. It's an indication, I think, that they felt that this part of their legislation was on pretty shaky constitutional ground.

So I would encourage you to watch this. This is a very important decision, not just for this case, but I think that that will be read very broadly as an indication of how much power does the Congress have to infringe on our constitutionally—our God-given liberties, by the way. These came from God, they didn't come from our Constitution. All the Constitution seeks to do is to make sure that the government can't take them away from us.

I want to spend our remaining time, Mr. Speaker, talking about a subject that was highlighted today in the ACORE, the American Council on Renewable Energy, "The Outlook on Renewable Energy in America." And there are several recent articles that deal with this. There was a very interesting exchange between T. Boone Pickens and Steve Forbes. T. Boone Pickens believes that the world has reached its maximum capacity for producing oil; that try as hard as we wish, the oil-producing countries will not be able to increase their production of oil, and this phenomenon is called peak oil. And T. Boone Pickens said several weeks ago that he believes the world has reached peak oil. Steve Forbes took exception with that and indicated that he believed that the marketplace could take care of this. And if it didn't find more oil, it would find alternatives to oil so there would be no deceleration in our growth when we're growing at roughly 2 percent a year in energy use. By the way, that 2 percent a year may not sound like much, but that doubles in 35 years, it's 4 times bigger in 70 years and it's 8 times bigger in 105 years. Now the world will still be here in 105 years, and my great, great grandchildren will still be alive in 105 years. I don't have the foggiest notion where we would get 8 times the energy compared to the energy that we are using now. So clearly that is not a world we should look forward to. T. Boone Pickens had an interesting dis-

cussion with Steve Forbes; and if you use those two names on a Google search, you will pull up their conversation.

There are many people who seem to worship the marketplace, they believe that it is both omniscient and omnipotent, it is all wise and all powerful. I point out to them that there are some things that even God can't do; God can't make a square circle, and the marketplace can't make oil where there is not oil. And the marketplace cannot provide alternatives to oil faster than technology will permit us to do that.

There is an interesting article, and this one appeared on March 25 in the Washington Post. This was really an interesting article. It says, "Corn Can't Solve Our Problem." Corn, of course, is the source of ethanol, which is an alternative renewable energy. And the article pointed out that if we took all of our corn ground, every bit of it, no tortillas for Mexicans and no food for pigs and cows and chickens and no cornbread for us, all of our corn is made into ethanol, that if you discounted that for the fossil fuel input, which they said was 80 percent. By the way, there are some scientists who believe that we use more energy in producing ethanol from corn than we get out of the ethanol. I generally use 75 percent in my discussions, this article said 80 percent. But if you discount the ethanol you produce by 80 percent, it would displace 2.4 percent of our gasoline. Now, that's making all of our corn into ethanol. It would displace, after you discounted it for the fossil fuel input, because you are just burning fossil fuel in another form if you don't do that, if you discounted for fossil fuel input, it would displace 2.4 percent of our gasoline.

The authors of the article pointed out something very interesting. They said if you are really interested in saving gasoline, you could save that much gasoline by tuning up your car and putting enough air in your tires. And I heard nobody who disputed that. So if we use all of our corn for ethanol, you could save as much gasoline by simply tuning up your car and putting air in the tires.

Then on April 5 there was another very interesting article that related to these renewables, and this was an article in the Wall Street Journal, upper right, very important, above the fold. It says, "A Dying Giant: Mexico Tries to Save a Big Fading Oil Field." "Canterell's Drop Off Faster Than Expected, Turning to Technology" is the title of the article. Canterell was the name of a Mexican fisherman who kept getting his nets fouled in crude oil, and he would take these nets to Pemex, and he knew who was at fault because there was only one oil company in Mexico, and said look what you did to my net, and they would give him a new net. And he came in so frequently they finally said, gee, we didn't think we were spilling that much oil. And they asked

him, where is this oil coming from? And he says, come and I will show you. And so he took them and showed them oil kind of bubbling up out of the ocean and they drilled there. This was named after him, the Canterell oil field. It was the second largest one in the world. The largest one in the world is the Ghawar oil field, the granddaddy of all oil fields, producing still, down from what it was at its peak, still producing 5 million barrels of oil a day. Canterell, until 2 years ago, produced 2 million barrels a day. In the last 2 years, it has dropped off 20 percent in production. Thus, the article, upper right in the Wall Street Journal on April 5.

Obviously, if we don't have oil, we're going to have to find alternatives, so this relates to the subject of this conference today on alternative renewable energy.

And then May 1, there is an article about Hugo Chávez "aims to weaken the U.S.," it says, "China to get preference with oil from projects now under state control." And he was celebrating his nationalization of the fields of four companies. I think that maybe all the oil now in Venezuela has been nationalized.

In addition to nationalized oil, he made the point that he was going to make China, with whom he is partnering, a preferred customer for his oil, and it would be shipped there rather than the United States. And his aim is to hurt the United States.

This pending critical shortage of oil has resulted in a common cause by five groups in this country. The "peak oil" group is just one of the groups that have common cause. And I wanted to spend just a moment talking about these people of common cause, all of whom want to move from fossil fuels to renewables, for different reasons.

The first group are those who are concerned about national security. A letter was sent by Boyden Gray and 29 others, Jim Woolsey, a number of retired four star admirals and generals to the President, this was a couple of years ago, saying, "Mr. President, the fact that we have less than 2 percent of oil in the world and we use 25 percent of the world's oil and we import about two-thirds of what we use is a totally unacceptable national security risk. We really have to do something about that."

The next slide is on this same subject, and this is a statement by Condoleezza Rice, a very interesting statement. "We do have to do something about the energy problem. I can tell you that nothing has really taken me aback more as Secretary of State than the way that the politics of energy is—I will use the word 'warping' diplomacy around the world." Concerned About National Security. So this is one of the groups that has common cause, Concerned About National Security.

The next chart shows a second group. This group has a lot of visibility now. Al Gore came here to the House 2 or 3

weeks ago and testified before our Science Committee. This is the group that believes that greenhouse emissions, primarily CO₂ produced by burning these fossil fuels which were sequestered away, some believe as much as millions of years ago when the sun shone on subtropical seas, as in the North Sea, in ANWR, in Prudo Bay, very different world then. And the algae-like organisms grew and dropped to the bottom and silt came in and the tectonic plates opened up, this is the conjecture of how we got our gas and oil. And this was moved down to a depth where there was the right temperature, the right pressure with a rock dome over the top to contain the gas, which is why you don't find gas and oil everywhere; that with time this then was converted into gas and the volatiles, of course, were oil. Well, these are the climate change, the global warming people who really want to move from fossil fuels to the renewables. Because when you are using a renewable, you release the same amount of CO₂ perhaps, but that's the CO₂ that was sequestered in the spring. If you're burning this in the fall, you are releasing the CO₂ that was sequestered in the spring and summer while the plant was growing, so there is no net increase, it's simply recycling of the CO₂. So this is the second group that has common cause.

A third group that has common cause are the peak oil people. And this is a classic name here, Hubbert. In 1956, M. King Hubbert predicted that the United States would peak in oil production in 1970. That was considered to be totally ridiculous. The United States was then king of oil, producing I think more oil than any other, and exporting a lot of oil at that time. And just as he predicted, in 1970 we peaked in oil production, and we've been going downhill ever since.

The red curve here, by the way, is the Soviet Union. They kind of fell apart when they came unglued and now they are going to have a second small peak. And a little later we will have a chart which shows you relatively the amount of oil which each of the major oil-producing countries in the world has.

We have two bills, and my next slide is one of those. This is a bill which our office has filed. This is to support Federal research development demonstration and commercial application activities to enable the development of self-powered farms. Our rationale is that if a farm can't be energy independent, we face a very grim future.

□ 2100

This is because as fossil fuels become less and less available, we have to move more and more to alternative fuels. Many of those are going to be produced on the farm, so if the farm can't be energy independent, we are going to have some tough times ahead. So this bill challenges our American farmers to become independent, and there will be prizes for doing that.

The second one is a broad act, America's Energy for America's Future, the bipartisan DRIVE Act as it is called, the acronym, Dependence Reduction Through Innovation in Vehicles and Energy Act, H.R. 60. So there are a number of bills before Congress. These are two important ones.

What I want to do now is to go through three reports that we have had, the first one in February of 2005, the second one in September of 2005 and the third one just released in February of 2007. These reports all say, and I have a few slides from each of these so you can see, Mr. Speaker, that they were delivering the same message to the American people. Paraphrasing what they said, each of these studies concluded that peaking of oil is imminent, if not present, with potentially devastating consequences.

Let's look at the first slide. This is from the Hirsch Report. The first of these reports, February of 2005, is the Peaking of Oil Production: Impacts, Mitigation and Risk Management. This is by the very big, prestigious SAIC, Science Applications International Corporation, and Robert Hirsch was the project leader, so this is frequently referred to as the Hirsch Report.

These are some quotes from that report. They said that "the peaking of world oil production presents the United States especially and the world generally with an unprecedented risk management problem." Unprecedented. That "the economic, social and political costs will be unprecedented."

Another authority in this area, Kenneth Deffeyes, says that "the least bad outcome of oil peaking will be a deep worldwide recession that may make the thirties look like good times." Then he goes on to say, "If you don't like that, try the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse: War, famine, pestilence and death."

A second chart here from the Hirsch Report, and I will just read the highlighted part here, "oil peaking presents a unique challenge," they say. And then they make the statement "the world has never faced a problem like this." There is no precedent in history to guide us. Unprecedented. "The world has never faced a problem like this."

The next chart is another quote from the Hirsch Report. "We cannot conceive of any affordable government-sponsored crash program to accelerate normal replacement schedules."

What they are talking about, any program that would provide energy from other sources to make up for the energy that won't be there once we have reached peak oil production, and the world's demand for energy keeps going up at about 2 percent, doubles in 35 years, four times bigger in 70 years.

The next chart shows us we are not going to drill our way out of this. This is a very interesting chart. When the Reagan Administration came in, we knew that M. King Hubbert was right. We were already 10 years down the other side in 1980, it peaked in 1970. Ten

years down the other side of Hubbert's Peak, and we knew something was wrong.

What the administration proposed, and this was my second favorite president, by the way, but he was wrong in this. What the administration proposed was to incent the American oil producers to go out and drill for oil. So we gave them some tax incentives. This is what the drilling was, and, boy, did they drill. But notice, the more they drilled, the less oil they got, because we went from positive, producing a bit more than we needed, to negative, not producing as much. If the oil is not there, drilling won't find it.

By the way, we really drill for oil in our country. We have drilled more wells in our country than all the rest of the world put together. In spite of drilling all those oil wells, currently I think 530,000 operating wells, 4,000 wells in the Gulf of Mexico, more than four times as many as all the wells in Saudi Arabia, in spite of that, we have not reversed the prediction of M. King Hubbert that our country would peak in 1970, and then it was down, down, down.

The next chart is a schematic which I think depicts the situation and where we are. This is a 2 percent growth here. By the way, you can make this very steep, we simply compress the abscissa, or make it very shallow, this has a long scale on the abscissa. But it doubles in 35 years. This has been following a roughly 2 percent increase in use. Obviously, up until today we have been able to produce as much oil as we are using. It costs more because there are some tentative shortages. That is why the price of oil has gone up.

So once we get near the peak and the demand keeps going up and the production is leveling off, that yellow area represents a gap between the amount of oil which is available, the green part of the curve, and the amount of oil we would like to use, which is this ever-increasing 2 percent growth rate.

Many people believe that what we ought to do is to fill that gap. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, we can fill the gap, and I don't think it would be productive to try to fill the gap, because there is only so many options out there for filling the gap.

I have 10 children, 15 grandchildren, and 2 great grandchildren. Wouldn't it be nice if I left them a little energy? Which is why I don't vote to drill in ANWR and I don't vote to drill offshore until they convince me that the energy they get from those projects is going to be invested in alternatives. Because we have known for 27 years, since 1980, we have known that M. King Hubbert was right about the United States. We peaked in 1970. Down, down, down since then. He predicted that the world would be peaking about now.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if he was right about the United States, which is clearly a microcosm of the world, why shouldn't he be right about the world and why shouldn't we be doing something about that?

