United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 5, 2007 No. 37

# House of Representatives

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

## DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
*March 5, 2007.*

I hereby appoint the Honorable MASIE K. HIRONO 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 Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) for 1 minute.

## THE TREATMENT OF OUR VETERANS

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, the failures of this administration are once again on display today. From the failure to plan for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, to plan for the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, and now we face the unconscionable failure to plan for the care of our veterans at Walter Reed and other facilities across the country.

This administration's inability to plan, their total disregard of expert advice, and the President's stubborn refusal to even acknowledge the consequences of marching our country off to war all have led to our servicemembers living in substandard conditions after coming back and fighting for this country.

Some of my colleagues deflect this criticism by saying yes, that's true, but what is your plan? Our plan is to actually plan ahead. Most members of the military like myself and the VSOs that support them anticipated the need for added resources to support our veterans at a time of war. But the President continued year after year after year to cut funding resources to the VA. The cost of war must include the cost of caring for our warriors.

Now another avoidable crisis is upon us and I say and the country says, Enough is enough. The era of putting politics before the needs of our citizens comes to an end. The American public will not stand for one more day of this incompetence. Now is the time to act. This Congress must exhibit the leadership that will restore the American people's confidence in their government and provide the services to our wounded veterans.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SALAZAR) at 2 p.m.

## PRAYER

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

Lord God, You are ultimately the beginning and the end. All time stands before You as ever-present. Be present to all the Members of Congress and all who work with them and beside them this day and this week.

May the daily decisions that Your people make be a sign to You, that acting with hearts set on what is right, seeking only lasting good for this Nation and for all peoples, they will prove themselves to be the faithful and free children of their heavenly Father.

May routine be transformed by Your spirit and so be filled with meaning. May the ordinary work of this institution, having consequences around the world, be undertaken by all as a mighty work, with fear of the Lord and give glory to Your Holy name both 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 his approval thereof.

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

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. POE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.



Printed on recycled paper.

## AMERICAN AID TO ''HAMAS'' UNIVERSITY

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, incompetence seems to be running loose in a couple of Federal foreign aid programs. The United States dumps millions of American dollars for programs all over the world. Some of these may be worthwhile, but I want to mention some that defy common sense.

According to the Washington Times, the United States has been giving millions of dollars to two Palestinian universities with links to the terrorist organization Hamas. The money is sent through the United States Agency for International Development and through a sister group called the American Near East Refugee Aid.

The Islamic University, which is controlled by Hamas, has received money for student scholarships and money to build a state-of-the-art facility. Al Quds University also got millions of dollars for scholarships for 2,000 students. This is the same university that held a week-long celebration honoring the founder of the suicide belt that kills Americans and innocents. So it seems the good ole U.S. taxpayer is paying for both sides of the war on terror.

No American money should be given to any university that preaches and teaches hate and terror.

And that's just the way it is.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

## INLAND EMPIRE AND CUCAMONGA VALLEY RECYCLING PROJECTS

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 122) to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Inland Empire regional recycling project and in the Cucamonga Valley Water District recycling project, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 122

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

**SECTION 1. INLAND EMPIRE AND CUCAMONGA VALLEY RECYCLING PROJECTS.**

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Inland Empire Regional Water Recycling Initiative''.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (Public Law 102–575, title XVI; 43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**''SEC. 16___. INLAND EMPIRE REGIONAL WATER RECYCLING PROJECT.**

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Inland Empire Utilities Agency, may participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Inland Empire regional water recycling project described in the report submitted under section 1606(c).

''(b) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost of the project.

''(c) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation and maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000.

''(e) SUNSET OF AUTHORITY.—The authority of the Secretary to carry out any provisions of this section shall terminate 10 years after the date of the enactment of this section.

**''SEC. 16___. CUCAMONGA VALLEY WATER RECYCLING PROJECT.**

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Cucamonga Valley Water District, may participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Cucamonga Valley Water District satellite recycling plants in Rancho Cucamonga, California, to reclaim and recycle approximately 2 million gallons per day of domestic wastewater.

''(b) COST SHARING.—The Federal share of the cost of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the capital cost of the project.

''(c) LIMITATION.—Funds provided by the Secretary shall not be used for operation and maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $10,000,000.

''(e) SUNSET OF AUTHORITY.—The authority of the Secretary to carry out any provisions of this section shall terminate 10 years after the date of the enactment of this section''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections in section 2 of Public Law 102–575 is amended by inserting after the last item the following:

''16____. Inland Empire Regional Water Recycling Program.

''16____. Cucamonga Valley Water Recycling Project.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

The purpose of H.R. 122, as amended, introduced by our colleague, Congressman DREIER of California, is to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Inland Empire regional water recycling project and in the Cucamonga Valley Water District satellite recycling plant.

H.R. 122, as amended, would add approximately 100,000 acre-feet of new water annually to one of the largest recycled water distribution systems in the Santa Ana River Watershed. Some of the recycled water will be used to reclaim the groundwater basin and help drought-proof the service area. These water recycling plants will develop recycled water near where it will be used, offsetting the energy costs associated with pumping.

The Subcommittee on Water and Power held hearings on similar legislation in the 108th Congress. In the 109th Congress, similar legislation was passed by the House.

H.R. 122, as amended, will provide a very modest amount of Federal financial assistance to help in the construction of these worthy water recycling projects.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 122, as amended, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 122, sponsored by our colleague, DAVID DREIER, authorizes the Bureau of Reclamation to participate in two water recycling projects in Southern California that will allow the water districts there to be less reliant on imported water.

As the water demand grows and supplies become more scarce in Southern California, this bill would help to drought-proof this arid area. These projects would add over 75,000 acre-feet of water annually to one of the last recycled water distribution systems in the Santa Ana River Watershed. This legislation passed the House during the past two Congresses, and I urge my colleagues to support this noncontroversial bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield as much time as he may consume to the sponsor of this piece of legislation, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. As I was just told by a distinguished member of the committee staff, we hope that the third time is a charm here. We have been pursuing this for quite a while, and I hope very much that we will be able to see final implementation of this.

I would like to recognize the leadership again on both sides of the aisle; the Committee on Natural Resources, of course, Mr. BISHOP, who served with great distinction on the Committee on Rules. And I will say that we miss him upstairs in the Rules Committee. I especially miss the fact that we are no

longer in the majority up in the Rules Committee, but he is serving very ably now as an important member of the Natural Resources Committee and the Water and Power Subcommittee. And I want to thank, of course, on the majority side the distinguished chairman of the full committee, Mr. RAHALL, my very good friend from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) with whom I worked closely on this, and of course the ranking member on the subcommittee, CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, and of course the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. YOUNG.

