

It is an interesting question of why we harm our own people, why we sometimes insist they have to prove their own innocence, and why we fail our own simply because the Federal Government is too large, too inflexible to be creative, to be just, and to be fair.

One last comment about Gene. His family raised on this property sugar beets. I am not a farmer, but it does not take a rocket scientist, either, to understand you cannot raise a root crop in a wetlands. Some day I wish the Federal Government would learn that as well.

DELPHI

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise on behalf of both current and retired Delphi workers in my district and around our Nation who are suffering from the financial woes of the largest automotive parts manufacturer in the country. Unfortunately, these Delphi workers are but the latest victims in a series of tragedies for the American worker. What we are currently witnessing, the bankruptcy and subsequent reorganization of Delphi is the fallout from regrettable trade agreements like NAFTA, and CAFTA, and the accompanying influence of some elected officials who are for globalized big business at the expense of the American people, big business built on low wages, no benefits, and no worker safety.

Job loss is also due to major auto firms' leadership and executive boards who failed to make fuel efficient vehicles that Americans and the world want to buy. So our workers suffer.

Delphi's most recent proposal is to lower wages from \$27 an hour to \$22 an hour through 2007, and then to \$16.50 thereafter. This would be a 40 percent cut in middle-class wages.

On Friday, Delphi filed a motion in bankruptcy court asking a judge to void its labor contracts. But how can you ask American workers to compete with a country like Japan which keeps its markets closed, the second largest market in the world? How can you ask our workers to compete with poverty level wages in Mexico and China? And how can you ask our workers to compete when big firms outsource everything to avoid paying workers what they justly deserve?

Late last year, Congressman GEORGE MILLER, ranking member of the Education and Workforce Committee, took the initiative to hold hearings on this subject.

I want to make sure this evening that many of the workers' voices from my district are heard, like Mary Pat Bishoff of Marblehead, who said, "My husband is 49 and has 32 years in at Delphi. He got sick and has been off since October. With only 5 years left on our first mortgage and 8 years on the

second, we had to refinance and take them up to 30 years just to survive. This will force us to pay \$733.11 a month instead of the \$152.11 we were paying. We are faced with a decision as so many others are, should he retire and risk losing his pension? Or, if he stays and they cut pay, that means sick pay will also go down and we will lose our home." What kind of a choice is that?

David Saylor of Port Clinton said, "I retired from the GM assembly plant at Lordstown, Ohio in December of 1987, with the promise I would have complete health care coverage for life. Well, I will now have to pay \$21 monthly, and that will greatly impact me since I took an early retirement and do not have the full 30-year retirement benefit."

Raymond Stahl of Vermillion, Ohio said, "They are shutting down the plant I work at and are moving it. Now I am out of a good paying job, and at my age it is going to be hard to even get another job let alone one that pays so well. America comes first, not overseas."

Andrew Briscar, another Ohioan, said, "I worked very hard for 20 years at the Delphi Packard Electric to get to a point where I can make a comfortable living for myself and my son. Now Delphi Packard Electric wants to cut my pay and benefits to a level that a young man or woman might make just coming out of high school."

Mr. Speaker, workers who dedicate years of service to a company should be able to count on a decent retirement and measure of economic security. This Congress must step up with meaningful pension reform to help secure pensions and encourage companies to continue providing them.

The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation should have been reinfused with funds long ago with its \$23 billion deficit, and we ought to be renegotiating trade agreements like NAFTA and CAFTA that continue to cash out good American jobs. Opponents said these jobs would go south, and they surely have, with GM now being Mexico's being largest employer. And it is no surprise that companies like Delphi, GM's biggest supplier, are following them.

I have spoken with Delphi management, and our delegation is doing everything possible to keep these Delphi jobs in America, but we need a majority of Members here dedicated to that purpose. I have invited Chairman Steve Miller of Delphi to tour the Sandusky Delphi facility and to meet with key employees and public officials, and he has yet to take me up on that offer.

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the Members to sign on to the Balancing Trade Act of 2005 which I have introduced to ask our trade ambassador to come back to us with recommendations to write all of these trade deficits that we are incurring with other trading countries around the world. America simply must put ourselves back in a positive trade balance status.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY) laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, April 5, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House, H232 Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed are copies of resolutions adopted on April 5, 2006 by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Copies of the resolutions are being transmitted to the Department of the Army.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

RESOLUTION—DOCKET 2748—LOWER KAWEAH DISTRIBUTARY SYSTEM, CALIFORNIA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin Streams, California, published as House Document No. 367, 81st Congress, and other pertinent reports to determine whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time, in the interest of flood damage reduction, and related purposes in the Lower Kaweah Distributary System, California.

RESOLUTION—DOCKET 2749—CEDAR RIVER, TIME CHECK AREA, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Iowa and Cedar Rivers, Iowa and Minnesota, published as House Document 166, 89th Congress, 1st Session, and other pertinent reports, to determine whether any modifications to the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time in the interest of flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, recreation, and related purposes along the Cedar River in Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

RESOLUTION—DOCKET 2750—NAVIGATIONAL SAFETY, DELAWARE RIVER, PENNSYLVANIA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Delaware River and its tributaries, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and New York, published as House Document 179, 73rd Congress, 2nd Session, the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Delaware River published as House Document 522, 87th Congress, 2nd Session, and other pertinent reports to determine whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time in the interest of improved navigational safety.