Well, in their report, I think unwisely, the Hirsch Report looked at ways of filling the gap. The next chart shows a stylized approach at filling the gap.

What it shows is when you decide to start doing these things, you won't get anything for quite a while. We have, what, about 3½ years before you get anything. So you have to anticipate the need before you start.

Notice that enhanced oil recovery, coal to liquid, heavy oil, gas to liquid, these are all finite resources. They won't last all that long. The only renewable one, the only one that will continue there is efficient vehicles. So they now are trying to fill the gap with clearly finite resources. There is only so much oil. If you get it there, it won't be there later. There is only so much coal. If you liquify it now, you won't liquify it tomorrow. There is only so much heavy oil. If you use it now, you won't be using it later.

The second chart from the Hirsch Report shows something very interesting, and we don't have time this evening to look at all of the information on this chart. But they are making an assumption here, which this is repeated from the Energy Information Agency, this is not what the Hirsch Report is predicting, by the way. They are repeating information from the Energy Information Agency. And somehow the Energy Information Agency, which stands not quite alone, but near live alone in this view, believes that we will find as much more oil as all the oil that now exists which is recoverable.

If we find that much oil, it will simply push peaking out to 2016. This chart was in 2000, and if we didn't find any more oil, it was going to peak then and start down, which is about what M. King Hubbert had predicted.

By the way, conventional oil probably peaked about then, but we are now getting a lot of oil from things like the Canadian tar sands, the heavy oils, the heavy sour oils and so forth. So we are now getting a fair amount of oil from what is called unconventional oil sources. But the conventional oil probably has already peaked.

They show another very interesting thing here, that if you use enhanced oil recovery and get it more quickly, you may move the peak out, what, about 20 years. But notice what happens after that. You can't pump it later if you pumped it now, and look how it falls off after they have used enhanced oil recovery to get it sooner.

The next chart is a very interesting one. This is projections by the Energy Information Agency. There is a lot we could talk about on these charts, because they are using data from the USGS and the USGS was using a frequency thing, which somehow gets translated to P here. I guess if you don't write clearly, F can look like a P. I have no idea how they got from frequency to P.

They say that we have three possibilities for the amount of oil that we

are going to find in the future. The P is for probability. They say that there is the 95 percent probability. They say the mean is the 50 percent probability, if in fact it is probability. Obviously if it is 95 percent probable, it is a whole lot more probable than 50 percent probable. But they somehow take these frequency figures that USGS used, and what they did with frequency was simply make a lot of assumptions and they ran models from these assumptions and they ran these things many times and they got different numbers. So the frequency indicates the number of times that they predicted that quantity of oil. So this has to do only with their simulations and not with reality in the field.

But somehow Energy Information Agency translated the F to P and to 95 percent probability, 50 percent probability, which they said was the mean. Now, if it is a frequency thing, the 50 percent thing could be the mean, but in probabilities it doesn't make any sense.

They were predicting in, what, a little bit before 2000, that if it followed the 95 percent probability, you would get that much oil. If you followed the 50 percent probability, it would follow this line, which they said was the most probable. And the 5 percent probability would follow this line.

What they didn't do, of course, was to include the other half. When you see the path of a hurricane it is a pretty narrow for today. Tomorrow it will be uncertain, because we are uncertain about it. The 50 percent has another line which goes down here and the 5 percent another line that goes down here. Really a big funnel. If you are only 5 percent certain what the future is going to be, obviously it is a big range that you are looking at.

But look at what the actual data points follow. The actual data points follow, as you would expect them to, follow the 95 percent probability, because that is what 95 percent probability means. It is more probable than 50 percent probability.

The next chart shows, and this again is from the Hirsch Report, we are going to go over two more of these reports quickly. This is the Hirsch Report. They here have listed the projections of some of the world's experts on when we would reach peak oil.

Notice this first group, 2007, 2009, 2007, 2009, 2010, 2010, then 2010 to 2020, and then a couple of them, one no visible peak and then CERA and Shell say it would be after 2020 or 2025 or after.

The next chart shows a very interesting chart produced by Cambridge Research Associates. This is the CERA, Cambridge Energy Research Associates. They produced this chart to try to convince the reader that they shouldn't have any confidence in the predictions of M. King Hubbert. Let's look at this.

The total U.S. production is the red. The green is the actual lower 48, which, by the way, is what M. King Hubbert

predicted. He didn't have in his prediction any oil from Alaska or any oil from the Gulf of Mexico. He was looking just at the lower 48. And the yellow ones here are Hubbert's lower 48 prediction.

He said that it would follow a curve like this, and the lower 48 actually followed a curve as shown by the green squares there, and CERA says that proves that M. King Hubbert was wrong and you shouldn't have any confidence in it. I think the average person looking at that says, gee, those green ones are pretty darn close to the yellow ones and he may a pretty good prediction, didn't he?

Now why did the red ones deviate from it? That is because we found a bunch of oil in Prudo Bay. A fourth of our total oil production came from Prudo Bay. So there was a little kick here in it. But notice, down, down, down after that. There was just a blip in the slide down the other side of Hubbert's Peak produced by this huge oil find in Prudo Bay from which a fourth of our oil has come from the last number of years. And you can't even see there the contribution of that fabled oil discovery in the Gulf of Mexico which is now being pumped by about 4,000 wells.

The next chart is a chart by CERA, and they put this in an article in which they said that this whole peak oil notion was a farce and them are debunking it. But, boy, when I looked at that chart, it looks like it has a peak to me. It goes up and it goes down. And they said it is going to be an undulating plateau.

□ 2115

By the way, they now are predicting, using the USGS figures, that we are going to find as much oil as all the oil that exists which is recoverable in the world.

Leherrere says that this is absolutely implausible considering all the advances we have had in discovery of oil, computer modeling and 3-D seismic and so forth.

If we don't find that extra oil, and you can make up your mind whether you think we are going to find it or not, we would have been peaking about here. Boy, that is about now, isn't it.

If we find much more oil, we will be peaking later. They have an enormous amount of oil from unconventional there. Maybe, maybe not. We are getting a million barrels a day from the Canadian tar sands. That is a part of the 84-85 million barrels a day that we are burning, a little more than 1 percent. And that is not sustainable because they are using huge amounts of energy from natural gas which will run out. The vein will shortly be ducking under a big overlay so they will have to develop it in situ rather than shovel it out with a shovel that shovels 100 tons, they dump it in a truck that holds 400 tons, and they take it and cook it to get this real heavy, stiff oil out. When it flows, they then mix it with a vola-

tile so it will keep flowing in the pipelines. They know it is not sustainable, and they are going to run out of natural gas. They are thinking about building a nuclear power plant; and, furthermore, shortly they will need to develop in situ and they have no idea how to do that.

Now we are going to look at some charts from the second study. All three of these studies are saying essentially the same thing: The peaking is either present or imminent with potentially devastating consequences if we don't do something about it.

The question everybody needs to be asking is why aren't we doing anything meaningful about this? We are barely nibbling at the margins of the problem, and this is a huge problem.

The U.S. Corps of Engineers, experts Colin Campbell, Jean LaHerrere, Brian Fleay, Roger Blanchard, Richard Duncan, Walter Youngquist and Albert Bartlett, who is no relative of mine, and I wish I had some of his genes. If you do a Google search for Albert Bartlett and energy, you will pull up the most fascinating one-hour lecture I have ever heard. He has given it over 1,600 times. It is honed to perfection. You will be fascinated by it. Please pull it up and read that article.

They have all estimated that a peak in oil production will occur around 2005. This is concurred with by the CEOs of several companies.

The next chart is another one from the Corps of Engineers, and they are quoting Jean Leherrere. The USGS estimate implies a fivefold increase in discovery rate and reserve addition for which no evidence is presented. This is his quote. "Such an improvement in performance is, in fact, utterly implausible given the great technological achievements of the industry over the past 20 years, the worldwide search, and the deliberate effort to find the largest remaining prospects."

This is a repeat of the chart that we just looked at. It shows the peaking currently if we don't find this additional oil, and it shows that if we find as much more oil as all of the oil we have found now, that the peak is pushed out to only 2030 or so. It is most unlikely that will happen.

Another chart from the Corps of Engineers study, this is the second of these big studies, let me just refer to the underlying part. "A careful review of all of the estimates leads to the conclusion that world oil production may peak within a few short years after which it will decline. Once peak oil occurs, then the historic patterns of world oil demand and price cycles will cease." With limited supply, the price of oil will go who knows where.

The next chart, again from the Corps of Engineers study, "Oil is the most important form of energy in the world today. Historically, no other energy source equals oil's intrinsic qualities of extractability, transportability, versatility and cost. The qualities that enabled oil to take over from coal as

the frontline energy source for the industrialized world in the middle of the 20th century are as relevant today as they were then."

Just a word about the quality of this oil. One barrel of oil has the energy equivalent of 12 people working all year. You pay just a little over \$100 for it refined. You are hiring the equivalent of a person working for you for a whole year for less than \$10. If you have some trouble getting your mind around that, imagine how far that gallon of gasoline or diesel, still cheaper, by the way at \$3 a gallon than water in the grocery store, how far that takes your car or your SUV.

I drive a Prius. A gallon takes me about 50 miles. How long would it take me to pull my Prius 50 miles? I can't pull it unless it is on the level, and then I work really hard and go very slowly. If it is uphill, I couldn't do it without a come-along and hooking it to the guardrail or a tree or something and inching it up the hill. How long would it take me to pull my Prius that 50 miles that a gallon takes me.

Another way of looking at the quality of fossil fuels is to recognize that if a strong man works hard all day, you can get more work out of an electric motor for less than 25 cents worth of electricity. That may be humbling to recognize that we are worth less than 25 cents a day in terms of fossil fuel energy; but that is why they say in this report, "Historically, no other energy source equals oil's intrinsic qualities."

My next chart, this is a fairly recent article and they say, "The current price of oil is in the \$45-57 per barrel range." It is now \$64, \$65, \$66. "It is expected to stay in that range for several years." It didn't, it went up to \$78. It has now dropped. There was a fear factor that looks like it was about \$18 because it pretty quickly dropped from \$78 to \$60 when the fear factor went away.

Oil prices may go significantly higher and some have predicted \$180 a barrel in a few years. This is from the Corps of Engineers study, and they are a very credible organization.

Now I am going to move to a third study, a GAO study. I asked for this study because I wanted to see if it corroborated the conclusions drawn by the other two studies. This one came out in February 2007, and it was embargoed for 30 days and then it came out a month or so ago. "Crude oil. Uncertainty about future oil supply makes it important to develop a strategy for addressing a peak and decline in oil production."

This is their curve for Hubbert's peak, peaking about 1970. This is the increased production from Prudhoe Bay, but down, down, down. Now we are at about half of the oil we were producing in 1970. That is in spite of the fact that we have drilled more oil wells than all of the rest of the world put together.

The next chart is very interesting. This chart has only the top 10. We are

not in the top 10. This lists the top 10 companies on the basis of oil production and reserves. Here it is on the basis of production and reserves.

Our big oil companies, ExxonMobil, Royal Dutch Shell, BP, you see those names on the pumps, they produce this much. They don't even appear in the top 10 over here. They don't have any meaningful oil reserves. They are pumping somebody else's oil. The top 10 reserves over here are Luke Oil, 2 percent, and then all of the rest of the top 10 are guess where, Saudi Aramco, National Iranian, Iraq National, Kuwait, Venezuela, Dubai, and so forth. Libya, Nigeria.

The next chart shows the same kind of data in a pie chart. Some people like to look at pie charts. This is the world oil reserves, OPEC and non-OPEC nations.

Now we have blown up the OPEC nations here to see who owns most of the oil. Obviously Iran, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Venezuela and so forth contain the oil there. By the way, Saudi Arabia is not included in that pie chart because it is so big it stands alone.

The next chart shows pictorially what these have shown in these little pie charts. This is what the world would look like, the world according to oil, and this is what the geography of the world would look like if the nation had square miles relative to the amount of oil it has. If the amount of oil determined the size of a country, this is what our world would look like.

Boy, look at Saudi Arabia. It dominates everything. The United States, we are squeezed over here, but we are in good shape compared to India. Look at India with a billion people and China with 1.3 billion. Boy, are they dependent on somebody else's oil.