I want to really underscore the great commitment and support that was provided in this effort by my California colleague, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, who was an original cosponsor of this bill and has long been a great champion for many, many years of regional water solutions. I am also very pleased to have had the continued support and cosponsorship of other Southern California colleagues in a bipartisan way, KEN CALVERT, GARY MILLER, and of course I am pleased to see that we have just been joined on the floor here by my good friend, who represents the Inland Empire, Mr. BACA. And I should say, Mr. Speaker, that I just signed one of those cosponsor sheets and turned it in at the desk that will now include Mr. BACA's name as one of the cosponsors of this important legislation.

As many of you will recall, this bill was passed, as I said, by the last Congress; but it was held up in the other body over issues that were much larger regarding overall reform of the Bureau of Reclamation's title 16 program. And I do share the concern that the program, while hugely popular, successful and competitive, is oversubscribed and underfunded. That being said, Mr. Speaker, the need to reform the program shouldn't hold back good projects like this one.

The Inland Empire Water Recycling Initiative authorizes $30 million for the Inland Empire Utilities Agency and the Cucamonga Valley Water District to assist in constructing two water recycling projects. The projects will produce nearly 100,000 acre-feet of new water annually to the area's water supply. This initiative has the support of all member agencies of the Inland Empire Utilities Agency, which encompasses 240 square miles in Southern California. It also serves a number of cities that I am very honored to be able to represent, the cities of Rancho Cucamonga, Upland and Montclair, some of the fastest growing cities in our Nation.

These water agencies are using high-quality recycled water in many water intensive applications like landscape and agricultural irrigation, construction and industrial cooling. This allows fresh water to be conserved or used for drinking, which reduces our dependence on expensive imported water. In addition, by recycling water which would otherwise be wasted and unavailable, these agencies ensure that we wring the last drop of use out of water before it is ultimately returned to the environment.

It is imperative that we continue to approve measures preventing water supply shortages in the western United States. And, Mr. Speaker, this recycling initiative will help meet the water needs of the Inland Empire and begin a strategic Federal-local partnership to bring a significant amount of new water supply to this very important region in Southern California. This project has already been recognized nationally as one of the most cost-effective water reuse projects that we have.

The Inland Empire Utility Agency and the Cucamonga Valley Water District are innovative leaders in using high-quality recycled water in environmentally sensitive and creative ways. This allows fresh water to be conserved for drinking, reducing our dependence on expensive imported water.

The hard work of these two local water agencies should be recognized.

Mr. Speaker, I want to specifically recognize the tireless efforts of Rich Atwater, the CEO of the Inland Empire Utilities Agency, and Robert DeLoach, the CEO of the Cucamonga Valley Water District.

I would also like to commend the boards of these agencies for their leadership in providing our region with safe, clean, and affordable water. And I will say, Mr. Speaker, that at a time when we are focusing constantly on the need to look at ways to recycle and focusing on the issue of environmentally sound planning for our future, meeting our needs, this measure is, again, a model that can be used for the rest of the country.

At this juncture, I would be happy to yield to my very good friend, with whom I am privileged to share representing part of the Inland Empire, Mr. BACA.

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

Mr. BACA. I appreciate the comments by Mr. DREIER. I appreciate his leadership on this important issue of water. It is critical to the Inland Empire. This is one that needs to be addressed, and he has constantly addressed the issues of water in the Inland Empire, not only now, but in the past. And I rise in support of H.R. 122, the Inland Empire recycling project.

And I appreciate Grace Napolitano's leadership in this endeavor because this is a bipartisan effort for the Inland Empire and its region in the area. This is not a Republican or a Democratic issue, but an issue that pertains to water and water that is important to a lot of us in that region and throughout the State of California.

This project is important for my district. And he not only mentioned his district that covers Upland and Rancho Cucamonga, but it is important for my district and across Southern California because it would help solve California's state-wide water shortage.

We all have been warned about global warming and the impact it is going to have in terms of the future and the possibility of the lack of water. Well, this addresses some of that. By recycling the water in our region, we will be able to increase the local water supply and reduce our dependence on imported water from San Francisco Bay delta area.

□ 1415

The Bureau of Reclamation has ranked this project as one of the most cost-effective new water supply projects in California; I state, the most effective, cost-effective water supply projects in California. And it is also endorsed by all cities, including Fontana and Ontario, as well as community groups and business groups, and environmental leader groups, and I state, environmental groups and leaders throughout the Inland Empire.

I rise to give my full support, and I urge my colleagues to do the same on this important issue on water that impacts not only the Inland Empire but the State of California, and I ask full support.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank my friend for his very able contribution.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, in closing that I think that this legislation underscores once again how the California congressional delegation continues, as it has in the past, to work in a bipartisan way addressing priority concerns that we have, whether it be transportation, dealing with the whole issue of base closure, dealing with the challenge of illegal immigration, dealing with this very important water resources issue, health care issues. California's delegation is working together in a bipartisan way to address them, and this legislation today is evidence of our great success at implementing the shared vision that we have for the constituents whom we are honored to represent in California. And I again thank both Democrats and Republicans on the Natural Resources Committee for their strong support of this important legislation.

And, again, as Mr. BACA said, I hope very much that the committee and others will utilize this very successful program as a model for future water recycling.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 122, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SOUTHERN IDAHO BUREAU OF RECLAMATION REPAYMENT ACT OF 2007

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 467) to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the A&B Irrigation District in the State of Idaho, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 467

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the ''Southern Idaho Bureau of Reclamation Repayment Act of 2007''.

**SEC. 2. EARLY REPAYMENT OF A&B IRRIGATION DISTRICT CONSTRUCTION COSTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 213 of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (43 U.S.C. 390mm), any landowner within the A&B Irrigation District in the State (referred to in this Act as the ''District'') may repay, at any time, the construction costs of District project facilities that are allocated to land of the landowner within the District.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF FULL-COST PRICING LIMITATIONS.—On discharge, in full, of the obligation for repayment of all construction costs described in subsection (a) that are allocated to all lands the landowner owns in the District in question, the parcels of land shall not be subject to the ownership and full-cost pricing limitations under Federal reclamation law (the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388, chapter 1093), and Acts supplemental to and amendatory of that Act (43 U.S.C. 371 et seq.), including the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (13 U.S.C. 390aa et seq.).

(c) CERTIFICATION.—On request of a landowner that has repaid, in full, the construction costs described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall provide to the landowner a certificate described in section 213(b)(1) of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (43 U.S.C. 390mm(b)(1)).