RESOLUTION—DOCKET 2751—COOS BAY, OREGON

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United

States House of Representatives, that the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on Coos Bay, Oregon, dated December 31, 1970 and published as House Document 151, 91st Congress, 2nd Session and other pertinent reports, with a view to determine whether any modifications of the existing navigation project are advisable at the present time, with particular reference to providing increased project dimensions and an additional turning basin to accommodate existing and prospective traffic.

RESOLUTION—DOCKET 2752—VANCOUVER LAKE, CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Washington, and Portland, Oregon, published as House Document 452, 87th Congress, 2nd Session, and other pertinent reports, to determine whether any modifications to the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time in the interest of erosion control, ecosystem restoration, and related purposes in the vicinity of Vancouver Lake, Clark County, Washington.

RESOLUTION—DOCKET 2753—TEN MILE RIVER, CONNECTICUT AND NEW YORK

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Housatonic River, Connecticut Federal Navigation Channel submitted as House Document 449, 70th Congress, and other pertinent reports, to determine whether any modifications to the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time in the interest of shoreline protection, flood control, ecosystem restoration, streambank erosion protection, and other related purposes in the vicinity of Ten Mile River, Dutchess County, New York and Litchfield County, Connecticut.

RESOLUTION—DOCKET 2754—LONG BEACH, BACK BAY SHORE, NEW YORK

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, that the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Atlantic Coast of Long Island from Jones Inlet to East Rockaway Inlet, Long Beach Island, New York, dated April 5, 1996, and other pertinent reports to determine whether any modifications to the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time in the interest of storm damage reduction, navigation, ecosystem restoration, and related purposes on areas of Long Beach Island, New York, affected by tidal inundation from Reynolds Channel, Hempstead Bay, and other connected waterways.

There was no objection.

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

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

FEDERAL BUDGET NEEDS TO MEET CONSTITUTIONAL MUSTER

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to

claim the time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from Utah who just spoke previously, a fellow member of the Congressional Constitutional Caucus, who had indicated that we come to this floor on a regular basis to address what the Founding Fathers intended with the American public and the other Members of this body, their intention for the framework of the Constitution and the framework of the government of the various levels.

James Madison stated in Federalist Papers No. 45 that the role of the Federal Government is limited and defined, whereas that of the States and the people, their powers are broad and numerous.

To remind this body, the caucus' function primarily is to focus upon the 10th amendment to the Constitution, which in essence says that all powers not specifically delegated to the Federal Government are retained by the States and the people respectively.

When you read that and when you think about that, it is really pretty simple what the founders were trying to do there. And when the Constitution was ratified in 1787, they probably thought it was pretty simple, too. They thought they had probably in place a plan that would be existing for future generations would understand that the role of the Federal Government would be limited, that the sovereignty of the States and of the people would be respected. They probably thought to themselves that there is probably no way that they could have written it even more clearly than they did; that future Congresses should follow suit, should be ones to limit what the Federal Government does, and to retain to the people and the States what their responsibilities are.

Unfortunately, if you simply look out any of the windows of this building on this growing city that we have before us in Washington, D.C., you see representative of what is a growing Federal Government in all facets of our life. I am sure that our founding fathers would be disappointed in the largesse of the government, the excessive spending, the number of line items that is now in the budget. As a matter of fact, the budget is something that we were just debating and discussing on the floor of this House for a number of hours. I serve on the Budget Committee and have the opportunity to discuss it there as well.

What would our Founding Fathers think if they were to see our spending levels today? Would they ask the question that I think we all should be asking: Is it inconsistent the size and

scope that the government has grown to today? Is it inconsistent in the nature of the spending that the government has grown to today?

If the Founding Fathers were with us today, I think they would give us a resounding no to what we are doing. They would say that it is inconsistent, that we have grown too large.

But we are all leaving here now and going back to our districts. Many Members will be going back and using this time to get involved with the media. We are actually in a 24/7 media cycle in this country now with the advent of all the communications that we have, whether it is in press and press releases or whether it is going on the radio or TV or e-mail. Many Members use this as an opportunity simply to go back to their district and to brag about all the money that the Federal Government is spending, all the new areas that they are enveloping as far as their responsibilities, just as the one that the gentleman from Utah was just talking about as far as the delineation of wetlands and how it impacts upon the people back at home.

Maybe this is exactly what our Founding Fathers feared, that we have grown so far apart from where the money comes from and where it is spent. Their goal was that the money should be spent closest to the people. That way, the people would have the greatest voice in how it was going to be spent. Unfortunately, we have just the opposite today. The inverse is true instead.

Let me just give you a couple examples that come to mind. Think about your local board of education and the schooling. Parents know who their teachers are, parents know who the principals are, parents know who the board of education is in their town that run their schools. But do parents know who the bureaucrats are down here in Washington, D.C. that now control education dollars that go back to those schools? People back at home know about the pothole in their front streets, people back at home know the name of their local mayor who may be responsible for making sure that street is paved. But do people know who the bureaucrats are in the U.S. Department of Transportation who are responsible for the transportation dollars that may or may not get back to their town to fix their potholes, but may instead go to someplace as the infamous bridge to nowhere?

Maybe this is exactly what our Founding Fathers were thinking of when they were looking at a government so far away across a broad ocean in England, and realizing that that English government was no longer connected to our government here, and so that is why they put the limits on it that they did.

We could go down with other examples, with the growing deficit that we have today, with the subpar service that we have in such agencies as FEMA, and ad infinitum as far as this