Russia, a huge oil exporter, but they don't have that much oil compared to the Middle East countries. This is very sobering. What it shows is that most of the oil in the world, and the President said it very well in his State of the Union message, most of the oil in the world is controlled by countries that don't even like us. Just look at the names of these countries, and you can figure that out.

Venezuela dwarfs us. They have several times as much oil as we have. Alaska, that is pretty big, a half or third of what we have in the lower 48.

The next chart, this is from a very interesting speech that I hope to spend an hour talking about next week here on the floor. It was given 50 years ago by Hyman Rickover in 1957. He said some really fascinating things in that speech.

Mr. Speaker, you will be amazed at how prophetic Hyman Rickover was. He is the father of our nuclear submarine. We generally think of him in that venue, but he was wise beyond his time relative to energy. You will be amazed at the predictions and observations he made.

"High energy consumption has always been a prerequisite of political

power." Boy, look at where the political power is going to be if political power is relative to the amount of energy you have. Just think of that last chart that we looked at.

"Ultimately, the nation which controls the largest energy resources will become dominant." I read that and I thought of China who is now going around the world buying oil wherever they can find it for sale. In terms of the economies of buying oil, whoever has the dollars today buys it and it doesn't matter who owns it. That may change in the future. That may be a very true statement in the future.

"If we act wisely and in time to conserve what we have," and we obviously didn't do that. I have made the observation that when we found that incredible wealth in the ground, we should have stopped as a culture and asked: What can we do with this to get the most good for the most people for the longest time? That is clearly not what we did.

With no more responsibility than the hog who found the feed room door open or the kids who found the cookie jar, we just pigged out. We want to continue doing that. The call now is to drill, drill, drill.

As I mentioned earlier, I have 10 kids, 15 grandkids, and 2 great-grandkids. I am going to leave them an incredible debt. Not with my votes. Look at them, and I didn't do it. But am I also going to leave them a world largely devoid of easily accessible energy, which is why, again, I don't vote to drill in ANWR and offshore.

"If we act wisely and in time to conserve what we have and prepare well for the necessary future changes, we shall ensure this dominant position for our own country."

We haven't done that.

□ 2130

Because we have not done that, we now have a real challenge. By the way, I have no doubt that the American people, with proper leadership, which I do not see a whole lot of for the moment, can meet this challenge. We are the most creative, innovative society in the world.

A couple of real quick charts here because our time is running out.

This chart looks at proven oil reserves by investment risk, and about a third of this pie chart; there is no investment because it is not allowed by the companies that own it. Then there is high investment risk. In some of the other countries, you make an investment risk like Hugo Chavez just did. They take the facilities away from you and nationalize them. There is a tiny piece of the pie chart here that has a low investment risk.

The next one looks at political risk, how unstable are these countries, what is the political risk. Boy, more than a third of it high risk, nearly a third of it minimum risk. So you look at these two risks, and that really means that we need to look carefully at the future.

Next chart, and this is an interesting one. This is a prediction of when we will peak. Now, several authorities here do not have any idea exactly when, but they said it could occur as early as this and maybe as late as that, but all of these have occurred before 2020. All of these have occurred before 2020. Very few believe that peaking could not occur before 2020.

The next chart, and I wish we had more time to look at this because this is a fascinating chart. This chart shows the discovery of oil. These bar graphs are the discovery. Obviously you add up all those bars, you will get the total amount of oil that we have found. You will get the same thing if you put a smooth curve over there. The area under the curve will equal the oil we have found.

The solid black line here is the oil we have used. Now, obviously up until about 1980 we were finding more than we use, but since then, we have been borrowing from what we found and we are now peaking.

And what will the future look like? They are predicting here we will find it not smooth like that, but on average that much, less and less. Most experts believe, by the way, we have found about 95 percent of all the oil we will find.

What will the future look like? We can change a little of the detail, but we cannot pump what is not there. If you use enhanced oil recovery, you may extend this out a little bit and it will drop off very quickly, as you saw on that chart.

The next chart is one which I really think is very productive to look at, and Hyman Rickover mentions this. In 8,000 years of recorded history, and we have here only the last 400 or so years of recorded history, roughly 400 years, but in 8,000 years of recorded history, the age of oil will occupy about 300 years. We have been about 150 years into the age of oil. Hyman Rickover in his speech of 50 years ago said that we are about 100 years in what will be called a golden age, and clearly it has been a golden age.

World population, if we put it on this chart, exploded at just about that rate, and if we reach peak oil, it will drop off the other side as quick as we have gone up. Notice what happened in the 1970s, Arab oil shock, more efficiency. If that had not happened, by the way, we would be in even more trouble today because up until the Carter years we had used as much oil every decade as we had used in all of previous history. That means if we had used half the oil, which is I think where we are now, you would have 10 years at current use rate.

Well, what do we do? I would just like to note in the remaining minutes that we have here, that I believe America is up to this challenge. There is no exhilaration like the exhilaration in meeting a big problem and overcoming it, and properly motivated, we are the most creative, innovative society in the world.

I said there were five groups early on. I mentioned only two of them. The two other groups that have common cause in moving to alternatives, one of those is the environmentalists that believe that our air is polluted enough; why would you want to burn more fossil fuels and pollute it more. The other is a group who is longing for a return to dominance in manufacturing. We are very creative. We could become a major exporter of the technology for exploiting these renewable alternative sources.

So there are these five groups. I do not want to argue with whether we have global warming or not because what they want to do for global warming is exactly what we need to do for peak oil. It is exactly what we need to do for national security. It is exactly what we need to do to clean up our air. It is exactly what we need to do to have some manufacturing superiority again. So these five groups have common cause.

We need to buy time by an aggressive conservation program. We need to use it wisely, to invest the time and energy in renewables that will pay off. The benefits, of course, I have indicated. We will now be a major exporting country again.

The last chart, and I am sorry we do not have time to look at this more, but we are very much, and I will close with this, like the young couple that has gotten a big inheritance. Fifteen percent of what they spend they earn, 85 percent is from the inheritance, and it is going to run out. Fifteen percent of what we use, more than half of that nuclear power, is renewables. The 85 percent is fossil fuels which will not last. So the big challenge is the challenge the young couple has. Obviously in the future they are going to have to either spend less or earn more, and that is exactly the challenge we have.

Last chart, and I really want to look at this one in the moments we have here. It is not like we are going to be living in a world that is not comfortable. Interesting chart here, it shows on the ordinate how satisfied you are with life. On the abscissa, it shows the amount of energy you consume. We are way out there in the far right. We use more energy per capita than anybody else in the world. But notice, all these countries, 20 some of them that use less energy than we, which are happier with their station in life than we are. You do not need to use the amount of energy we use to be happy.

We have a really challenging future. I think we are up to it with proper leadership.

IMMIGRATION POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COHEN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today was May Day, and there were

demonstrations across America in favor of a more open immigration policy, an immigration policy that I might add has already resulted in 15 to 20 million illegals being present in our society. The American people need to pay very close attention to this issue.

Several weeks ago, the President of the United States took advantage with Congress being out of session to give a major immigration policy speech down along the border in Arizona. Flanked by dozens of border patrol officers, President Bush stuck to the usual script, securing the border, yes, but first a guest worker program must be set up that includes giving Social Security benefits to illegals, to those people who have been working here illegally, and of course, part of the program must be to legalize the status of those millions of illegal immigrants who already reside in our country.

I have observed in my 30 years in Washington that when a President initiates a major policy speech on a controversial issue while Congress is in recess, it usually is because what he is advocating is indefensible and that he is seeking to minimize criticism.

While the President was posturing with the border patrol, we Members were back in our districts listening to the pleas of our constituents. The American people are begging their government to save their families from the onslaught of illegal immigration.

Instead of meeting with America's elite who live behind gates and work at corporate boardrooms and whose kids attend private schools, President Bush should be talking to people who are watching their children's public schools, their community hospitals and the security of their own neighborhoods being brought down by a massive flow of foreigners, illegally establishing themselves in our country.

If this President pushes through his so-called comprehensive immigration plan, which will legalize the status of those who have broken our laws and are in this country illegally, America's current 15 to 20 million illegal residents within a decade will mushroom to another 40 to 50 million.

Wake up, America. We are about to lose our country. Wake up, America. The President and Congress are not watching out for you.

The comprehensive immigration legislation that is being bandied around town by this President and by Members of Congress will be a green light to 100 million people throughout the world to do anything they can do to get to our country because we do not have the will to stop them. No matter how impenetrable the defense, no matter how diligent the border patrol, there will be no stopping them. Give them benefits, give them jobs, give them health care, give them every right to the treasures that belong to the citizens and legal immigrants who are in our country and they will come from overseas, and there will be nothing that we can do to stop them because we have given them

the greatest incentive to come here, even though they are breaking our laws in doing so.

Tens of millions of new illegals are bringing down the wages of our middle class, some carrying disease right into our schools and communities, some criminals, many in need of Social Security, education and health benefits, all to be taken, of course, from the resources that are dedicated to Americans so that our American people and legal immigrants will have these resources available to them. That is where all of that is going to come from. Who is going to pay the price? The American people will pay the price, not the American elite, the American people.

Wake up, America. You are about to be assaulted, and your elected representatives are not on your side. No one will stop the horde if this so-called comprehensive bill goes through. Who is going to stop them? Not the border patrol.

And what about the border patrol, America's most important defense in this battle against such an invasion? While the President stood with border patrol agents down in the Yuma sector in Arizona, praising them for their hard work, saying how proud he was of them, the border patrol agents were painfully aware that two of their fellow officers languish in Federal prisons. They are being held in solitary confinement for doing their job, the job that the President claims he wants the border patrol agents to do.

It is the President's appointees who have perpetrated upon this border patrol the worst miscarriage of justice that I have ever witnessed. Ignoring pleas for mercy and pleas for justice, ignoring the clear misconduct of his protégé, U.S. Attorney Johnny Sutton, the President has backed up his employees at the expense of border patrol agents, especially these two, Ramos and Compeon.

The President has permitted his Justice Department to throw the book at these two border patrol agents for stopping a drug dealer, and perhaps, just perhaps, maybe there was some procedural errors that they were involved in. This administration turned what is, at worst, procedural violations, that they did not file the reports, even though there are questions as to whether their supervisors should have filed the reports or not; in fact, the rule states that the supervisors will file such reports, that this administration has turned that lack of proper paperwork into felonies that have put Ramos and Compeon, two border patrol agents who have well-served our country, defended our families with their lives, they are now languishing in prison for 11 years of hard time.

President Bush backs up his appointees who either incompetently or maliciously chose to prosecute our law enforcement officers, while at the same time, I might add, chose to grant immunity to the drug smuggler who they stopped.

U.S. Attorney Johnny Sutton claims that he had no choice in this matter, the biggest lie of all. U.S. Attorney Johnny Sutton had plenty of choices to make, and as a prosecutor, that is what prosecutors do. They make mistakes on who to prosecute. That is one of the fundamental decisions they have to make. He was faced with a decision, either prosecute the drug dealer who had \$1 million worth of drugs that he was smuggling into our country, or prosecute the border patrol agents by turning their procedural mistakes into breaking the law, and thus, into felonies for supposedly covering up the breaking of the law.

Our U.S. Attorney chose to give immunity to the drug smuggler who was, of course, smuggling \$1 million worth of drugs into our country, but not to give immunity to the border patrol agents for procedural missteps.

□ 2145

That was his decision. He decided, our U.S. Attorney decided to back the drug smuggler and destroy the Border Patrol agents, and he knew exactly how that decision would affect the lives of Ramos and Compeon.

Agents Ramos and Compeon should have been commended for their courageous service in stopping an illegal drug smuggler from bringing in over \$1 million worth of drugs into our communities. If they had stopped a terrorist with a nuclear bomb, I am sure by now they would be national heroes. Instead, the President refuses to take a sober look at the facts of this case and issue pardons for these men, the pardons that justice demands and the American people are crying out for, and the Border Patrol, throughout this country, is looking at as a sign whether this President supports the job they are doing.

But, of course, they won't issue any pardon. Even to let these men out on bond pending their appeal would require an admission that some loyal Bush appointee was wrong.