(d) EFFECT.—Nothing in this Act—

(1) modifies any contractual rights under, or amends or reopens, the reclamation contract between the District and the United States; or

(2) modifies any rights, obligations, or relationships between the District and landowners in the District under Idaho State law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The purpose of H.R. 467, as amended, introduced by our colleague Congressman SIMPSON, is to authorize early repayment of landowner obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the A&B Irrigation District in southeastern Idaho.

The A&B Irrigation District receives part of its irrigation water supply from the Bureau of Reclamation's Minidoka Project. H.R. 467, as amended, will provide administrative consistency between the landowners within the A&B Irrigation District and those within other districts served by the Minidoka Project.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation simply allows landowners to pay off their financial obligations related to the Bureau of Reclamation's Minidoka project. We believe this legislation is appropriate and, in fact, may provide a slight financial benefit to the United States.

In the 109th Congress, the Subcommittee on Water and Power held a hearing on similar legislation. This legislation was subsequently passed by the House. We have no objection to this noncontroversial bill.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 467. H.R. 467, sponsored by our colleague MIKE SIMPSON, allows for the early repayment of capital costs associated with a Federal water project in Idaho.

Under existing law, landowners who benefit from this water project cannot prepay the capital costs they owe to the Federal Government. But this bill gives the Bureau of Reclamation the ability to accept prepayment from these landowners. This legislation benefits the American taxpayer because it allows early revenue to flow into the U.S. Treasury and allows local landowners to reduce their debt.

I urge my colleagues to support this very good, commonsense bill.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 467, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PIEDRAS BLANCAS HISTORIC LIGHT STATION OUTSTANDING NATURAL AREA ACT OF 2007

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 276) to designate the Piedras Blancas Light Station and the surrounding public land as an Outstanding Natural Area to be administered as a part of the National Landscape Conservation System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 276

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; DEFINITIONS.**

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Piedras Blancas Historic Light Station Outstanding Natural Area Act of 2007''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) LIGHT STATION.—The term ''Light Station'' means Piedras Blancas Light Station.

(3) PUBLIC LANDS.—The term ''public lands'' has the meaning stated in section 103(e) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1703(e)).

(4) OUTSTANDING NATURAL AREA.—The term ''Outstanding Natural Area'' means the Piedras Blancas Historic Light Station Outstanding Natural Area established pursuant to section 3.

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds as follows:

(1) The publicly owned Piedras Blancas Light Station has nationally recognized historical structures that should be preserved for present and future generations.

(2) The coastline adjacent to the Light Station is internationally recognized as having significant wildlife and marine habitat that provides critical information to research institutions throughout the world.

(3) The Light Station tells an important story about California's coastal prehistory and history in the context of the surrounding region and communities.

(4) The coastal area surrounding the Light Station was traditionally used by Indian people, including the Chumash and Salinan Indian tribes.

(5) The Light Station is historically associated with the nearby world-famous Hearst Castle (Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument), now administered by the State of California.

(6) The Light Station represents a model partnership where future management can be successfully accomplished among the Federal Government, the State of California, San Luis Obispo County, local communities, and private groups.

(7) Piedras Blancas Historic Light Station Outstanding Natural Area would make a significant addition to the National Landscape Conservation System administered by the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management.

(8) Statutory protection is needed for the Light Station and its surrounding Federal lands to ensure that it remains a part of our historic, cultural, and natural heritage and to be a source of inspiration for the people of the United States.

**SEC. 3. DESIGNATION OF THE PIEDRAS BLANCAS HISTORIC LIGHT STATION OUTSTANDING NATURAL AREA.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to protect, conserve, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the unique and nationally important historical, natural, cultural, scientific, educational, scenic, and recreational values of certain lands in and around the Piedras Blancas Light Station, in San Luis Obispo County, California, while allowing certain recreational and research activities to continue, there is established, subject to valid existing rights, the Piedras Blancas Historic Light Station Outstanding Natural Area.

(b) MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—The boundaries of the Outstanding Natural Area

as those shown on the map entitled ''Piedras Blancas Historic Light Station: Outstanding Natural Area'', dated May 5, 2004, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Director, Bureau of Land Management, United States Department of the Interior, and the State office of the Bureau of Land Management in the State of California.

(c) BASIS OF MANAGEMENT.—The Secretary shall manage the Outstanding Natural Area as part of the National Landscape Conservation System to protect the resources of the area, and shall allow only those uses that further the purposes for the establishment of the Outstanding Natural Area, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), and other applicable laws.

(d) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, and in accordance with the existing withdrawal as set forth in Public Land Order 7501 (Oct. 12, 2001, Vol. 66, No. 198, Federal Register 52149), the Federal lands and interests in lands included within the Outstanding Natural Area are hereby withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the public land mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws and the mineral materials laws.

**SEC. 4. MANAGEMENT OF THE PIEDRAS BLANCAS HISTORIC LIGHT STATION OUTSTANDING NATURAL AREA.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the Outstanding Natural Area in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances the unique and nationally important historical, natural, cultural, scientific, educational, scenic, and recreational values of that area, including an emphasis on preserving and restoring the Light Station facilities, consistent with the requirements section 3(c).

(b) USES.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall only allow such uses of the Outstanding Natural Area as the Secretary finds are likely to further the purposes for which the Outstanding Natural Area is established as set forth in section 3(a).

(c) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Not later than 3 years after of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a comprehensive management plan consistent with the requirements of section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712) to provide long-term management guidance for the public lands within the Outstanding Natural Area and fulfill the purposes for which it is established, as set forth in section 3(a). The management plan shall be developed in consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and local government agencies, with full public participation, and the contents shall include—

(1) provisions designed to ensure the protection of the resources and values described in section 3(a);

(2) objectives to restore the historic Light Station and ancillary buildings;

(3) an implementation plan for a continuing program of interpretation and public education about the Light Station and its importance to the surrounding community;

(4) a proposal for minimal administrative and public facilities to be developed or improved at a level compatible with achieving the resources objectives for the Outstanding Natural Area as described in subsection (a) and with other proposed management activities to accommodate visitors and researchers to the Outstanding Natural Area; and

(5) cultural resources management strategies for the Outstanding Natural Area, prepared in consultation with appropriate departments of the State of California, with emphasis on the preservation of the resources of the Outstanding Natural Area and the interpretive, education, and long-term scientific uses of the resources, giving priority to the enforcement of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (16 U.S.C. 470aa et seq.) and the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.) within the Outstanding Natural Area.

(d) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—In order to better implement the management plan and to continue the successful partnerships with the local communities and the Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument, administered by the California Department of Parks and Recreation, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies pursuant to section 307(b) of the Federal Land Management Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1737(b)).

