

doing something about those poor people who were victims of the fire. And so they voted \$20,000 for these victims of the fire. And that done, they went onto other business and Davy Crockett forgot about it.

Then about a year later, he was out campaigning. And it was mostly rural then. And he was on his horse. There was a farmer with his team who was plowing. So Davy Crockett times his horse so that he gets to the farmer just as he comes to the end of the row.

He speaks to the farmer. And the farmer is very cold. And finally he tells him, he says, "Yeah, I know who you are, you are Davy Crockett. I voted for you last time you ran, but I cannot vote for you again."

And then he made a very interesting statement. He said, "I suppose you are out electioneering now. But you had better not waste your time or mine, I shall not vote for you again."

Davy Crockett said, "this was a sock-dolager", I don't know what a sock-dolager is, but that is what he said. And this is what the man said: "You gave a vote last winter which shows that either you have no capacity to understand the Constitution or that you are wanting the honesty and firmness to be guided by it. In either case you are not the man to represent me."

Well, Davy Crockett was finally convinced that he had not understood the Constitution. He asked the man, gee, I really would like to apologize. I would like to explain to the people that I am now a new man, I understand the Constitution.

He said, if you will get a few people together and have a barbecue, I will pay for it. He said, well, we won't need you to pay for it. But if you come a week from this coming Saturday, we will have a barbecue. And Davy Crockett came and there were 1,000 people there that he spoke to and apologized for his vote in the Congress.

Now, I want to read from the Constitution. And I want you to stop me, it will not take very long to read. I want you to stop me, Madam Speaker, when I come to that part that says that it is okay for us to be involved in education, in philanthropy, and in health care.

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports and excises, to pay the debts, to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States; to regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States; to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures; to provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States; to establish Post Offices and

post roads; to promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries; to constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court; to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the laws of Nations.

I will not read the rest of this, because I tell you all of the rest of the Constitution deals with just two things, and read it to affirm that this is correct.

All of this part deals with the Congress and its responsibility for the military. We declare war. This is not the King's army. We declare war. Raise and support armies and so forth.

Then the last couple of paragraphs here deal with the District of Columbia, and then to make all of the laws necessary to enforce the above. Now, where, Madam Speaker, was there any reference to our right to be involved in these three things? I am not saying that we should not be doing these things, I am simply saying that if we are going to do them, I am very concerned that we should not do them by ignoring the Constitution.

If they are good and proper things to do, we should have amended the Constitution. We have done it 27 times. I do not mind doing it again. But I really mind ignoring the Constitution. Because let me tell you why, we are engaged now in a war. I have no idea when the war will end.

Civil liberties are always a casualty of war. Abraham Lincoln, my favorite President, suspended habeas corpus. And during World War II, we interred the Japanese Americans. My friend, Norm Minetta, with whom I served in this House, Secretary of Transportation, several years younger than I. He says, "Roscoe, I remember holding my parents hand as they led us into that concentration camp in Idaho."

That war is over. And we are now a bit embarrassed that we did that. The civil war is over. And we got back habeas corpus. But I am concerned that we not permit this war to result in an erosion of our civil liberties. I do not know when the war will end.

I have a great quote here. It is probably not from Julius Caesar, because it did not appear in print, as far as we know, until what, 01. It probably was not passed down by word of mouth until that time. But this ascribed to Julius Caesar.

I think it so reflects this inherent reaction of people to a war situation. "Beware of the leader who bangs the drums of war in order to whip the citizenry into a patriotic fervor. For patriotism is indeed a double-edged sword, it both emboldens the blood just as it narrows the mind. And when the drums of war have reached a fever pitch, and the blood boils with hate, and the mind is closed, the leader will have no need in seizing the rights of the citizenry, rather the citizenry, infused with fear

and blinded by patriotism will offer up all of their rights unto the leader, and gladly so. How do I know? For this is what I have done, and I am Julius Caesar."