Instead, the President continues to back his long-time buddy at the Justice Department, Johnny Sutton, even though the decision he made, instead of going after the drug dealer, to go after the Border Patrol agents and destroy their lives, was obviously a bad call.

The President has ignored the rotten smell that is coming from this case. He has ignored the fact that the Department of Homeland Security operatives went to Congress and intentionally lied to Members of Congress on investigative subcommittees, claiming that Ramos and Compeon had joked about going out and shooting a Mexican the day they intercepted this drug dealer and the incident ensued.

Ramos and Compeon are Mexican Americans. They are Americans of Mexican descent. Their wives are Americans of Mexican descent. Their children are Americans of Mexican descent. Yet we had members of the Department of Homeland Security from

this administration lying to Congress saying these men wanted to go out and shoot Mexicans. They lied over and over again, and this administration has lied over and over again, dealing with the Ramos and Compeon case.

What we have here is a situation where the supervisors who were on the scene within minutes of them stopping this drug dealer, and when he escaped over the border, those supervisors did not ask Ramos and Compeon about the incident. Ramos and Compeon didn't comment, because they knew that procedures were that they would have had to do 5 or 6 hours worth of more work, filling out more paperwork, bringing in the FBI.

Both the supervisors and Ramos and Compeon knew that this would have just created a lot more work for them on their own time. They decided not to do it, because the guy had gotten away, so why report that shots were fired, and they didn't even think they had hit him.

Well, making it worse, of course, as we know, the supervisors, who were actually threatened by the U.S. attorneys, the prosecutors in this case, were threatened that if they did not testify against Ramos and Compeon, and claimed that, in fact, there was an attempt to cover up this incident, rather than just being a case of where they were trying not to have to put themselves in a position where they were going to have to do all this more paperwork, they threatened the supervisors to put them in jail. Of course, the supervisors buckled. They didn't want their lives to be destroyed.

Well, let me put it this way. What we have got here, failure to report, to file a report, is a procedural violation. It is not a crime. This U.S. Attorney chose to go after the Border Patrol agents instead of the drug dealer. He chose to make a procedural violation into a crime, into a felony.

Again, threats were made against the supervisors, so what do you have there? A witness being threatened by the prosecution. We have seen this across our country. We know when prosecutors try to get somebody and squeeze them to say what's the truth or not the truth in order to protect themselves. They will stretch the truth.

So either they went along, the supervisors went along on the assault on Ramos or Compeon, or they too would be prosecuted. Everybody hears this, gets the picture. The whole thing stinks. Ramos and Compeon are taking a fall to demonstrate to all Border Patrol agents that if they use their guns to secure our borders, even from drug smugglers, they will be destroyed. They will be targeted and destroyed by this administration because that is this administration's policy.

Yes. Now, what does that policy mean? Where did that come from? If Border Patrol agents can't use their guns at the border, how can we control our borders?

Now, of course, the Border Patrol agents are afraid, and, rightfully so, to

get out of their car if they see a potential drug dealer driving across. What a horrible message, what a horrible decision. Yet this President has to stick with his appointees.

Clearly, border security is not a priority for this administration. There may be well some other priority at work, some other agenda that we don't know about. Granting immunity to this drug smuggler, granting immunity to the people who smuggle drugs, human traffickers, which happened in another case, I might add, where another law enforcement officer ended up in jail, doing this, while granting immunity to the human traffickers and the drug smugglers, suggests the bizarre nature of this administration's border and immigration policy.

If anybody denies it or defies it who works for the Border Patrol or anyone else in the government, this administration, through Ramos and Compeon, through his prosecutors, have made it clear that anyone who defies their policies will be vilified and destroyed. Note, U.S. Attorney Johnny Sutton, Johnny Sutton, the U.S. Attorney labeled Ramos and Compeon in the media as "corrupt." There are quotes around corrupt.

This is the U.S. Attorney himself, not the prosecutors who were filing or arguing the case. The U.S. Attorney labeled Ramos and Compeon corrupt, a clear lie. Neither of these two agents have ever been accused of corruption.

Ramos, a 10-year veteran of the Border Patrol, an officer in the Naval Reserve, had been nominated Border Patrol agent of the year. He was nominated for that award. To be considered for that award, just prior to this incident, this is a corrupt officer? Ramos and Compeon are clean. They have never been accused of that. Yet the U.S. Attorney is on the radio calling them corrupt.

Something stinks about that situation, doesn't it. U.S. Attorney Johnny Sutton lied and claimed that Ramos and Compeon were corrupt, and then he threw the book at them.

At the same time, he gave a professional drug smuggler a "get out of jail free" card and had his prosecutors lie to the jury telling them that the drug smuggler was a novice who was only trying to raise money to buy medicine for his sick mother. That's what the jury was told when the prosecutors at that time knew, they made that argument to the jury, that this was a novice at one time to raise money for a sick mother, they knew that drug smuggler had already been involved in a second drug smuggling incident that they knew of.

This is while he was under immunity for the load that he had been intercepted for bringing into the country by Ramos and Compeon. By the way, it's not just Ramos and Compeon, of course. We are talking about a border and immigration policy by this administration that is bizarre, that is incomprehensible, that is totally confused

and leads to many, many questions. Why is, for example, why is this President, if, yes, Border Patrol and immigration control issues are important to him? Why is the President holding the security of our borders hostage to, basically, making sure that we can't proceed with defense and other border security measures unless we also pass a bill that includes the provision of legalizing the status of 15 to 20 million people who are already in this country illegally?

What do those two issues have to do with one another? If he believes in the security of the border, why is he demanding also that in order to secure the border we have to legalize the status of 15 to 20 million illegals, by the way, which will lead to a massive hoard of new illegals, of course, that no fence will stop. No one is being fooled by this call for a comprehensive reform.

It is a code word for amnesty, legalizing the status of those who are here illegally. The President has destroyed his own credibility by playing such word games as defining amnesty in a way such that nobody accepts the definition. It is a totally unacceptable and irrational definition of the word "amnesty."

Why the President has chosen over and over again to try to play that kind of word game, I don't know. The chaotic and confused picture of this comprehensive border policy, and the things that are going on in our border, suggests that there are other forces that are at play. What are those forces? There are certainly very powerful interest groups that play here in Washington, and there may well be a hidden agenda that is being foisted on the American people.

The President's own words suggest this. During the February 14, 2007, press conference, President Bush said the following, "I believe that in order to enforce the borders, we need a temporary worker program so that people don't try to sneak into the country to work, that they can come in an orderly fashion and take the pressure off the Border Patrol agents that we have got here so that the Border Patrol doesn't focus on workers that are doing their jobs that Americans won't do, but are focusing on terrorists and criminal elements, gun runners, et cetera, to keep the country, both of our countries, safe, Mexico and the United States, safe."

Mr. Speaker, I am not really sure that it's the responsibility of the United States government, to have a high priority of keeping Mexico safe. Just what is being proposed, how will that affect Mexico at the expense of the American people?

Just whose interest is our government representing? During his Yuma speech, the President proclaimed the border "should be open to trade and lawful immigration and shut down to criminals and drug dealers and terrorists and coyotes and smugglers and people who prey upon innocent life."

How does that square with the President's U.S. Attorney and long-time friend and protege, Johnny Sutton, who he backs to the hilt, throwing the book at our Border Patrol agents and other law enforcement officers over procedural errors, but at the same time letting drug smugglers go, letting people who are smuggling illegal immigrants into our country go?

Of course, that is not the only thing, Ramos and Compeon and what's going on with our law enforcement. The policies themselves are incomprehensible.

According to a recent AP story, 98 percent of all illegal border crossers are not even prosecuted, 98 percent. Between October 1 of 2000 and September 30 of 2006, nearly 5.3 million illegals were simply escorted back across the Rio Grande and turned loose. Well, no wonder they don't give up, and they end up coming back a second or third or fourth time.

The Justice Department claims it has "higher priorities than going after ordinary illegal immigrants." They said they elected to pursue a more elective strategy going after drug smugglers and criminals. Really? Tell that to Border Patrol agents Ramos and Compeon, who are languishing right now, right now as we speak, in solitary confinement in Federal prisons, all because U.S. Attorney Johnny Sutton, close friend and protege of the President, decided to grant immunity to the drug smuggler in order to testify against the Border Patrol agents.

Not only did Sutton allow this criminal to get away with it once, as I stated, this very same drug smuggler was involved with a second shipment. He has probably been involved with many more shipments of drugs.

But, they knew that he was involved with a second shipment even before Ramos and Compeon went to trial, and that information was kept from the jury. Let me repeat that, information that the very same drug smuggler that had been stopped by Ramos and Compeon, that very same man who now Ramos and Compeon are being tried for at that moment for violating procedures because he was just a novice, a man who had never done this before, this was his first attempt at drug smuggling. The fact that they knew of a second load that would have already happened by the time of the trial, that was kept from the jury.

The jury was presented by the prosecutor, a lie, that this man was obviously a novice, and had never been involved in drug smuggling before. The jury was told the drug smuggler was, as I say, first-time novice, to pay for his mother's medicine.

□ 2200

And the U.S. Attorney knew that he had already been involved in a second drug load, and that was kept from the jury. Something really stinks about this case. This is the same U.S. Attorney that has been claiming all along, along with the prosecutors, that the drug smuggler wasn't armed.

Now, we know that both of the Border Patrol agents suggest that as the drug smuggler is running away from them to get across the border, he turned in a way that appeared to be aiming something in their direction, and they didn't have much time to think about it and they fired their weapons. Now, whether or not he had a gun is impossible to prove. He got away. He went across the border. We have only the word of the drug smuggler that he was not armed. And, again, the drug smuggler is not only believed, but his story is backed up by the U.S. prosecutors over the word of two veteran law enforcement officers, one who served this country for 10 years in the Border Patrol, the other 5 years, both of them veterans of our military. And they believed the drug dealer, in order to destroy the Border Patrol agents. And then, again, we hear over and over again, and presented in trial, that the drug smuggler was unarmed. Yet it is only his word that suggests that. And I might add this; the drug smuggler's family has stated to journalists that this drug smuggler had always been armed when smuggling drugs, and he had been doing so since he was 14 years old.

Now, let's put that in perspective. Does anyone really believe that a drug smuggler in that area is going to be in possession of a \$1 million asset, these drugs, and he won't have anything there to defend those assets on either side of the border? Our U.S. Attorney believes the drug smuggler when he says he is unarmed, and destroys the Border Patrol agents when they say they thought he was aiming something at them. To this day, the smuggler is free from prosecution. He has never been charged with a crime, and is awaiting a potential settlement in his \$5 million lawsuit against the Border Patrol.

Now, let's recap. Two Border Patrol agents are languishing in solitary confinement in Federal prisons for 11 years, while the illegal drug smuggler whose van was abandoned contained \$1 million worth of narcotics, he was granted immunity; he has been given free medical care, and provided an unconditional border crossing card, which was more than likely used when he smuggled a second stash of drugs into the United States before Ramos and Compeon went to prison. And we are supposed to believe that this President wants to free up our Border Patrol agents from just normal duties so they can go after the real criminals?

By the way, at Ramos and Compeon's trial the prosecutor belittled the Border Patrol agents for thinking that they should be out trying to stop drug smugglers. And that prosecutor, belittling them in front of the jury, said if they wanted to stop drug dealers, they should have joined the DEA, the Drug Enforcement Agency. This is our prosecutor that is supposed to be representing us belittling these two men for stopping a drug dealer with \$1 million worth of drugs, saying that they

should have gone and joined the DEA if they wanted to stop drug dealers. To suggest all of this represents a confused, chaotic, and contradictory border strategy and immigration policy is to put it mildly.

During the Ramos and Compean trial, the lead prosecutor bragged how section 1325 cases are not even prosecuted. What are 1325 cases? Improper entry by an alien. It states any alien who enters or attempts to enter the United States at any time or any other than as designated by Immigration officers shall be fined under title XVIII or imprisoned for not more than 2 years, or both.

The law is clear, but the law is not being enforced. The law isn't being enforced. Our Border Patrol agents are under attack even if they stop drug dealers, much less other people. The other people who are just coming across, we are not enforcing that. Millions have been returned without having to pay any penalty at all. So why not come back a second and third time until they succeed?