(e) RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.—In order to continue the successful partnership with research organizations and agencies and to assist in the development and implementation of the management plan, the Secretary may authorize within the Outstanding Natural Area appropriate research activities for the purposes identified in section 3(a) and pursuant to section 307(a) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1737(a)).

(f) ACQUISITION.—State and privately held lands or interests in lands adjacent to the Outstanding Natural Area and identified as appropriate for acquisition in the management plan may be acquired by the Secretary as part of the Outstanding Natural Area only by—

(1) donation;

(2) exchange with a willing party; or

(3) purchase from a willing seller.

(g) ADDITIONS TO THE OUTSTANDING NATURAL AREA.—Any lands or interest in lands adjacent to the Outstanding Natural Area acquired by the United States after the date of the enactment of this Act shall be added to and administered as part of the Outstanding Natural Area.

(h) OVERFLIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act or the management plan shall be construed to—

(1) restrict or preclude overflights, including low level overflights, military, commercial, and general aviation overflights that can be seen or heard within the Outstanding Natural Area;

(2) restrict or preclude the designation or creation of new units of special use airspace or the establishment of military flight training routes over the Outstanding Natural Area; or

(3) modify regulations governing low-level overflights above the adjacent Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary.

(i) LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to preclude or otherwise affect coastal border security operations or other law enforcement activities by the Coast Guard or other agencies within the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, or any other Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies within the Outstanding Natural Area.

(j) NATIVE AMERICAN USES AND INTERESTS.—In recognition of the past use of the Outstanding Natural Area by Indians and Indian tribes for traditional cultural and religious purposes, the Secretary shall ensure access to the Outstanding Natural Area by Indians and Indian tribes for such traditional cultural and religious purposes. In implementing this section, the Secretary, upon the request of an Indian tribe or Indian religious community, shall temporarily close to the general public use of one or more specific portions of the Outstanding Natural Area in order to protect the privacy of traditional cultural and religious activities in such areas by the Indian tribe or Indian religious community. Any such closure shall be made to affect the smallest practicable area for the minimum period necessary for such purposes. Such access shall be consistent with the purpose and intent of Public Law 95–341 (42 U.S.C. 1996 et seq.; commonly referred to as the ''American Indian Religious Freedom Act'').

(k) NO BUFFER ZONES.—The designation of the Outstanding Natural Area is not intended to lead to the creation of protective perimeters or buffer zones around area. The fact that activities outside the Outstanding Natural Area and not consistent with the purposes of this Act can be seen or heard within the Outstanding Natural Area shall not, of itself, preclude such activities or uses up to the boundary of the Outstanding Natural Area.

**SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend and include extraneous material related to this bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Piedras Blancas Light Station is one of only a handful of tall, seacoast lighthouses built on the West Coast. It is located in San Luis Obispo County in Southern California.

Completed in 1875, the lighthouse was manned by the Coast Guard until 1975, when it was automated. The Coast Guard transferred the lighthouse and the surrounding public land to the Bureau of Land Management in 2001. This area is not only historically significant, but it is also home to a population of gulls, cormorants and an elephant seal colony, numbering 10,000 animals.

H.R. 276, sponsored by my committee colleague Representative LOIS CAPPS, would establish the Piedras Blancas Historic Light Station Outstanding Natural Area to be managed by the Bureau of Land Management as part of the existing National Landscape Conservation System. This area would be managed by the BLM to conserve the significant historical and natural resources found there.

Mr. Speaker, Representative CAPPS has worked tirelessly on behalf of this legislation, and we commend her for her efforts. Identical legislation was approved by the House in the last Congress, and we urge our colleagues to support this measure once again.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 276.

Last year the Republican majority was supportive of this measure, and this bill was passed in the House of Representatives. This year, we once again support this bill and commend Representative CAPPS for her work to recognize this historic site in her district.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, Representative CAPPS is traveling back from her district in California and could not be here on the floor. She has submitted a statement which we will be submitting for the RECORD today.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 276, the Piedras Blancas Historic Light Station Outstanding Natural Area Act.

First, I want to thank the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, Mr. RAHALL, and chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, Mr. GRIJALVA, as well as the ranking members of the full Committee and Subcommittee for expediting the consideration of this legislation and for bringing H.R. 276 before us today. This bill was passed by the House of Representatives last year but was never acted on by the Senate.

H.R. 276 would designate the Piedras Blancas Historic Light Station—located in my congressional district—as an Outstanding Natural Area within the BLM's National Landscape Conservation System.

The Piedras Blancas Light Station is located on an 18-acre parcel of BLM administered land along the Pacific Coast in San Luis Obispo County. The property is adjacent to Pacific Coast Highway and the Hearst Castle State Historic Monument, and it looks over a pristine coastal area that includes the southern portion of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary and California Coastal National Monument. It is also nationally recognized as an important monitoring point for migrating whales, and is used by the U.S. Geological Survey, the National Marine Fisheries Service and a number of universities and colleges for marine wildlife and plant research.

The Light Station and the surrounding area are also important for tourism. For example, the national historic Light House—built in 1879—is a main destination focal point on the central coast, and the peninsula is very popular for viewing sea otters, elephant seals, and sea lions from shore. The elephant seal colony at Piedras Blancas attracts an estimated 400,000 visitors annually.

In 2001, BLM assumed ownership and management of the Light Station from the U.S. Coast Guard. Since then, BLM, State and local agencies, community stakeholders and conservation groups have developed a very successful partnership to preserve the Light Station.

Some of these partners include: the Piedras Blancas Light Station Association; California State Parks; San Luis Obispo County; the cities of Cambria and San Simeon; the California Coastal Conservancy and Coastal Commission; NOAA; and the Hearst Corporation.

As a result of their hard work, the site was re-opened to public tours in 2003—for the first time in 128 years. These partners continue to work together on a series of environmental education, historical restoration and resource protection programs; and, I'm confidant they will each support and showcase this national designation if enacted.

My legislation tracks the successful model of designating the Oregon Coast's Yaquina Head as an Outstanding Natural Area, which was signed into law in 1980. Yaquina Head was later included in the National Landscape Conservation System.

Like Yaquina Head, the addition of the Piedras Blancas Light Station to the NLCS would be an important step in protecting and preserving this valuable natural and historic resource. It will also focus attention on the restoration of the Light Station and surrounding area, specifically the three on-site National Register properties; and, it will serve as a means to increase public awareness of the Light Station's scientific, cultural and educational values.