That is probably not Julius Caesar. But it does, I think, reflect a common tendency on the part of people.

Benjamin Franklin, I do not know if he was the first to say it, "if you will up your freedom to get security, at the end of the day you will neither have freedom nor security, or you will deserve neither freedom nor security."

□ 2330

We are now at war. When will this war end? I want to make very sure that I bequeath to my kids and my grandkids more than an ever increasing debt, more than an energy deficient world. I want this great free country to be bequeathed to them just as I got it from my fathers.

This was a great new experiment. We weren't certain it was going to succeed. I am reading here from the Gettysburg Address, and Abraham Lincoln recognized this as an experiment which might not succeed. I don't know if you have thought about that in this Gettysburg Address.

Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new Nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Not so in England and Europe, was the divine right of kings.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether this Nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure.

And then he ended that Gettysburg Address with almost a prayer, that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

This has been a great experiment. We are the most blessed people on the planet. It has been said by a number of people that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance.

What will our children inherit? Unfortunately, we are going to bequeath to them an enormous debt, the largest intergenerational debt transfer in the history of the world. We are going to bequeath to them a world with deficient energy to run a society as we run ours. Will we also bequeath to them a Constitution gutted by apathy where the civil liberties of our people are at risk?

Mr. Speaker, the world needs the United States and for the United States to be the great free powerful country that it is. I believe that we need to be very vigilant in protecting these great civil liberties given to us by our Creator and guaranteed to us by our Constitution.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order

of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) for the time remaining before midnight.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to come before the House again tonight, and I can tell you that we in the 30-something Working Group come to the floor to share not only with Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker, but also the American people about the plans that we have for the country.

As you know, we have been sharing with the Members our concern of this side the aisle the Republican majority and rubber stamping the Republican President and all of his ideas and original thoughts that have put this country in an unprecedented financial situation that we have never been in before, especially as relates to the borrowing that has been going on from foreign countries within the last four years and continue to happen even now.

Mr. Speaker, as you know on this side of the aisle we talk about taking America in a new direction, a new direction in making sure that American workers make a liveable wage and definitely a minimum wage, raising the minimum wage to \$7.25 an hour from what it is now. The Republican majority has not done so since 1997.

We also talk about energy innovation, making sure that we invest in the Midwest versus the Middle East as relates to E-85, alternative fuels, and other technology that can assist us in working with Detroit and other motor companies here in the United States and making more fuel efficient cars. That will happen. That is our plan on HouseDemocrats.gov.

Also, we talk about making sure that folks can retire with dignity, protecting Social Security, and making sure that we don't privatize Social Security. If left up to the White House, that will happen. Thanks to many of the Members here on this floor that are on the Democratic side of the aisle that we have fought time after time again in some 600 to 500-plus town hall meetings around the country, helped turn the tide on that issue because the Republican majority was all set, cocked, and ready to privatize Social Security.

Another initiative there is to make sure that veterans are honored in the way they should be honored. We have made a full commitment that those that have served this country will no longer need to reap the benefits of a broken promise to them, to make sure that we fulfill that. I think, also, for us to talk about the issue of access to college. We have said that we are going to cut student loans price cost in half and also roll back the interest rate, and make sure that we have tax breaks for those that wish to go to college and pay for their college. And, also, make sure, Mr. Speaker, that we implement the real security, Homeland Security here and overseas. We have our plan here. This is just a small pamphlet here that talks about the real security

plan. We have put forth this plan and legislation here on the Democratic side of the aisle. Unfortunately, none of those bills have surfaced to the floor or many of them are stuck in subcommittees and not heard in committees and not worked in a bipartisan way. And we have committed to the American people that we will continue, we will promote bipartisanship versus not working in a bipartisan way as the Republican majority has decided to do so.