And why isn't the law being enforced? And because the law hasn't been enforced, the situation at the border is out of control. Surprise, surprise. If you don't enforce the law at the border, it's out of control. Tens of millions of people are here who shouldn't be here.

Now, who is to blame? Yes, I think the top person in our government and all the people in our government who have been supporting these policies are to blame. Whether it is President Bush, President Clinton, or Members of leadership in Congress, the law hasn't been enforced, and it has been very clear that it has not been enforced. This has not been an accident that we have 15 million to 20 million illegals in our country creating horrible situations for driving down wages, destroying education, et cetera, et cetera. More and more people are coming across our borders without any type of consequence because it has been a policy not to enforce that law, the policy of this administration for the last 6 years. Of course, who did they prosecute but the Border Patrol agents if they didn't do their paperwork right.

Well, what is going, of course, we have more and more people crossing the border. Those who are here and get here illegally begin to realize that they are able to find work, and they are actually getting jobs that pay them more money than they would have in the countries from which they come, Guatemala, Mexico, El Salvador, China, and elsewhere. So they realize they can get work here and get paid more. And they also realize that they are able to get free services from the Federal, State, and local government. The taxpayers of the United States are going to provide them services they could never get at home, health care, education, housing, et cetera. It is a bonanza for these people.

Now, they are not bad people. Let me state for the record and be very em-

phatic about this. A huge proportion, maybe 90 percent of all illegal immigrants coming to this country are likely to be wonderful human beings. If we were in their spot, we would be coming across the border, too. They are not at fault for wanting to come here, and they are not at fault for coming here to better the lives of their families, to better their own lives. That's not their fault. We don't dislike them for that at all. The people to blame here, the people to be upset with are the policy-makers who permitted this massive flow of people into our country; because, even though these are good people coming in, they are having a horrible impact on our society. A horrible impact. And it is up to us to represent the interests of the people of the United States, even though these good people who would like to come here by the tens of millions all around the world are good people. And my heart goes out to them. But my job and our job should be to protect the interests of the people of the United States. And there is nothing wrong with that. There is nothing selfish with that. There is nothing selfish with wanting to protect our children and make sure the health care and resources go to our children and our families.

But the word has gone out all over the world that they can get jobs, they can get benefits. And I will tell you this. If the word goes out that we are going to legalize and we end up legalizing the status of those who are here illegally, the flow of illegals that is now coming into our country will turn into a tidal wave. We have trouble controlling our borders now. If we legalize the status of 10 million to 15 million illegals in our country as what is being advocated in this supposed comprehensive immigration plan, it will make the situation so much worse, so much more out of control, it will be a catastrophe for this country. Ten years from now, we will have lost our country to tens of millions of new people who are consuming all of the resources we put aside for our elderly, for our young people, for our children, for our families.

Wake up, America. You are being betrayed. We are being told that our Border Patrol agents are going to secure our borders: Just pass the comprehensive bill, then we will secure the borders. Well, first of all, those are two unrelated issues. But then, on top of it, we know now that our government is prosecuting the Border Patrol agents or anyone else who gets in the way of the hordes of illegals that are now flooding into our country at this level. This is total insanity and is already doing, as I say, great harm to the people of our country. And no doubt, even though the President was there with our Border Patrol agents, our defenders in the Border Patrol and elsewhere are demoralized.

And it is not just Ramos and Compean why our defenders are demoralized. What about the case of Edwards

County, Texas? Deputy Sheriff Gilmer Hernandez, another American of Mexican descent.

□ 2210

He too was prosecuted and imprisoned under the direction of Johnny Sutton. Anybody catch a pattern here?

In this case, Deputy Hernandez tried to protect himself from a van full of illegals who tried to run him over after a routine traffic stop. He shot out the tires, and in the process, an illegal hiding behind the van's wheel well sustained a minor injury.

Once again, our government chose to ignore the immigration crime there of human trafficking. You had human trafficking laws that were being violated by those illegals who were driving that van and taking those people in. And our U.S. attorney chose to go after the deputy. Not only did the coyotes get away, the injured illegals have already been rewarded with \$100,000 and green cards to match.

Deputy Hernandez now sits in prison. The illegals are now living in Austin, Texas, \$100,000 richer. This is bizarre. This is twilight zone stuff.

These aren't idiots that have designed this policy. These are people who have the wrong goals in mind, who are not representing the interests of the people of the United States, and are certainly not appreciative of our defenders.

We're being told that the Justice Department's priority is to pursue criminals and human traffickers, yet we hear about that case that I just mentioned.

Our defenders are afraid to defend us. And they're not afraid to defend us. That's not just a policy that just happened. It's not just happening that they are afraid to defend us. This administration and the powers that be have set out to intimidate the Border Patrol and to make them fearful to enforce the law.

At the same time we are emboldening those who would break our laws. So it's been the policy, perhaps for a decade, perhaps more than a decade, but certainly during this entire administration, to intimidate those who are defending us at the border and embolden those who would cross the border illegally.

By the way, in both of the aforementioned cases, our Justice Department determined that the illegal aliens coming across this country, one, a drug smuggler, the others coyotes smuggling illegals across the country, that their civil rights were violated.

There's something wrong with this picture when our government is protecting the so-called civil rights of people who are smuggling drugs into our country and carrying loads of illegal immigrants into our country in violation of our law. Something is totally wrong with this picture.

If controlling the borders is a priority, why is this President, again, using border security as a wedge to

achieve other goals? And his other goals, of course, amnesty to those who are here illegally and setting up a guest workers program.

Again, whose interest is our government representing?

Economist Robert Samuels pointed out some of the horrible impact of this policy that we have had that has brought so many illegals into our country. He claims that what we are doing, you know, some people say we are bringing in cheap labor, but he suggests we are importing poverty, and that that importation of poverty is having a dramatically negative impact on our country. If this country continues to allow uneducated, unskilled workers to come here illegally, it will bankrupt America, and we are in the process of bankrupting America.

According to a report released by the Heritage Foundation, 50 to 60 percent of illegal immigrants are high school dropouts. 4.6 million U.S. households are headed up by immigrant dropouts. The Pew Hispanic Institute Center estimates that 49 percent of high school dropouts are illegal immigrants.

The Heritage report estimates that the cost to the American taxpayer over the lifetime of a high school dropout is \$1.1 million per dropout. Because of the government benefits they receive versus what they pay back into the system in taxes, the net cost, per year, for all of these illegal alien dropouts that are coming here, high school dropouts, these poverty-stricken people, the net cost to us per year is \$397 billion, almost \$400 billion a year.

Put that in perspective. Of all the things we try to finance in this Congress and can't find an extra \$25 million for breast cancer research.

Put it into the context with the millions of illegals who are working here in the United States off the books, who do not pay their share of the taxes, but will still reap the benefits of government programs, from welfare to health care to Social Security to public schools and housing.

This is a catastrophe, a catastrophe not just in the making, but a catastrophe in reality that we are living right now. I see it happening in my own Southern California district every day.

And what are those consequences? Let's just note. In my area, the schools, the quality of education is going down. For the ordinary people who depend on public schools, their kids are getting shortchanged. The emergency rooms in hospitals are closing up and health care's going down.

Our criminal justice system is being inundated and, we have, I'm not sure the exact number. I think it's 50 percent of all the felons, it might be 75 percent of all the felons where there are warrants of felons that they are looking for are illegal immigrant felons.

It's breaking down our criminal justice system. If you get raped or murdered or run over by a drunk in Cali-

fornia in my area, it's likely it's been done by someone who should never have been there legally in the first place.

Our government is betraying the interest of our people. It's not protecting our people. Yet, politically, our government is dominated by powerful forces who want these high levels of immigration, legal or illegal.

This has been no mistake. People didn't just close their eyes and say, oh my gosh; there's 15 to 20 million people here illegally. No, it has been a policy decision made by people that we will support, that they will support the policies that have created this monstrous threat.

It is not an accident. It is not something that just happened. The policy decisions were made by an elite, but the American people were kept in the dark about these decisions.

Now, who was it? Who's behind this flow into our country?

First of all, business wants cheap labor. When I say that, that doesn't mean that they just want cheap labor from people who are coming here illegally. That means they want the people who are coming here illegally to bid down the wages of our own people.

So not only are the illegals working for less money, but now the American working people have to take less money, because their job will be given to an illegal. So big business wants cheap labor. They want the illegals to depress wages. That is a very powerful force.

The liberal left coalition, which runs the Democratic party, wants more illegals as well. They want the political clout that a massive influx of low class and highly manipulated immigrants will provide their power structure. So you've got big business interests and business interests and the liberal left democratic establishment. Now, that is a one heck of a tough coalition. And it's about as tough as it gets.

And yes, the political and economic elites have benefited from this. Yeah. The democratic elites have got their political tools. And the businessmen have the people who cut their lawns, be nannies to their children, change the sheets in their hotels, do everything that they need to have done at a much lower wage, and give them the opportunity to give themselves huge pay raises. They give themselves levels of pay that CEOs never would have gotten years ago.

You know, CEOs used to get about 10 times as much as working people in their companies. Now they give themselves hundreds, if not thousands of times more than the people working in their company.

But of course the people in their company can't really push too hard because they can't be replaced, many of them, by people from overseas. We can get H1B visas and flood the market with Pakistanis or Indians to do computer work. If our people won't accept

50 or \$60,000 we can flood the market with H1B visas and we can make sure that the computer people from our country, you know, that they are going to have to accept lower wages, or we'll give it to the Pakistani or the Indian.

□ 2220

That is illegal. What about the legal people who come here who even work for less than that Pakistani or Indian who comes in with an H-B1 visa?

These elites who, as I say, live behind closed gates and don't have their kids in public schools, they are doing things that destroy the well-being of their fellow citizens.

We see cities that are not only turning a blind eye to illegals, but they are welcoming illegals into our country. Recently, San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom vowed to maintain San Francisco as a "sanctuary city" for illegals, and he will do everything he can to provide sanctuary for those illegals. He is discouraging Federal authorities from conducting any immigration raids. Well, in whose interest is this mayor watching out for and the others who talk about these sanctuary cities? There are hundreds of these sanctuary cities across our country. The employers know it. Rental companies know it. The illegals know it. The word is going out all over the world. There are sanctuary cities. If you can make it there, you have got it made. And there will be a treasure of benefits for you as well, and the local government is going to protect you. Well, by proclaiming their moral superiority in protecting illegals, what are they doing? They are in reality committing a monstrous crime not just against the American people but against all those people overseas, perhaps 100 million people now waiting in line overseas to come here legally. They are waiting in line to come here legally, but yet we have got the mayor of San Francisco who is siding with the guys who cut in line in front of those people who are waiting to respect our laws and to come here to be Americans in the legal way.

If the people who are here illegally have their status legalized and if we have people protecting those people who are here illegally, what does that tell the millions of people who are waiting overseas? It tells them they had better not wait. They are fools. This mayor of the city of San Francisco isn't protecting illegals. He is actually accosting, actually committing a crime against the people who are waiting in line overseas. He is favoring those people to break the law over those who stand in line and wait to obey the law. He is siding with the lawbreakers rather than siding with those immigrants from overseas who would like to come here and follow our laws. He is not just protecting the unfortunate people of the world. He is siding with that group of people over those unfortunate people who would obey our laws and come here.

The prosecution of Ramos and Compean has not gone unnoticed, as

well as the sanctuary cities I am talking about, the actions of the mayor of San Francisco. Yes, couple that with the prosecution of Ramos and Compean, and what we have got is there are good people all over the world as well as some bad people, but good people even who are saying that they can come here now. Let's get to the United States because the United States doesn't have the will to stop us. These are good people, but they will consume our resources that we should have for our own people, and they will depress the wages of the American worker, and they will bring diseases right into our schools that we have a long time ago conquered. And the breakdown of our borders will have been lost not only just to the good people who will flood across and be out of control but to drug dealers who have noticed Ramos and Compean and the Border Patrol agents and also to terrorists. You can bet that the terrorists around the world have noticed the chaos on our southern border.