Specifically, H.R. 276 stresses long-term conservation of the Light Station by requiring timely completion of a management plan. The management plan would be developed through a public process and include guidelines for restoration of the National Register of Historic Places buildings, including the Light House; public access; ecological and cultural resource management; and, fostering scientific study and research opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, the Piedras Blancas Light Station is a wonderful resource. It has the potential to serve as a model for future resource management, and therefore would be an appropriate addition to the BLM's National Landscape Conservation System.

Again, I would like to thank the Committee on Natural Resources for supporting this bill to designate Piedras Blancas Historic Light Station as an Outstanding Natural Area, and urge its immediate passage.

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 276.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COLORADO NORTHERN FRONT RANGE MOUNTAIN BACKDROP PROTECTION STUDY ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 903) to provide for a study of options for protecting the open space characteristics of certain lands in and adjacent to the Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests in Colorado, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 903

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS; PURPOSE.**

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Colorado Northern Front Range Mountain Backdrop Protection Study Act''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Rising dramatically from the Great Plains, the Front Range of the Rocky Mountains provides a scenic mountain backdrop to many communities in the Denver metropolitan area and elsewhere in Colorado. The portion of the range within and adjacent to the Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests also includes a diverse array of wildlife habitats and provides many opportunities for outdoor recreation.

(2) The open space character of this mountain backdrop is an important esthetic and economic asset for adjoining communities, making them attractive locations for homes and businesses.

(3) Rapid population growth in the northern Front Range area of Colorado is increasing recreational use of the Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests and is also placing increased pressure for development of other lands within and adjacent to that national forest.

(4) Efforts by local governments and other entities have provided important protection for portions of this mountain backdrop, especially in the northern Denver metropolitan area. However, some portions of the mountain backdrop in this part of Colorado remain unprotected and are at risk of losing their open space qualities.

(5) It is in the national interest for the Federal Government, in collaboration with local communities, to assist in identifying options for increasing the protection of the mountain backdrop in the northern Front Range area of Colorado.

(c) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to identify options that may be available to assist in maintaining the open space characteristics of lands that are part of the mountain backdrop of communities in the northern section of the Front Range area of Colorado.

**SEC. 2. COLORADO NORTHERN FRONT RANGE MOUNTAIN BACKDROP STUDY.**

(a) STUDY AND REPORT.—The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service and in consultation with the State and local officials and agencies specified in subsection (c), shall review the lands within the study area and, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, shall report to such officials and to Congress regarding the following:

(1) The present ownership of such lands.

(2) Which undeveloped land may be at risk of development.

(3) Actions that could be taken by the United States, the State of Colorado or a political subdivision of such State, or any other parties to preserve the open and undeveloped character of such lands.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) STUDY AREA.—The term ''study area'' means those lands in southern Boulder, northern Jefferson, and northern Gilpin Counties, Colorado, that are situated west of Colorado State Highway 93, south and east of Colorado State Highway 119, and north of Colorado State Highway 46, excluding lands within the city limits of the cities of Boulder or Golden, Colorado, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Northern Front Range Mountain Backdrop Study Area'' dated April, 2006.

(2) UNDEVELOPED LAND.—The term ''undeveloped land'' means land that—

(A) is located within the study area;

(B) is free or primarily free of structures; and

(C) the development of which is likely to adversely affect the scenic, wildlife, or recreational value of the study area.

(c) CONSULTATIONS.—In implementing this Act, the Secretary shall consult with the following:

(1) The Colorado Department of Natural Resources.

(2) Colorado State Forest Service.

(3) Colorado State Conservation Board.

(4) Great Outdoors Colorado.

(5) The Boards of County Commissioners of Boulder, Jefferson, and Gilpin Counties, Colorado.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to take any action that would affect the use of any lands not owned by the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today I rise, Mr. Speaker, in strong support of H.R. 903, introduced by my colleague on the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Colorado, Representative MARK UDALL.

This legislation would require the Forest Service to review lands in or adjacent to the Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests and report to Congress on the present ownership of the lands, and which undeveloped lands may be at risk of development, as well as apprising Congress of appropriate actions that could be taken to preserve the open and undeveloped character of these lands.

Rapid population growth in the northern Front Range area of Colorado is spreading west from Denver, pushing homes and shopping centers up the valleys and along the highways. This development then spreads out along the ridges and mountaintops that make up this backdrop. New homes and businesses in the wildland urban interface also create new liabilities for first responders and a more complicated management framework for forest managers.

The result of these changes is the potential loss of many of the very qualities that attract new residents and contribute to the quality of life of the region. H.R. 903 is designed to help provide a better understanding of what steps might be done to lessen the risk.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend and congratulate my colleague, Mr. UDALL, for his commitment and leadership on this matter. A hearing was held on a nearly identical measure last Congress, and the bill was approved by the Natural Resources Committee and passed the House by voice vote last September.

Mr. Speaker, we strongly support H.R. 903 and urge its adoption by the House today.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 903.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 903 would require the Forest Service to review non-Federal lands in or adjacent to the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest and recommend strategies to maintain open space. Republicans do not object to this legislation, but considering the current budget constraints on the Forest Service, we believe funds would be better used to tackle the enormous risk of catastrophic wildfire in Colorado. Currently, 42 percent of Colorado's forests are suffering from bark beetle infestation, which continues to spread and will likely kill thousands of acres of trees. These dead and dying trees pose extremely high wildfire risks to Colorado's forests. Surely funds would be better spent on removing dead and dying trees that pose a tremendous threat to homes and communities, watersheds and wildlife habitat.

Moreover, we believe that local and State governments should address open space and smart growth options rather than Federal Government agencies based here in Washington, D.C. While we commend Mr. UDALL's good intentions, we believe recommendations and solutions to these problems should come from the counties and the States, not from the Federal Government.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 903, the Colorado Northern Front Range Mountain Backdrop Protection Study bill.

It is identical to a measure that passed the House last year but on which the Senate did not complete action. I appreciate the actions of Chairman RAHALL, Ranking Member DON YOUNG, and the staff of the Natural Resources Committee for making it possible for the House to consider it today.

The bill is intended to help local communities identify ways to protect the Front Range Mountain Backdrop in the northern sections of the Denver-metro area, especially the region just west of what will soon be the Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge.

The Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest includes much of the land in this backdrop area, but there are other lands as well.

Rising dramatically from the Great Plains, the Front Range of the Rocky Mountains provides a scenic mountain backdrop to many communities in the Denver metropolitan area and elsewhere in Colorado.

The portion of the range addressed in this bill also includes a diverse array of wildlife habitats and provides many opportunities for outdoor recreation.