I talked about energy efficiency and HouseDemocrats.gov right here energizing America. Talked about innovation. We want to make sure that we have the scientists, we have the school teachers that can teach the next generation, making sure that we carry out broadband opportunities throughout the country not just in certain parts of the country, but to make sure we have that in here. We want to educate 100,000 new scientists and engineers within the period of 4 years, and provide scholarships to students that qualify to work in those fields of innovation, making sure that we have highly qualified teachers in every math and science 12th grade classroom by offering tuition assistance to talented undergraduate students, and also paying competitive salaries to make sure that teachers will go into the profession and won't have to make a sacrifice beyond their means.

I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that we point these things out. We were in the majority; and if we have the opportunity to do so after November going into January, those are things that we will implement immediately, that we would make sure, and other initiatives.

One other, Mr. RYAN, before I yield to you, is the issue of making sure that we work towards balancing the budget. The Republican majority talks about cutting it in half. We are the only party here in this Chamber that has actually balanced the budget and know how to do it. Pay as you go is how you do it, not borrowing, Mr. RYAN and Mr. Speaker, from foreign nations at the record number that the Republican majority has done. We have said we will do away with the rubber stamp, Mr. RYAN. No longer will the White House have their original thoughts pass through this Congress without any question, without any oversight, without any major questions, and very little change. Energy companies will not be able to come here and use the power of this House, either be Democrat or Republican. When we are in the majority, they will not use it to their benefit, we will use it to the American people's benefit.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think it is important what you said. These aren't unreachable goals for us. These are goals that are achievable, and they are very achievable in the early days. Many of these advances we could make within the first 100 hours, Mr. MEEK, within the first 100 hours. Within the first 3 or 4 days that we are here, the

American people are going to know by the legislation that we pass out of this House next January that there is a new America, and we are going to go in a new and a different direction.

And all we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is just think about what will happen in those first 100 hours. We pass an increase in the minimum wage to \$7.25. How many lives will that affect around this country? Six or 7 million directly, and then millions of others as the bottom gets bumped so the middle income people will get bumped as well.

Cutting student loans. If you have a student loan right now and your rate is 6 or 7 percent, parents and students, loans interest rate will be cut in half within the first 100 days here. That is \$12 billion. So many people may be saying, well, are you going to get the money? We are going to not give the oil industry \$12 billion in corporate welfare. The American people have a choice to make. Okay? They can reaffirm that legislation, they can reaffirm that position that the Republican Congress implemented over the last year or two and that President Bush affirmed by signing the bill into law and Vice President CHENEY kicked off with his secret meeting that he had years ago where we were complaining and saying, well, the oil industry was in there writing the legislation. And everyone said, well, the Democrats, you know, they were in there writing the legislation and now we have \$3 gas prices. Okay?

So these small steps, and as you said so articulately at the wee hours or almost the wee hours of the morning about balancing the budget. We implemented what was called pay-go years ago, which means the government can't spend any money that it doesn't have. It can't go out and borrow it. You have to cut it from a program in order to get it, like we will do with our education. We are going to reimplement those rules so that we have a system in place that will restrain the runaway spending.

□ 2340

Now, you have many conservatives like William F. Buckley saying that this President is not a conservative because of the spending, the borrowing that has been going on from this Congress, on and on and on and on. We can take care of these problems very simply.

Now, I am not saying that the structural problems are not going to be more difficult. Getting to a balanced budget after the Republicans have bumped the debt ceiling five times and are going to allow the United States Government to borrow more money from foreign governments than any President prior to President Bush put together, that is going to be a difficult thing to overcome, and that is going to take time. Reforming the government when Republicans have put in all their cronies that operate like they operated FEMA, it is not that they are bad people, but it is that power corrupts, Mr.

Speaker, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

The institution is corrupted because there has been no change, and we when you see Newt Gingrich, the man who gave birth to the Republican revolution, be the most critical of what is going on here, it is not the Democrats saying it only. It is William F. Buckley, it is Pat Toomey, it is Newt Gingrich, it is Dick Armeey.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It is Charles Barkley.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is Charles Barkley. For God's sake, if you do not believe it, Mr. Speaker, that Newt Gingrich criticism does not hold water, Charles Barkley's should.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Let me just say this very quickly before I yield to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ here.