Mr. Speaker, in the coming weeks, Congress will begin debate on the Flake-Gutierrez bill. This flawed bill almost guarantees a legalization of the status from 12 to 15 million illegal immigrants already in the United States. The bill requires illegals to pay fines and sit through English classes in order to claim that it doesn't qualify as an amnesty. However, the 1986 Immigration Reform Act required the exact same thing: a waiting period, fines, mandatory English classes. And no one can deny that that was an amnesty bill.

The bottom line is the Flake-Gutierrez bill, if it passes, you can skip the line, skip it totally, all those people waiting in line overseas, and buy your citizenship for a whopping \$2,500. Under this legislation right now, illegals who seek amnesty do not have to pay back taxes nor do they have to wait the current 10-year period before re-entry into this country after they have been caught here illegally. Flake-Gutierrez will permit the newly minted residents, legal residents now because they have now been made legal residents, to apply for billions of dollars in public assistance. The Heritage Foundation estimates the fiscal cost to the taxpayers of such an amnesty will be \$30 billion a year. Newly legitimized residents, legalized residents, will also receive Social Security benefits based on their work while they have been here illegally. Since most illegal immigrants worked under fake Social Security numbers or stolen ones, it will create unknown costs to the Social Security Administration.

And, of course, President Bush has already made a secret agreement with Mexico that we had to dig out of the administration with Freedom of Information requests. That secret agreement was that any new legalization of status will include giving those illegal Mexicans who worked in the United States Social Security benefits for

their time when they have worked in the United States, but that has been kept hush hush.

By the way, Social Security isn't just a retirement plan. It is also a survivors' benefit. And you can imagine how many morticians from around the world are going to be sending their letter into Social Security, saying somebody worked in your country illegally for this year. He died and please start sending your thousand dollar checks to his children at this address. This is a catastrophe not only in the making. This is a catastrophe that is already before us. This bill could pass and destroy our Social Security system.

Perhaps the worst element in this is that, contrary to claims otherwise, the bill does not send illegals back to the back of the line. Currently, there are over 3 million aliens who have already been approved for green cards but are still waiting overseas, waiting for sometimes up to 23 years, to come here legally. Under this bill millions of illegals who claim to have been here illegally since 2006 can keep working legally now in the U.S. and will be eligible for permanent residence. So they will be here legally, and then they can apply for permanent residence in 8 years. People who have played by the rules will still have to wait for their green cards overseas. So why should they wait in line at all?

As I say, this is going to give us tens of millions of new illegals pouring into our country, destroying our social infrastructure, our schools, our hospitals, our retirement systems. The last amnesty in 1986 resulted in 15 to 20 million new illegals pouring into our country. This amnesty will give us 50 million or more. The Heritage Foundation estimates that 100 million new people will be here after 10 years as a result of this immigration reform. Wake up, America. We are losing our country. We are being betrayed. Who is representing the interest of the American people?

The President has often mentioned the reason most illegals come here is to do work that most Americans won't do. However, Flake-Gutierrez specifically allows employers to lay off Americans and replace them with new foreign workers as long as those Americans were laid off 90 days before they decided to bring the new people in. Employers are also absolved of any form of civil or criminal liability related to the prior employment of illegals. And as long as the incentive to work and benefits exist, illegals will flood into our country.

I have been a consistent advocate for tough employer sanctions. Yet Flake-Gutierrez prohibits State and local governments from punishing employers who have hired illegal immigrants or from requiring them to use an employment verification system or from requiring that that system be used to verify the legal status of renters or public benefits applicants or people who are undergoing background checks.

□ 2230

It dramatically reduces the civil penalties for employers who knowingly hire or continue to employ illegals, or who fail to comply with the employment verification system already approved by the last Congress. As a matter of fact, section 301 of the bill, employers can avoid using the verification system altogether simply by saying they are hiring private contractors.

This legislation is tantamount to the surrender of America's ability to control our territory from any foreigner who wants to come here. It is an immigration catastrophe, a nightmare for America's most vulnerable, our vulnerable middle class, a nightmare. Frighteningly, President Bush is supportive, as are many corporate-minded Republicans, and almost every Democrat that I know, although there are a few, hopefully, coming over to our side who understand how this is hurting their constituents. As I say, a handful of Democrats have signed on to the bill to pardon Ramos and Compean.

But by and large, the Republican leadership, the President, the Democratic leadership, the Democratic Party and most Members of Congress are in favor of this type of "comprehensive bill" and have not been helpful in saving Ramos and Compean.

Who is watching out for the American people? Well, it is up to us, the United States. And what we can do is make sure that everyone talks to their representative and talks to their Senator, and does so aggressively, not in a low voice, but in an aggressive voice because you're protecting your families and your children and you're protecting your country in the future.

We are up against a powerful political coalition. They are using examples saying, oh, we need these illegal aliens to work; there are jobs Americans won't take. There are jobs that Americans won't take at the pay level that these big businessmen want to give them. And don't tell me that if we paid janitors more money, that we can't find people to be janitors. I was a janitor years ago. You go back, and janitors are making the same amount of money as I made when I was a janitor 40 years ago, yet the income of our country, the GNP, has quadrupled. They have been left out because a horde of illegals have come into this country and bid down their wages.

Now, why is it that people who are janitors or people who work with their hands, people who work in regular middle-class jobs shouldn't be able to enjoy the fruits of our country, that their wages should be depressed, they should be frozen out of having a better living for their family? Then they say, well, there are jobs they won't even do, like picking fruits and vegetables. We've got more people between the ages of 18 and 40, young, healthy men housed in prisons in the middle of our agricultural areas who could profit by working. They could earn enough money to pay for their own incarceration and

pay for a little restitution. But those ideas are too creative. No, no, no. Instead, let's just bring the illegals across, that will keep everybody's wages down and we can control them and they will be off the chart.

Well, let me suggest this; we've been given a false dichotomy saying that we have to offer a legalization status, an amnesty, or we have to have massive deportations. It's either legalization or deportation. That is the most serious of all of the lies that are being told today about immigration because that is not true. We do have an alternative; there is an alternative to just deporting. We don't want to have sweeps of law enforcement through foreign neighborhoods, but we can just make sure that we have ID cards, we have Social Security cards, that we have ID cards that can't be tampered with so we can prove who we are dealing with. We can have a verification system so that employers will know who they're employing and we can hold those employers accountable. And we can also make sure that illegals who don't have the benefits cards, these identities that show they are eligible, cannot get the health care, the education, the housing, the Social Security and retirement benefits that are due to American citizens and people who are here legally.

If we do not give the jobs and the benefits to people who are here illegally, they will go home. Just as soon as you give it to them, they will come. If you don't give it to them and they find trouble earning a living, supporting their families, they will go home. It's called attrition. That is the decision we have to make. Creating a false dichotomy, saying it's either going to be legalization or deportation, that's the type of word game that is unfair in this debate. It's just like calling amnesty something that it isn't, saying that this is not an amnesty when it clearly is.

We must be able to say no to people who are using the scarce resources that are meant for our people. These resources belong to the American people, whether it is our education establishment, our health care, job training, housing, retirement benefits, these are things that belong to the American people. We must protect the interests of our people and say no to people who would consume those things that are meant for our own people.

This is not mean-spirited selfishness. And probably that is the greatest debate of all, because people are playing on it as if we're trying to push us into letting more and more illegals come in here and destroying our system, like just to say, if you try to stop it, you're being mean-spirited and nasty. Americans don't like that. Americans don't like it at all, of course they don't. We are as generous as any people in the world. But it is not selfish to take care of your own family. It is not selfish to take care of your own community. It is not selfish to take care of your own country before you expend the re-

sources and take care of people elsewhere in the world. It is not selfish, it is being responsible.

And we, as representatives of the people of the United States, owe it to the people of the United States to be watching out for them, watching out for their interests. If we don't do it, no one is going to watch out for the interests of our people. I am afraid that tonight it's up to us, the people. Either we will speak out; we will rise with a righteous rage and oppose this immigration travesty that is about to be foisted upon us or we will suffer grave consequences. Within 10 years, our country will have been lost. Ten, 20, 30, 40, 100 million new people here, some of them terrorists, some of them criminals, most of them good people, but still, people who don't deserve to be consuming those resources that we have built and saved and created for our own people.

So with that, I close and ask the American people to wake up and pay attention.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COHEN). All Members are reminded that personal abuse, innuendo, or ridicule of the President is not permitted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ENGEL (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of a family medical need.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and May 2 on account of personal health.

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 Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KUCINICH, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today and May 2.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, May 2.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, May 7 and 8.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, May 2 and 3.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Ms. Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1591. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 2, 2007, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1408. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, United States Capitol Police, transmitting the semiannual report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period October 1, 2006 through March 31, 2007 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to Public Law 109-55, section 1005; (H. Doc. No. 110-28); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1409. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act Regulations — Future Applicability (RIN: 1024-AC84) received March 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1410. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Glacier Bay National Park, Vessel Management Plan Regulations (RIN: 1024-AD25) received March 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1411. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oil, Gas, and Sulfur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) — Plans and Information — Protection of Marine Mammals and Threatened and Endangered Species (RIN: 1010-AD10) received April 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1412. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule Designating the Western Great Lakes Populations of Gray Wolves as a

Distinct Population Segment; Removing the Western Great Lakes Distinct Population Segment of the Gray Wolf From the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife (RIN: 1018-AU54) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1413. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 070213032-7032-01; I.D. 030607F] received March 26, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1414. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No. 061109296-7009-02; I.D. 030607B] received March 26, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1415. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 070213032-7032-01; I.D. 032607F] received April 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1416. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 070213032-7032-01; I.D. 031507E] received April 16, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1417. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 ft (18.3 m) LOA Using Pot or Hook-and-Line Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 070213033-7033-01; I.D. 032807A] received April 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1418. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Gulf Red Snapper Management Measures [Docket No. 061121304-7053-01; I.D. 112006B] (RIN: 0648-AY87) received April 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1419. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [I.D. 032107B] received April 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1420. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone

Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 070213033-7033-01; I.D. 040607B] received April 25, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1421. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Closure of the Trimeter I Fishery for Loligo Squid [Docket No. 061124307-7013-02; I.D. 112106A] received April 25, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1422. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 070213033-7033-01; I.D. 040607A] received April 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1423. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Closure of the 2007 Gulf of Mexico Commercial Fishery of Tilefishes [Docket No. 040205043-4043-01; I.D. 040607F] received April 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1424. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fish and Seafood Promotion Act Provisions; Seafood Marketing Councils [Docket No. 040720212-6238-02; I.D. 040204A] received April 25, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1425. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Extension of Emergency Fishery Closure Due to the Presence of the Toxin That Causes Paralytic Shellfish Poisoning [Docket No. 050613158-5262-02; I.D. 090105A] (RIN: 0648-AT48) received April 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1426. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; 2007 and 2008 Final Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No. 070213032-7032-01; I.D. 112206B] received April 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1427. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Revision and Reformulating of Requirements for the Authorization to Use International Transport Standards and Regulations [Docket No. PHMSA-2005-23141 (HM-215F)] (RIN: 2137-AE01) received April 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1428. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inspection Authorization 2-year Renewal [Docket No. FAA-2007-27108; Amendment No. 65-50] (RIN: 2120-AI83) received April 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1429. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30547; Amdt. No. 467] received April 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1430. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, Weather Takeoff Minimums; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30543 Amdt. No. 3212] received April 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1431. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30540; Amdt. No. 3209] received April 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1432. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, Weather Takeoff Minimums; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30539 Amdt. No. 3208] received April 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1433. A letter from the Deputy Director for Regulations, Office of Pipeline Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pipeline Safety: Design and Construction Standards to Reduce Internal Corrosion in Gas Transmission Pipelines [Docket No. PHMSA-2005-22642] (RIN: 2137-AE09) received April 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1434. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30542; Amdt. No. 3211] received April 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1435. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, Weather Takeoff Minimums; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30541 Amdt. No. 3210] received April 23, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1436. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Coordinated Issue All Industries Distressed Asset/Debt Tax Shelters ULL: 9300.99-05 [LMSB-04-0407-031] received April 20, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1437. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Concise General Statement Appeals Settlement Guidelines [Notice 2004-30] (RIN: ULL NO.: 9300.36-00) received April 20, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1438. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service,

transmitting the Service's final rule — Concise General Statement Applicable Federal Rates — May 2007 — received April 20, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1439. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Clean Renewable Energy Bonds [Notice 2007-06] received March 22, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1440. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — [26 CFR 601.201]: Rulings and determination letters (Also: Part 1, 25, 103, 143) [Rev. Proc 2007-26] received March 22, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1441. A letter from the Board of Trustees, Federal Old-Age And Survivors Insurance And Disability Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting the 2007 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), and 1395t(b)(2); (H. Doc. No. 110-30); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1442. A letter from the Board of Trustees, Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting the 2007 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund And Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), and 1395t(b)(2); (H. Doc. No. 110-29); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