Its open-space character is an important esthetic and economic asset for adjoining communities, making them attractive locations for homes and businesses.

But rapid population growth in the northern Front Range area of Colorado is increasing recreational use of the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest and is also placing increased pressure for development of other lands.

We can see this throughout Colorado and especially along the Front Range.

Homes and shopping centers are spreading up the valleys and along the highways. This development then spreads out along the ridges and mountain tops that make up the backdrop.

The result is potential loss of many of the very qualities that attract new residents.

This bill is designed to help provide a better understanding of what steps might be done to lessen that risk.

Already, local governments and other entities have provided important protection for portions of this mountain backdrop.

The bill acknowledges their good work and aims to assist further efforts along the same lines.

The bill does not interfere with the authority of local authorities regarding land use planning.

And it does not infringe on private property rights.

Instead, it will bring the land protection experience of the Forest Service to the table to assist local efforts to protect areas that comprise the backdrop.

Under the bill, the Forest Service will work in collaboration with local communities, the state, nonprofit groups, and other parties.

I think this is in the national interest.

The backdrop both beckoned settlers westward and was a daunting challenge to their progress. Their first exposure to the harshness and humbling majesty of the Rocky Mountain West helped define a region, and the pioneers' independent spirit and respect for nature still lives with us to this day.

We need to work to maintain the mountain backdrop as a cultural and natural heritage for ourselves and generations to come.

This bill is intended to assist in that effort, and I urge its approval.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 903.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## EXTENDING AUTHORIZATION FOR THE AMERICAN VETERANS DISABLED FOR LIFE MEMORIAL

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 995) to amend Public Law 106–348 to extend the authorization for establishing a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor veterans who became disabled while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 995

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

**SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR ESTABLISHING DISABLED VETERANS MEMORIAL.**

Public Law 106–348 is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''The establishment'' and inserting ''Except as provided in subsection (e), the establishment''; and

(B) by striking ''the Commemorative Works Act (40 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.)'' and inserting ''chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code'';

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking ''section 8(b) of the Commemorative Works Act (40 U.S.C. 1008(b))'' and inserting ''section 8906 of title 40, United States Code'';

(B) by striking ''or upon expiration of the authority for the memorial under section 10(b) of such Act (40 U.S.C. 1010(b)),''; and

(C) by striking ''section 8(b)(1) of such Act (40 U.S.C. 1008(b)(1)'' and inserting ''8906(b)(2) or (3) of such title''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding section 8903(e) of title 40, United States Code, the authority to establish a memorial under this section shall expire on October 24, 2015.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

The 106th Congress authorized the Disabled Veterans Life Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in Washington, D.C., to honor disabled veterans. The law specified that the memorial is to be established pursuant to the Commemorative Works Act. A memorial site located near the Rayburn House Office Building was identified, but the project is yet to advance due to security and traffic concerns raised by the Architect of the Capitol and the U.S. Capitol Police.

The foundation is in the process of negotiating a solution to that problem. However, the Commemorative Works Act specifies that the legislative authority for any memorial expires 7 years after the date of enactment, October of this year for this proposal. H.R. 995, sponsored by our colleague from Illinois, Representative PHIL HARE, amends the original authorization to extend authority to establish the memorial to October 24, 2015.

□ 1430

This extension will allow additional time to ensure an appropriate commemoration to our Nation's disabled veterans to whom we owe a tremendous obligation.

While Representative HARE is a new Member of this House, he is well acquainted with the sacrifices made by our Nation's veterans, both from his service in the Army Reserves and his more than 20 years as district director for our former colleague and advocate for veterans, Mr. Lane Evans. We congratulate Representative HARE for his work on behalf of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that, given the ongoing and recent scandal regarding the care and support of our current disabled veterans, this legislation, H.R. 995, is timely and appropriate to honor and remind us of the sacrifice of all veterans and those that are disabled as a consequence of their service to this country. This is an obligation that is owed to them. This memorial would be a fitting reminder that we have an ongoing obligation and responsibility to their care and comfort.

Mr. Speaker, we strongly support H.R. 995 and urge its adoption by the House today.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 995 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 995 has been adequately explained by the majority and we support the extension to establish a memorial honoring our disabled veterans.

I note that the original law authorizing this memorial was authorized by our own war hero, Congressman SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Last year, Congressman Sue Kelly of New York introduced this extension bill, and I am happy to see that Congressman HARE is carrying on her legacy. I urge the adoption of the bill.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HARE), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for the very kind words.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 995, a bill to extend the authorization for the American Veterans Disabled for Life Memorial. I introduced H.R. 995 along with my colleague Congressman MARK KIRK to provide the time necessary to raise the private funds and navigate the approval process in order to bring this memorial to life in Washington, D.C. Without this bill, the charter for the memorial will expire in October of this year.

I would like to thank Chairman RAHALL for quickly moving this legislation through the Resources Committee; and Lois Pope, the Chair of the Disabled Veterans LIFE Memorial Foundation, who has worked tirelessly to establish this memorial since 1996. I also appreciate the efforts of Congressman KIRK and Congressman DENNIS MOORE to ensure the memorial is funded and dedicated by 2010, and all the other Members who have made this legislation a priority in the 110th Congress.

There are more than 3 million disabled veterans living today and millions of veterans from past and future conflicts who will be honored by this long overdue memorial.

It is my hope as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that this memorial will only be the beginning of our recognition of the incredible sacrifices of our veterans. This memorial cannot repay the sacrifice of our disabled veterans, but it will serve as a reminder of the debt that we owe to each and every one of them.

Transcending conflicts, service branches and generations, the American Veterans Disabled for Life Memorial will express America's lasting gratitude to the men and women whose lives were forever changed in service to our country.

Due to its proximity to the Capitol, the memorial will remain in the sight of America's lawmakers, serving as a constant reminder of the human cost of conflict and the sacrifices of our disabled veterans. The memorial will be a setting for school groups to learn about disabled veterans, the cost of freedom and the challenges faced by those with disabilities. Most importantly, it will be a place for disabled veterans to come and know they are recognized by a grateful Nation.

I am proud to be a freshman legislator in the 110th Congress because we are changing this country's priorities. In our recently passed continuing resolution, we increased veterans health care by over $3.6 billion, and we are taking swift action to hold those who are responsible for the inexcusable conditions at Walter Reed accountable.

Congress has a responsibility to plan for the long-term well-being and health of our troops, and I am committed to taking care of our veterans when they are in conflict and when they return home. This bill is a critical first step in honoring the sacrifices our military men and women have made and continue to make for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 995 and join me and the other 28 cosponsors to ensure this memorial is built and dedicated as soon as possible.