A Washington Post editorial on Tuesday, July 25, which is today, A14, this is an editorial, Mr. Speaker, and I am just going to read the first paragraph, maybe some of the second.

Do large corporations need another tax break? The House of Representatives seems to think so. It plans this week to take up a measure defining when States can tax companies doing business in their State and make it easier for companies to avoid paying State taxes. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the Business Activity Tax Simplification Act would drain \$1 billion from State government treasuries during the first year in effect and \$3 billion a year by 2011 as corporations continue to take advantage of this situation.

Now, it just goes on. The National Governors Association is just totally outraged by this, and they are saying a Federal corporate tax cut using State dollars, that is what they are calling this, this is the editorial today in the Washington Post.

I think it is important that we point out who the Republican majority is fighting on behalf of. We have State governments now that are in deficits have to figure out how they can make up. Mr. RYAN used to be a State senator. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ used to be a State Senator and State representative in the Florida legislature. I used to be a State senator and State representative in the Florida legislature. I think it is important for us to look at the States and look at what they have to do.

We are both Fleming fellows, and when we were taking that fellowship program at the Center for Policy Alternatives in Washington, D.C., for State legislatures, it talked about the devolution of taxation, putting tax cuts here, putting it on the backs of the States. We can take out a credit card and we can borrow from foreign Nations; that is this Republican rubber stamp Congress has been doing, but in the States, Mr. Speaker, they have to balance their budget. And so when they balance the budget, what do they do? Raise tuition costs. They cut dollars going to local governments, and local

governments then have to put a penny here and a penny there, and a million here and a million there on property taxes to be able to make it up.

Meanwhile, we have got Members here in Congress, because special interests knocked on their door and said, hey, can you help us get more money, more subsidies that you have already given us, while we are at it, let us do all we can, do not worry about it, the folks back home will pay for it, that is why it is important, 11:30 at night we are back and we are making sure we share with the Members and the American people.

I just wanted to read this because we are all creatures of State government and State service, and we know how those legislatures feel. This is the National Governors Association. So these are not Democratic governors only, not Republican governors only, not Independent governors only.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I am so glad that you highlighted that because the fiscal irresponsibility is startling, and so often it is difficult for us to quantify or physically represent what the impact is of the fiscally irresponsible decisions that are going on here, and we are not just making this stuff up ourselves.

Mr. MEEK is absolutely right. The three of us were State legislators. We worked every day to balance our State budgets. States cannot operate in the red like the Federal Government can. The Federal Government can deficit spend. That is not possible at the State level. So, when we pass down a tax cut, it means that there is less revenue available at the State level in the programs that they are counting on those Federal dollars to fund, and so they have the devolution of the tax cuts.

Look, it is so often the Republicans talk about how they make these references to tax-and-spend liberals. Well, not only as you have talked about are they borrow-and-spend Republicans, but they also have refused to acknowledge that tax cuts are another form of spending. I mean, they are adopting irresponsible tax cuts for the wealthiest few. It would be one thing if they were passing tax cuts on to middle class working families. They are passing tax cuts that add to the deficit for the wealthiest few.

Let us just go over some opinions and some reality that is being offered out there as far as what third party validators have to say about their irresponsible spending.

Here is a USA Today editorial from February 21, 2006, of this year. The title of it is, "Who's spending big now? The party of small government," and USA Today said, "Tax cuts, they say, force hard decisions and restrain reckless spending. The last time we looked, though, Republicans controlled both Congress and the White House. They are the spenders. In fact, since they took control in 2001, they have increased spending by an average of nearly 7.5 percent a year, more than double

the rate in the last 5 years of Clinton-era budgets."

