his commitment to protect the environment in the Caribbean. His remarks at the opening ceremony of the Third Conference on the Environment indicated his support for environmental sustainability and compliance with the international environment agenda in order to foster partnerships for preservation in the region.

During his speech, Ambassador King encouraged students and professionals to transition to sustainable business and support nongovernmental organizations that make such business a priority. He also challenged his audience to utilize the expertise of Caribbeans abroad that have experienced success in environmental sustainability.

Ambassador King insisted on strengthening stewardship, advocacy, public education, and innovation in the absence of great financial resources in order to improve the environment. While he marked the progress made by Caribbean nations in terms of securing trained and knowledgeable staff on environment and development issues, he acknowledged the narrow scope of much of the expertise due to limited resources forcing specialization.

Ambassador King gave the example of The University of the West Indies (UWI) as a Caribbean institution of higher learning that should adopt sustainable energy and recycling programs to better the environment of the Caribbean. With a focus on such programs, graduates of UWI, and other Caribbean universities, would be more dedicated to achieving sustainability in the environment as well as building upon existing exercises aimed at biological diversity.

Article 58 of the Treaty of Chaguaramas, which established the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), details the framework wherein member nations are to operate in order to protect and manage their biological and natural resources. Ambassador King encouraged CARICOM members to develop a vision for environmental sustainability, with the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States setting the precedence.

THE TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2007

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, on Friday, June 29th, 2007, the United States and the Republic of Panama signed the Trade Promotion Agreement, which is the result of the tireless negotiations between both the United States and Panama. After the agreement is signed, Congress will have an opportunity to comprehensively review it, an opportunity that I wholeheartedly welcome.

This agreement will increase much needed access to medicines for developing countries, strengthen provisions in labor, environment and national security. This agreement also sees to it that significant cuts are made to trade barrier tariffs. Additionally, this bill seeks to improve on the growing commercial relationship between both countries on the growing Panamanian market which has a strong affinity for American goods, demonstrated by the 67 percent trade deficit Panama currently holds with the U.S.

Small businesses stand to benefit from this agreement as well. The elimination of Panamanian tariffs on our goods will lower the transaction costs. This would create a mutually beneficial relationship between small business sellers in the United States and buyers in Panama.

This agreement is about more than the commercial exchange of goods and services. I would like to note that our relationship with Panama is a long standing one since its independence from Colombia in 1903. We have an uncompromising commitment to providing opportunities for the people of Panama to work towards a better future while providing American businesses the opportunity to expand their market access in another country.

I would be remiss if I did not mention the $5.25 billion expansion of the Panama Canal which will create additional unique opportunities. Three of the four contracts for this project have already been awarded to U.S businesses.

Madam Speaker, I submit for your further consideration the text of the proposed U.S. Panama Trade Promotion Agreement. I look forward to a productive and informative discussion about it in the weeks and months to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2007

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I was required to be back in my home district to assist my mother, who recently had surgery. For this reason, I was unable to attend recorded votes for yesterday, Wednesday, July 11, 2007.

COLLEGE COST REDUCTION ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 2007

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2669, the College Cost Reduction Act of 2007, which will cut excess subsidies paid by the federal government to lenders in the student loan industry and reinvest those funds to allow for the single largest investment in higher education since the GI bill, at no new cost to taxpayers.

Over the last few decades, the cost of a postsecondary education in our country has more than doubled for graduates with student loans, from $9,250 to $19,200—a 108 percent increase (58 percent after accounting for inflation). As the richest nation in the world, we have a moral obligation to eliminate the barriers this de facto economic segregation erects. No child should be forced to forgo the dream of a college education due to fear of debt, and no child should have that potential debt dictate their future career choice.

The College Cost Reduction Act will provide us with a real chance, a $15.1 billion chance, to roll back the spiraling cost of higher education in this country. By cutting interest rates in half on subsidized student loans and increasing the maximum Pell Grant scholarship, this act makes College more affordable and moves more Americans into the middle class.

Passing H.R. 2669 will also provide upfront tuition assistance to students committed to teaching at public schools in high-poverty communities or high-need subject areas. Furthermore, this legislation provides loan forgiveness to encourage students who choose to pursue careers as public servants. By enacting these provisions, we will be allowing students to become a nurse, public defender, prosecutor or firefighter free from the restraints of debt.

Finally, the College Cost Reduction Act Congress will be making a landmark, $500 million investment in Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-Serving Institutions, and Tribally-Controlled, Native or Predominately Black Institutions, ensuring that students can not only enter college, but count on continued support through graduation.

In the first 50 legislative hours of the 110th Congress, the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives took up and passed H.R. 5, the College Student Relief Act, which cut the interest rates in half on certain subsidized student loans over the next five years. In passing that legislation, we kept our promise of making college more affordable and accessible. Today, with H.R. 2669, the College Cost Reduction Act, we build on this effort and once again prove that the 110th Congress is on the job and fighting for a better America.

PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT OF 2007

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 2007

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, today I am reintroducing bipartisan legislation, the Private Property Rights Protection Act of 2007, along with my friend and colleague from California.

This legislation would prevent the federal government or any authority of the federal government from using economic development as a justification for exercising its power of eminent domain.

The protection of private property rights lies at the foundation of American government. As James Madison wrote in the Federalist Papers, ''[G]overnment is instituted no less for the protection of property than of the persons of individuals.''

Two years ago, the Supreme Court held in Kelo v. City of New London that ''economic development'' can be a ''public use'' under the Fifth Amendment's Takings Clause. The 5–4 decision has substantially weakened the rights of private property owners by handing the government a raw taking power with negligible accountability to the ''public use'' requirement in the Fifth Amendment's Taking Clause.

The ''public use'' requirement imposed an important limitation on eminent domain power to ensure the government may not force individuals to forfeit their property for the benefit of another private party.

However, Kelo transformed established constitutional principles when it permitted the government to seize the private property of one