Mr. KIRK. Madame Speaker, on February 12, I joined my colleague from Illinois, Mr. HARE, in introducing H.R. 995 to extend the authorization of the American Veterans Disabled for Life Memorial through 2015. This legislation will give the American Veterans Disabled for Life Foundation more time to raise the money needed to build this memorial just south of the Rayburn Building. I believe the time has come to recognize the sacrifices made by America's more than three million disabled veterans by building a memorial for them in here in Washington, D.C.

Last December President Bush signed into law a bill to transferring control of the land for the memorial from the District of Columbia to the National Park Service. Now the American Veterans Disabled for Life Memorial Foundation needs to raise approximately $65 million to cover the cost of construction. By passing H.R. 995 today, we will give the foundation time to raise this money.

Earlier this year I joined my colleague from Kansas, Mr. MOORE, in introducing legislation to authorize the minting of commemorative coins to help raise money for this cause. As we extend the authorization for the memorial today, I want to encourage my colleagues to join us in cosponsoring H.R. 634 to issue these coins. No federal funds will be used to build the disabled veterans memorial, but it is appropriate for Congress to do all it can to support and encourage its construction.

With more than three million disabled veterans in the United States today, it is fitting that a memorial to their sacrifice be erected in Washington, D.C. It is my hope that passing Mr. HARE's legislation will bring us closer to making the American Veterans Disabled for Life Memorial a reality.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 995.

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. GRIJALVA. 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.

## LOWELL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 299) to adjust the boundary of Lowell National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 299

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the ''Lowell National Historical Park Boundary Adjustment Act''.

**SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS.**

The Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the establishment of the Lowell National Historical Park in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and for other purposes'' approved June 5, 1978 (Public Law 95–290; 92 Stat. 290; 16 U.S.C. 410cc et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 101(a), by adding a new paragraph after paragraph (2) as follows:

''(3) The boundaries of the park are modified to include five parcels of land identified on the map entitled 'Boundary Adjustment, Lowell National Historical Park,' numbered 475/81,424B and dated September 2004, and as delineated in section 202(a)(2)(G).''.

(2) In section 202(a)(2), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(G) The properties shown on the map identified in subsection (101)(a)(3) as follows:

''(i) 91 Pevey Street.

''(ii) The portion of 607 Middlesex Place.

''(iii) Eagle Court.

''(iv) The portion of 50 Payne Street.

''(v) 726 Broadway.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 299, introduced by my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), provides for a minor boundary adjustment to the Lowell National Historic Park. Lowell National Historic Park was established in 1978 to commemorate the City of Lowell's prominent role in the American Industrial Revolution.

H.R. 299 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire five small tracts of land totaling less than 1 acre. These tracts are necessary to complete development of the canalway, a linear park and walkway along Lowell's 5.6-mile historic power canal system.

These parcels provide the access points needed for the development, maintenance, and surveillance necessary to complete the historic canalway. While the total boundary adjustment is less than 1 acre, it would allow public access to at least 2 miles of this historic canalway.

I want to commend my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) for his efforts on behalf of Lowell National Historic Park. He has worked diligently to advance many partnership efforts such as this one, which would bring together Federal, State, and local resources to preserve and interpret the park.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 299 is supported by the administration, the City of Lowell, and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Identical legislation was approved by the House last Congress, and we urge our colleagues to support this measure today.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 299, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the majority has adequately explained this bill, which passed the House in the 109th Congress and is supported by the administration. I urge adoption of this bill.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the Gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) for bringing this important bill to the floor.

This bill passed the House unanimously last December, and the other body was unable to take it up before the 109th Congress ended. I am hopeful that, given more time, this bill will work its way through the Senate and be signed into law by the President.

Mister speaker, my bill is simple but its impact cannot be overstated. This bill will authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire five small tracts of land totaling less than an acre and add them to the boundaries of the Lowell National Historical Park.

Adding these small tracts of land will allow the park to add more and safer access points, and allow the visiting public full access to the entire canal system.

The park was created in 1978, a product of the late Paul Tsongas and his vision for Lowell, Massachusetts. Paul knew that Lowell, as the cradle of America's Industrial Revolution, was worthy of preservation.

The park attracts three-quarters of a million visitors each year, and the ripple effect is significant.

Since the park has come into existence, Lowell has been named a Distinctive Destination City by the National Trust for Historic Preservation and an All American City by the National Civic League.

This bill will keep the progress at the Park rolling, by allowing the last two miles of Lowell's historic canal way to be accessed by the public.

I would like to thank Park Superintendent Michael Creasey, Assistant Superintendent Peter Aucella, and all the others that have worked on this project.

Their tireless efforts, and the effort of their staff, keep Lowell National Historical Park as one of the crown jewels of the national park system, and make the Mill City proud.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 299.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## DESIGNATING THE JIM WEAVER LOOP TRAIL AT WALDO LAKE IN WILLAMETTE NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 247) to designate a Forest Service trail at Waldo Lake in the Willamette National Forest in the State of Oregon as a national recreation trail in honor

of Jim Weaver, a former Member of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 247

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

**SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL RECREATIONAL TRAIL, WILLAMETTE NATIONAL FOREST, OREGON, IN HONOR OF JIM WEAVER, A FORMER MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**

(a) DESIGNATION.—Forest Service trail number 3590 in the Willamette National Forest in Lane County, Oregon, which is a 19.6 mile trail that begins and ends at North Waldo Campground and circumnavigates Waldo Lake, is hereby designated as a national recreation trail under section 4 of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1243) and shall be known as the ''Jim Weaver Loop Trail''.

(b) INTERPRETIVE SIGN.—Using funds available for the Forest Service, the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare, install, and maintain an appropriate sign at the trailhead of the Jim Weaver Loop Trail to indicate the name of the trail and to provide information regarding the life and career of Congressman Jim Weaver.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 247 was introduced by my colleague on the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Oregon, Representative PETER DEFAZIO. This legislation designates an existing Forest Service trail in the Willamette National Forest in Oregon as a national recreation trail in honor of Jim Weaver, a former Member of the House of Representatives. This trail will be designated as the Jim Weaver Loop Trail. It forms a 19.6-mile loop around Waldo Lake.

Congressman Weaver served in this body from the 94th Congress through the 99th Congress and was a former subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources. He was a strong advocate of conservation and public lands. The establishment of this trail around one of Oregon's largest and most beautiful lakes is a fitting tribute to our former colleague. Under this bill, an interpretive sign will be installed at the trail head to indicate the name of the trail and provide information on the life and career of our former colleague, Congressman Weaver.