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:

Ms. CASTOR: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 348. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1429) to reauthorize the Head Start Act, to improve program quality, to expand access, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-116). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. MATSUI: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 349. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1867) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010 for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-117). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. SUTTON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 350. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1868) to authorize appropriations for the National Institute of Standards and Technology for fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-118). 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 Ms. NORTON (for herself and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia) (both by request):

H.R. 2080. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to conform the District charter to revisions made by the Council of the District of Columbia relating to public education; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. NORTON (by request):

H.R. 2081. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to increase the salary of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. REYES:

H.R. 2082. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. GORDON (for himself and Mr. PICKERING):

H.R. 2083. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to improve energy standards for home appliances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HENSARLING (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. GOODE, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. POE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MACK, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. FEENEY, Ms. FOX, and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina):

H.R. 2084. A bill to reform Federal budget procedures, to impose spending safeguards, to combat waste, fraud, and abuse, to account for accurate Government agency costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, Ways and Means, Appropriations, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. FALLIN (for herself and Mr. BOREN):

H.R. 2085. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the McGee Creek Authority certain facilities of the McGee Creek Project, Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 2086. A bill to enhance the integrity of the United States against the threat of terrorism; to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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 Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2087. A bill to improve the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EVERETT (for himself, Mr. BONNER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. MARSHALL):

H.R. 2088. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to provide cost-share payments in support of on-farm water conservation projects to enhance regional water availability and quality; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JEFFERSON (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BAKER, Mr.

BOUSTANY, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. MCCREERY, and Mr. MELANCON):

H.R. 2089. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 701 Loyola Avenue in New Orleans, Louisiana, as the "Louisiana Armed Services Veterans Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KLINE of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. HAYES, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 2090. A bill to establish the National Guard Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 2091. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow bonds guaranteed by the Federal home loan banks to be treated as tax exempt bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 2092. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide assistance for developing countries to promote quality basic education and to establish the achievement of universal basic education in all developing countries as an objective of United States foreign assistance policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 2093. A bill to amend the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 to provide for additional reporting by lobbying firms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Kansas (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas):

H.R. 2094. A bill to provide for certain administrative and support services for the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 2095. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prevent railroad fatalities, injuries, and hazardous materials releases, to authorize the Federal Railroad Safety Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 2096. A bill to sunset Federal laws and regulations which treat the American people like children by denying them the opportunity to make their own decision regarding control of their bank accounts and what type of information they wish to receive from their banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROTHMAN:

H.R. 2097. A bill to authorize grants to carry out projects to provide education on preventing teen pregnancies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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. SARBANES:

H.R. 2098. A bill to provide for the disposition of the Federal property located in Anne Arundel County, Maryland, a portion of

which is currently used by the District of Columbia as the Oak Hill juvenile detention facility; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SUTTON:

H.R. 2099. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to order a mandatory recall of any product that is regulated by the Food and Drug Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TANCREDO:

H.R. 2100. A bill to provide for equal protection of the law and to prohibit discrimination and preferential treatment on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex in Federal actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Education and Labor, and 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 Ms. WATSON (for herself and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 2101. A bill to prohibit after 2008 the introduction into interstate commerce of mercury intended for use in a dental filling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself, Mr. DENT, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. KANJORSKI):

H. Con. Res. 135. Concurrent resolution recognizing Pennsylvania hunters for their continued commitment to safety and for setting a new State safety record in 2006; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. TOWNS):

H. Con. Res. 136. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding high level visits to the United States by democratically-elected officials of Taiwan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. BERKLEY (for herself, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H. Con. Res. 137. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to a free trade agreement between the United States and Taiwan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H. Con. Res. 138. Concurrent resolution supporting National Men's Health Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SALI, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. CLARKE):

H. Con. Res. 139. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should address the ongoing problem of untouchability in India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself and Ms. WATSON):

H. Res. 346. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Jack Valenti should be recognized for his contributions to public service and public

entertainment; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SIREs, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Ms. SOLIS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. REYES, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. FARR, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H. Res. 347. A resolution recognizing the historical significance of the Mexican holiday of Cinco de Mayo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. Res. 351. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Federal authorities should strengthen and vigorously enforce all existing immigration laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. MICA, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PETRI, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COBLE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BAKER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. ALTMIRE):

H. Res. 352. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Public Works Week; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H. Res. 353. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be an increased Federal commitment supporting the development of innovative advanced imaging technologies for prostate cancer detection and treatment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia:

H. Res. 354. A resolution to recognize the year 2007 as the official 50th anniversary celebration of the beginnings of marinas, power production, recreation, and boating on Lake Sidney Lanier, Georgia; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FALOMAVAEGA (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CANNON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREs, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. WEXLER):

H. Res. 355. A resolution recognizing and welcoming the leaders of the Pacific Islands to Washington, D.C., and commending the East-West Center for hosting the Pacific Islands Conference of Leaders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H. Res. 356. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that

the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) should stop the utilization of materials that violate provisions of the United Nations-brokered Interim Agreement between the FYROM and Greece regarding "hostile activities or propaganda" and should work with the United Nations and Greece to achieve longstanding United States and United Nations policy goals of finding a mutually-acceptable official name for the FYROM; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California:

H. Res. 357. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the Intermediate Space Challenge in Mojave, California; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RADANOVICH (for himself, Mr. NUNES, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. CARDOZA):

H. Res. 358. A resolution recognizing the significance of the contribution of the Brotherhood of the Badge to the Global War on Terror through its provision of surplus law enforcement equipment to Iraqi police forces; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 359. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Sugar Ray Robinson should be recognized for his athletic achievements and commitment to young people; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself and Mr. SALI):

H. Res. 360. A resolution recognizing the 70th anniversary of the Idaho Potato Commission and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that an Idaho Potato Month should be established; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. WATSON (for herself, Mr. ISSA, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COBLE, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. WEXLER):

H. Res. 361. A resolution recognizing and honoring Jack Valenti and expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives to his family on his death; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 20: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 23: Mr. DENT, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. HINCKEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WU, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 24: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 46: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 50: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 65: Mr. HILL and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 67: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 82: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. HODES, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 102: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 135: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 171: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 174: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 196: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

- H.R. 197: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. DRAKE, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. HIGGINS.
- H.R. 233: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
- H.R. 241: Mr. MACK.
- H.R. 281: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SPACE, and Mr. LEVIN.
- H.R. 287: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
- H.R. 288: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
- H.R. 297: Ms. HARMAN.
- H.R. 343: Mr. PLATTS.
- H.R. 359: Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 368: Mr. BONNER, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. PORTER, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. BOREN.
- H.R. 402: Mr. PEARCE.
- H.R. 406: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. KILPATRICK.
- H.R. 457: Mr. POE.
- H.R. 505: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H.R. 506: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
- H.R. 507: Mr. SIRES, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. DEFazio.
- H.R. 552: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. REHBERG.
- H.R. 566: Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.R. 579: Mr. SPACE, Mr. LAMPSON, and Ms. HOOLEY.
- H.R. 583: Ms. HOOLEY and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
- H.R. 618: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
- H.R. 621: Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
- H.R. 624: Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. WEINER.
- H.R. 628: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
- H.R. 654: Mr. NADLER and Mr. WEINER.
- H.R. 661: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
- H.R. 670: Mr. FORTUÑO.
- H.R. 678: Mr. HONDA.
- H.R. 690: Mr. OLVER and Mr. RAHALL.
- H.R. 695: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SPACE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. MEEHAN.
- H.R. 698: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. RENZI, Mr. HARE, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. BLUNT.
- H.R. 711: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
- H.R. 718: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. GORDON.
- H.R. 728: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SPACE, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. TERRY.
- H.R. 729: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 748: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. PLATTS.
- H.R. 751: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
- H.R. 758: Mr. MICHAUD.
- H.R. 760: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
- H.R. 768: Mr. BOOZMAN.
- H.R. 769: Mr. BOOZMAN.
- H.R. 771: Mr. MCKEON and Mr. CALVERT.
- H.R. 776: Mr. CUMMINGS.
- H.R. 782: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. SPRATT.
- H.R. 784: Mr. TURNER, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. TERRY.
- H.R. 805: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
- H.R. 808: Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.R. 811: Mr. CARNEY.
- H.R. 840: Mr. MEEK of Florida and Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 869: Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. CARNEY.
- H.R. 881: Mr. GORDON.
- H.R. 882: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, and Mr. BOREN.
- H.R. 891: Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
- H.R. 916: Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. BOREN.
- H.R. 938: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. GERLACH.
- H.R. 940: Mr. MATHESON.
- H.R. 943: Mr. 4BOREN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.
- H.R. 947: Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 964: Ms. WATSON.
- H.R. 971: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
- H.R. 980: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SHULER, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. KUCINICH.
- H.R. 982: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
- H.R. 989: Ms. FOX and Mr. LATOURETTE.
- H.R. 1014: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Jr. PASTOR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BONNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WAMP, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. LEE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. MICHAUD.
- H.R. 1023: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. PASCRELL.
- H.R. 1026: Mr. LAMPSON.
- H.R. 1029: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. MICA.
- H.R. 1064: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. WYNN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KIND, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. CARNEY.
- H.R. 1069: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. TOWNS.
- H.R. 1072: Ms. BALDWIN.
- H.R. 1073: Mrs. CAPPS and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
- H.R. 1074: Mr. STUPAK.
- H.R. 1076: Mrs. BIGGERT.
- H.R. 1081: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
- H.R. 1082: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
- H.R. 1088: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
- H.R. 1092: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H.R. 1098: Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. DENT.
- H.R. 1103: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. HINOJOSA.
- H.R. 1108: Mr. COSTA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
- H.R. 1110: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Ms. MATSUI.
- H.R. 1113: Mr. JINDAL and Mr. GORDON.
- H.R. 1115: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. TERRY.
- H.R. 1137: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
- H.R. 1147: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. HULSHOF.
- H.R. 1188: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. WAXMAN.
- H.R. 1190: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WAMP, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCCOUL of Texas, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
- H.R. 1192: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
- H.R. 1193: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. EHLERS.
- H.R. 1194: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
- H.R. 1222: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
- H.R. 1223: Mr. PLATTS.
- H.R. 1232: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 1239: Mr. WATT, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. BARROW.
- H.R. 1248: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 1261: Mr. WAMP, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 1270: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
- H.R. 1272: Mr. MCINTYRE.
- H.R. 1280: Mr. SERRANO.
- H.R. 1283: Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. MARSHALL.
- H.R. 1293: Mr. TERRY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. BOREN.
- H.R. 1300: Mr. COSTA and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
- H.R. 1303: Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
- H.R. 1304: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. FEENEY.
- H.R. 1314: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
- H.R. 1324: Mr. POE.
- H.R. 1338: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. WATSON, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
- H.R. 1343: Mr. BOREN, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H.R. 1344: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. ALLEN.
- H.R. 1350: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H.R. 1352: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
- H.R. 1353: Mr. COSTA.
- H.R. 1359: Mr. WELDON of Florida.
- H.R. 1391: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. HIGGINS.
- H.R. 1400: Mr. FORBES, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HOYER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. JINDAL, and Mr. POE.
- H.R. 1409: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
- H.R. 1414: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 1421: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mrs. CUBIN.
- H.R. 1422: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
- H.R. 1439: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. CROWLEY.
- H.R. 1461: Mr. WYNN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
- H.R. 1469: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. DOYLE.
- H.R. 1474: Mr. EVERETT, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MORAN, of Virginia, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
- H.R. 1481: Mrs. DRAKE, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 1498: Mr. ALLEN.
- H.R. 1509: Ms. BERKLEY.
- H.R. 1519: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 1527: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1534: Mr. FARR.
- H.R. 1535: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