Now, what kind of an impact are we talking about on real people? The tax cut reconciliation package that we passed out of this Chamber a couple of months ago, let us see who that helps because one would think that the purpose of a tax cut is to just give tax dollars back to the average person.

Does the tax cut bill do that? Well, let us take a look at the evidence because the average amount that an American would get back, based on income from the 2006 tax cut bill passed by the Republicans, looks like this. If you make between \$10,000 and \$20,000 a year, you get enough back from that tax cut bill to buy a Slurpee. If you make between \$40,000 and let us say \$50,000 a year, you get enough back just about, because it is continuing to increase, to buy a gallon of gas, not a tank, mind you, a gallon of gas, which is about three bucks. And if you make more than \$1 million, you did okay in the tax cut bill. You get enough to buy a Hummer.

There is a slight discrepancy here. It is really pretty startling. Now, when we are talking about the billions, with a B, that the tax cut bill cost, again, it is hard to illustrate for folks what the kind of numbers and immensity, enormity of what we deal with here every day really means. So how much is a billion just so people can wrap their minds around it?

Well, a billion hours ago, humans were making their first tools in the Stone Age. To quantify it further, a billion seconds ago, it was 1975 and the last American troops had pulled out of Vietnam. A billion minutes ago, it was 104 A.D., and the Chinese had first invented paper. But under the Republicans, \$1 billion ago was only 3 hours and 32 minutes at the rate that the government spends money under this Republican leadership.

That is just to help people understand what is really going on here, who is for fiscal responsibility and who is just a lot of talk.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And who has a record of it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And who has a record of it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We do not really have to look that far to the 1993 operation that we had here and the Democrats who obviously were not perfect, but we knew how to balance budgets. We knew how to implement the PAYGO rules so that we were not borrowing money.

We actually were going to pay down the debt and begin generating surpluses in the United States of America. Can you imagine now, since the Republicans have raised the debt limit five times, harking back to a day when we actually had surplus money and we were on track to actually pay off the national debt in the United States of America? Actually pay it off?

□ 2350

That is what we need to get back to. And it is not that difficult if you are

disciplined and you are willing to say no.

This is like giving candy to a baby, and then the baby wants more candy, and they keep giving it to them. That is the oil industry. That is the top 1 percent. And really, quite frankly, I am even starting to meet people in my district who are in the top 1 percent who are saying I don't want any more tax cuts. I am doing fine. I have a Hummer, I have this, I have a nice house, I have Italian marble flown in, I am doing okay. But kids 2 miles away, on the other side of town, aren't doing well. Their parents are trying to work for minimum wage, a single mom with one child is living in poverty with that kid by working a minimum wage job. It is unacceptable.

And when you run these huge budget deficits and you raise the debt, and this is the interest we are paying in the 2007 budget, \$230 billion, just on the interest on the debt. We get no value from that. That is not lowering tuition costs, where people would benefit, get educated, contribute to the economy and generate wealth. That is not taking care of our veterans. That is not investing in health care or research or alternative energy sources. There is no value from that. And that is the disappointing part, is that we are not getting any kind of benefit from that money.

In fact, as Mr. MEEK pointed out in the last hour, that money is going to Japan and China to pay down the money that we are borrowing, and paying interest on the money we are borrowing from them. So here we are, and this is just silly, we are borrowing money from China to give tax cuts to the wealthiest 1 percent, who don't need it, and to give \$16 billion in subsidies to the oil companies, to give huge subsidies to the health care industry, and then the money that we borrow, China will charge interest on it, and then take the money they make off us and invest it back into their state-run factories because China is a Communist country.

That is not a level playing field, to begin with, because China manipulates their currency, as we talked about yesterday. They do not enforce their intellectual property laws. They have no environmental laws. They have no human rights, no religious freedoms, none of the things we value. So they are taking this money and wiping out the middle class of the United States. That is not free trade. That is not fair trade. It is an unbalanced system.