- H.R. 1537: Mr. KAGEN, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. POE, and Mr. HONDA
- H.R. 1542: Mr. HONDA, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. CARNAHAN.
- H.R. 1551: Mr. SESTAK, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 1554: Mr. GOODE and Mrs. DRAKE.
- H.R. 1556: Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ING-LIS of South Carolina, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.
- H.R. 1560: Ms. KAPTUR.
- H.R. 1576: Mr. COSTA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1586: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
- H.R. 1589: Mr. MORAN of KANSAS, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. OBERSTAR.
- H.R. 1627: Mr. CONAWAY.
- H.R. 1636: Mr. RAHALL.
- H.R. 1644: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
- H.R. 1645: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
- H.R. 1647: Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BOREN, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. WILSON of Ohio.
- H.R. 1653: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H.R. 1655: Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 1660: Mr. LAMBORN.
- H.R. 1687: Mr. WAMP, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. SIMPSON.
- H.R. 1692: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 1700: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WU, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SRES, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SHULER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. Cuellar, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. HILL, and Mr. DONNELLY.
- H.R. 1702: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 1707: Mr. FILNER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 1709: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. PUTNAM.
- H.R. 1716: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. GILCHREST.
- H.R. 1727: Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DENT, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
- H.R. 1728: Mr. PALLONE and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 1731: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. PLATTS.
- H.R. 1732: Mr. CUMMINGS.
- H.R. 1746: Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WATSON and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 1747: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
- H.R. 1755: Mr. KUCINICH.
- H.R. 1756: Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. ADERHOLT.
- H.R. 1761: Mr. WOLF.
- H.R. 1767: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. BOREN, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mrs. MYRICK.
- H.R. 1772: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PAUL, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 1773: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. MURTHA.
- H.R. 1776: Mr. POE and Mr. MICHAUD.
- H.R. 1779: Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. STARK, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
- H.R. 1781: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. ALEXANDER.
- H.R. 1797: Mr. MCHUGH.
- H.R. 1824: Mr. BOOZMAN.
- H.R. 1827: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 1843: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. DELAULO, and Mr. BONNER.
- H.R. 1857: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
- H.R. 1869: Mr. SIREs, Mr. CANNON, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 1877: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MCCOTTER.
- H.R. 1881: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. PLATTS.
- H.R. 1884: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
- H.R. 1900: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 1901: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 1902: Mr. GONZALEZ.
- H.R. 1909: Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H.R. 1915: Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
- H.R. 1930: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.
- H.R. 1932: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BONNER, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
- H.R. 1940: Mr. WAMP, Mr. BAKER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mrs. MYRICK.
- H.R. 1941: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. WOLF.
- H.R. 1942: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POE, Mr. BLBRAY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GINGREY, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.
- H.R. 1944: Mrs. CAPPs, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CARSON, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. EMANUEL.
- H.R. 1945: Mr. STARK and Mr. EHLERS.
- H.R. 1962: Ms. HIRONO.
- H.R. 1953: Mr. DOYLE and Ms. BERKLEY.
- H.R. 1956: Mr. TOWNS.
- H.R. 1961: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
- H.R. 1965: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
- H.R. 1975: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. SCHIFF.
- H.R. 1976: Mr. ALTMIRE.
- H.R. 1992: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 2005: Mr. BOSWELL.
- H.R. 2015: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. WEINER, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KIRK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HODES, Mr. SESTAK, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H.R. 2017: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 2019: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. WATSON, Ms. LEE, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
- H.R. 2032: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. LaTourette.
- H.R. 2034: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. HIGGINS.
- H.R. 2039: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
- H.R. 2060: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H.R. 2065: Ms. DELAULO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. ELLISON.
- H.R. 2066: Mr. KIND and Mr. ALLEN.
- H.R. 2075: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama and Mr. SHAYS.
- H.R. 2077: Mr. REGULA.
- H.R. 2078: Mr. REGULA.
- H.J. Res. 30: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
- H. Con. Res. 21: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
- H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. JONES of North Carolina and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
- H. Con. Res. 80: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H. Con. Res. 94: Mrs. CAPPs.
- H. Con. Res. 112: Mr. STARK and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
- H. Con. Res. 115: Mr. MCINTYRE.
- H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. KLEIN of Florida.
- H. Con. Res. 133: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. MELANCON.
- H. Res. 100: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
- H. Res. 101: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
- H. Res. 111: Mr. PLATTS and Mrs. BACHMANN.
- H. Res. 121: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. CARSON, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. NADLER.
- H. Res. 146: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
- H. Res. 158: Mr. SALI.
- H. Res. 164: Mr. POE.
- H. Res. 171: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
- H. Res. 183: Ms. NORTON and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H. Res. 186: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. LEE.
- H. Res. 194: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. SERRANO.
- H. Res. 216: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. DENT, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. CAMP of Michigan.
- H. Res. 223: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. RENZI, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. RAMSTAD.
- H. Res. 227: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H. Res. 231: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.
- H. Res. 247: Mr. NADLER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HARE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. WATSON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HODES, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Ms. LEE.
- H. Res. 250: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FEENEY, Ms. FOXF, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MACK, Mr. FORTUÑO, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr.

HERGER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H. Res. 257: Mr. CALVERT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. FORBES.

H. Res. 258: Mr. SIRES, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H. Res. 272: Mr. NADLER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Ms. MATSUI.

H. Res. 281: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. TERRY, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MELANCON, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H. Res. 282: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HARE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H. Res. 287: Ms. ESHOO.

H. Res. 291: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Res. 295: Ms. WATSON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FLAKE, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H. Res. 296: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H. Res. 316: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 325: Mr. TERRY.

H. Res. 326: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. ROSKAM.

H. Res. 333: Mr. CLAY and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 334: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. KELLER, Mr. DENT, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. SHULER.

H. Res. 338: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WU, and Mr. TANNER.

H. Res. 340: Mr. TERRY.

H. Res. 345: Mr. HALL of New York and Mr. RANGEL.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representatives WU and GINGREY, or a designee, to H.R. 1868, the Technology Innovation and Manufacturing Stimulation Act of 2007, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of Rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.J. Res. 40: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H. Res. 268: Mr. TIERNEY.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1867

OFFERED BY: MR. HONDA

AMENDMENT No. 1: At the end of section 3, add the following new subsection:

(h) GLOBAL WARMING EDUCATION.—

(1) INFORMAL EDUCATION.—As part of Informal Science Education activities, the Director shall support activities to create informal educational materials, exhibits, and multimedia presentations relevant to global warming, climate science, and greenhouse gas reduction strategies.

(2) K-12 INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS.—As part of Discovery Research K-12 activities, the Director shall support the development of K-12 educational materials relevant to global warming, climate science, and greenhouse gas reduction strategies.

H.R. 1867

OFFERED BY: MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 2: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 19. REQUIREMENT OF OFFSETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No authorization of appropriations made by this Act or other provision of this Act that results in costs to the Federal Government shall be effective except to the extent that this Act provides for offsetting decreases in spending of the Federal Government, such that the net effect of this Act does not either increase the Federal deficit or reduce the Federal surplus.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “deficit” and “surplus” have the meanings given such terms in the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.).

H.R. 1867

OFFERED BY: MR. MCNERNEY

AMENDMENT No. 3: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 19. HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director is authorized to establish a new program to award grants on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis to Hispanic-serving institutions to enhance the quality of undergraduate science, mathematics, engineering, and technology education at such institutions and to increase the retention and graduation rates of students pursuing associate’s or baccalaureate degrees in science, mathematics, engineering, or technology.

(b) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—Grants awarded under this section shall support—

- (1) activities to improve courses and curriculum in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology;
- (2) faculty development;
- (3) stipends for undergraduate students participating in research; and
- (4) other activities consistent with subsection (a), as determined by the Director.

(c) INSTRUMENTATION.—Funding for instrumentation is an allowed use of grants awarded under this section.

H.R. 1867

OFFERED BY: MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 4: At the end of section 3, insert the following new subsection:

(h) REDUCTION.—Each of the amounts authorized to be appropriated or made available under this section shall be reduced by 1 percent.

H.R. 1867

OFFERED BY: MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 5: At the end of section 3, insert the following new subsection:

(h) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized under this section may be used for research related to—

- (1) archives of Andean Knotted-String Records;
- (2) the accuracy in the cross-cultural understanding of others’ emotions;
- (3) bison hunting on the late prehistoric Great Plains;

- (4) team versus individual play;
- (5) sexual politics of waste in Dakar, Senegal;
- (6) social relationships and reproductive strategies of Phayre’s Leaf Monkeys; and
- (7) cognitive model of superstitious belief.

H.R. 1867

OFFERED BY: MR. EHLERS

AMENDMENT No. 6: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 19. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING THE MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) although the mathematics and science education partnership program at the National Science Foundation and the mathematics and science partnership program at the Department of Education practically share the same name, the 2 programs are intended to be complementary, not duplicative;

(2) the National Science Foundation partnership programs are innovative, model reform initiatives that move promising ideas in education from research into practice to improve teacher quality, develop challenging curricula, and increase student achievement in mathematics and science, and Congress intends that the National Science Foundation peer-reviewed partnership programs found to be effective should be put into wider practice by dissemination through the Department of Education partnership programs; and

(3) the Director of the National Science Foundation and the Secretary of Education should have ongoing collaboration to ensure that the 2 components of this priority effort for mathematics and science education continue to work in concert for the benefit of States and local practitioners nationwide.

H.R. 1867

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT No. 7: Strike section 6.

H.R. 1867

OFFERED BY: MS. MATSUI

AMENDMENT No. 8: At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 19. COMMUNICATIONS TRAINING FOR SCIENTISTS.

(a) GRANT SUPPLEMENTS FOR COMMUNICATIONS TRAINING.—The Director shall provide grant supplements, on a competitive, merit-reviewed basis, to institutions receiving awards under the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship program. The grant supplements shall be used to train graduate students in the communication of the substance and importance of their research to nonscientist audiences, including policymakers.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall transmit a report to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, describing how the activities required under subsection (a) have been implemented. The report shall include data on the number of graduate students trained and the number and size of grant supplements awarded, and a description of the types of activities funded through the grant supplements.

H.R. 1867

OFFERED BY: MR. WELDON OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT No. 9: In section 3(a)(1), strike “There” and insert “Except as provided in paragraph (3), there”.

At the end of section 3(a), insert the following new paragraph:

(3) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), the total amount authorized to be appropriated under this subsection shall not exceed the amount actually appropriated for the Foundation for fiscal year 2007 if—

(A) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2008 is less than \$17,309,400,000;

(B) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Exploration Systems for fiscal year 2008 is less than \$3,923,800,000; or

(C) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Space Operations for fiscal year 2008 is less than \$6,791,700,000.

In section 3(b)(1), strike “There” and insert “Except as provided in paragraph (3), there”.

At the end of section 3(b), insert the following new paragraph:

(3) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), the total amount authorized to be appropriated under this subsection shall not exceed the amount actually appropriated for the Foundation for fiscal year 2008 if—

(A) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2009 is less than \$17,614,200,000;

(B) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Exploration Systems for fiscal year 2009 is less than \$4,312,800,000; or

(C) the total amount appropriated for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Space Operations for fiscal year 2009 is less than \$6,710,300,000.

H.R. 1867

OFFERED BY: MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

AMENDMENT No. 10: At the end of section 3, add the following new subsection:

(h) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized under this section may be used for research related to—

(1) the reproductive aging and symptom experience at midlife among Bangladeshi Immigrants, Sedentees, and White London Neighbors; and

(2) the diet and social stratification in ancient Puerto Rico.

H.R. 1867

OFFERED BY: MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

(h) REDUCTION.—Each of the amounts authorized to be appropriated or made available under this section shall be reduced by 0.5 percent.

H.R. 1867

OFFERED BY: MR. KIRK

AMENDMENT No. 12: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 19. STUDY ON MERCURY LEVELS.

The Director shall solicit proposals for annual research on mercury levels in each of the Great Lakes, with details on the trend and source of mercury in the water levels and aquatic life.