And we just keep feeding the beast: Right here. How much more do you want? How much more interest do you want?

Be happy to yield.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, referring back to the chart, we are talking about \$230 billion on the debt. And I am looking at education there on that chart, and you can stack three of those charts, the education dollars investment beside the debt and you still won't make it to the 230.

You have the homeland security folks running around here talking about we have to protect the homeland on the majority side, as though, Mr. Speaker, that just became a problem. Folks burning all kind of Federal jet fuel running down to the border talking about how we are going to get tough. Sending National Guard troops from throughout the States when we already have an overextended military and saying we would like to do more in homeland security. But as it relates to the Republican majority plan, the investment dollars are not there.

Look at veterans, the blue over here, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, which is quite interesting. Goodness, what we are paying down on the debt because of the Republican out-of-control spending on the majority side, the rubber stamp Congress, doing everything the President says to do for the billionaires and millionaires and all of the people that Mr. RYAN pointed out, who are not outside rallying in front of the Capitol saying we need more money, doing what I just pointed out here in The Washington Post editorial just today, just stacking on top, piling on, putting more cream, and whip cream, and whipping it on up and throwing eight or nine cherries on top of this eight-floor cake they are giving to the special interests. Looking at what the veterans are getting. Nothing. Little or no investment. Well under \$50 billion.

I am looking at this chart, and it is well under \$30 billion. So when you look at it as it relates to the investment, it just doesn't pay off.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And just so we can segue into how we would do it differently, what we would do is we would go back to the days of PAYGO rules. We would make sure that we have some fiscal discipline that we impose on ourselves, just like the State legislatures that we came from, just like they do, which is that we are not going to deficit spend. Just like families who struggle every day to not spend more money than they take in; to not put all their wants and desires on a credit card and live on credit card debt. We need to operate this budget like families feel compelled to operate their family budgets. We are simply not doing that.

What we would do, and we have offered amendments time and again, Mr. RYAN, through Mr. SPRATT, our lead Democrat on the House Budget Committee. He has offered amendment after amendment that has been rejected unanimously by the Republicans again and again opposing reestablishing PAYGO.

PAYGO is tough. It forces some difficult choices. But it would make sure that we could really cut the deficit and go back to the surpluses that we had under the Clinton administration. I mean, that is the direction that we need to move in. If we continue down this path, if we continue in the direction that the Republicans have taken

us, we will continue to spiral downward and pass the deficit and the debt onto future generations.

Really, we only have a couple of minutes, and what I didn't get to mention at the end of our last hour was what Speaker Gingrich had said. So if you would just before we end yield back to me, I kind of want to throw that out there for everyone's final thoughts. Be happy to yield.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Well, one other thing that we have forgotten to mention tonight, and I know the clock is ticking, but with all these other costs, we keep forgetting to mention interest rates for people who are going out and trying to get a car or a house and the significant increase over the past year or so in interest rates. So you have the health care, you have the tuition costs, you have the gas, natural and what you get at the pump, and you throw in there if you are trying to get a new house or car and what your interest rates are now, or they would have been because everybody is going out trying to borrow money, you run into a difficult situation.

Again, by balancing the budget, as President Clinton and the 1993 Democratic Congress proved, by balancing that budget, you will in turn reduce interest rates and then let the private sector go out and borrow money and make things happen in the market.

Www.housedemocrats.gov/30something. All of our charts and everything are available, including the article that voted Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ one of the 50 most beautiful people on Capitol Hill.

With that, I yield to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Well, just to throw this out, I want to end by telling you what Speaker Gingrich said at the end of that panel. He said, "While waiting for voter backlash to clean up Congress, he had some pithy advice for lawmakers, who in the current wave of scandal and personal enrichment on Capitol Hill have confused the public interest with their personal interest, said the former Speaker, my answer to them is: Go home."

Good advice.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor once again to address the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEFAZIO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)