This bill before us today is identical to a measure that was reported favorably by the Natural Resources Committee last year.

Mr. Speaker, we strongly support H.R. 247 and urge its adoption by the House today.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 247 and yield myself 45 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the majority has adequately explained this bill. We have no objections. It is a good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the sponsor of H.R. 247, is at the moment traveling back to Washington, but he has a statement that will be submitted into the RECORD.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 247, a bill to rename Forest Service trail number 3590, which circumnavigates the world-renowned Waldo Lake, as the "Jim Weaver Loop Trail" in honor of former Congressman Jim Weaver. The legislation would also designate this 22 mile trail as a national recreational trail under the National Trails System Act. This legislation has special significance to me because Mr. Weaver was not only my predecessor as the representative of Oregon's Fourth Congressional District, but he was also my boss—both here in Washington, D.C. and back home in the district—and is a friend. I am pleased that the legislation is cosponsored and supported by all of Oregon's five House members. In addition, it is supported by the Forest Service and a number of local interest groups.

Jim Weaver has been an Oregonian for nearly sixty years. He represented the southwest portion of the state in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1975 to 1987. During his time in Congress, Mr. Weaver made natural resource conservation one of his signature pursuits. He was a tireless advocate for outdoor recreation, and the protection of some of Oregon's most treasured natural features.

He was the leading force responsible for the inclusion of new wilderness areas north of Waldo Lake in the Oregon Wilderness Act of 1984, and worked tirelessly with then Senator Hatfield to ensure that these lands received protection.

The 10 square mile Waldo Lake is considered ultraoligotrophic, meaning it's ranked as one of the purest bodies of water on Earth, and is comparable to distilled water. According to the Forest Service's Water Quality Report, two of the main reasons for its purity are the low levels of sedimentation and lack of development in the area, two characteristics which should be credited to Mr. Weaver's efforts.

Waldo Lake and the surrounding area, including the loop trail, is a popular recreation destination. Naming this trail for Mr. Weaver is a fitting tribute to the legacy of Congressman Weaver and his commitment to protecting Waldo Lake and the surrounding area.

This legislation gives long-overdue recognition to Congressman Weaver and forever associates his name with an area that he loves and worked hard to protect. I want to thank Chairman RAHALL and his Staff Director, Jim Zoia, and Ranking Member YOUNG for their efforts in dicharging the bill for today's floor action. I look forward to the Senate taking up the bill expeditiously, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 247.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AUTHORIZING NATIONAL PARK SERVICE STUDY REGARDING THE SOLDIERS' MEMORIAL MILITARY MUSEUM

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1047) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Soldiers' Memorial Military Museum located in St. Louis, Missouri, as a unit of the National Park System.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1047

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

**SECTION 1. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE STUDY REGARDING THE SOLDIERS' MEMORIAL MILITARY MUSEUM.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds as follows:

(1) The Soldiers' Memorial is a tribute to all veterans located in the greater St. Louis area, including Southern Illinois.

(2) The current annual budget for the memorial is $185,000 and is paid for exclusively by the City of St. Louis.

(3) In 1923, the City of St. Louis voted to spend $6,000,000 to purchase a memorial plaza and building dedicated to citizens of St. Louis who lost their lives in World War I.

(4) The purchase of the 7 block site exhausted the funds and no money remained to construct a monument.

(5) In 1933, Mayor Bernard F. Dickmann appealed to citizens and the city government to raise $1,000,000 to construct a memorial building and general improvement of the plaza area and the construction of Soldiers' Memorial began on October 21, 1935.

(6) On October 14, 1936, President Franklin D. Roosevelt officially dedicated the site.

(7) On Memorial Day in 1938, Mayor Dickmann opened the building to the public.

(b) STUDY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall carry out a study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Soldiers' Memorial Military Museum, located at 1315 Chestnut, St. Louis, Missouri, as a unit of the National Park System.

(c) STUDY PROCESS AND COMPLETION.—Section 8(c) of Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–5(c)) shall apply to the conduct and completion of the study required by this section.

(d) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit a report describing the results the study required by this section to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1047, introduced by my colleague from Missouri, Representative CLAY, directs the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Soldiers' Memorial Military Museum located in St. Louis, Missouri, as a unit of the National Park System.

Construction of the memorial and military museum began in 1935. The site was dedicated by President Franklin Roosevelt in 1936. On Memorial Day, 1938, the building officially opened to the public. The Soldiers' Memorial Building is a stately structure which, in addition to serving as a memorial to those who lost their lives in the service of their country, also contains exhibit rooms that house a collection of military items. The building has been found eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. It is operated by the City of St. Louis and made available to the public free of charge.

I want to commend my colleague from Missouri, Representative CLAY, for his efforts to preserve this memorial and museum, which was built to honor those who gave their lives to this country.

Mr. Speaker, the House approved identical legislation in the 109th Congress. We strongly support H.R. 1047 and urge its adoption by the House today.

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

□ 1445

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the majority has adequately explained H.R. 1047, but I wish to note that while this legislation passed in the House in the 109th Congress, it is not supported by the administration because the memorial is not distinguished beyond that of many war memorials, and it is not known whether it meets the criteria of national significance.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank my friend and colleague from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are unanimous in supporting the courageous men and women serving in our Armed Forces. In recent days, we were appalled to learn that our veterans are not receiving high-quality health care. We have been sickened by some of the stories and images of the patients at Walter Reed Hospital who have been neglected and left untreated. And we are beginning to understand that this is a nationwide crisis. We are all somewhat ashamed that we have failed to provide to those who have given the most to keep our Nation free and secure.

With these recent events in mind, I want to address the legislation before us today. H.R. 1047 is a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Soldiers' Memorial Military Museum in the city of St. Louis as a unit of the National Park System.

This memorial is a shining landmark to those brave men and women who gave their lives in World War I. Today, as much as any time in our history, the American people feel a very special connection to our military forces, and the citizens of our Nation have a real need to visit shrines that honor our wartime heroes.

The St. Louis Soldiers' Memorial is a valuable shrine where citizens can participate in the tradition of honoring our Nation's veterans. Initiated by the residents of St. Louis in the 1920s, after many years of fundraising, the land was acquired and the monument was constructed. On October 14, 1936, St. Louis Soldiers' Memorial Military Museum was officially dedicated by President Roosevelt. And St. Louis Soldiers' Memorial Military Museum also has a unique place in our Nation's history as it is the only structure in St. Louis that is known to have been dedicated by a sitting U.S. President.

The Soldiers' Monument is a national treasure, and it is recognized as an architectural masterpiece. Designed by one of the 20th century's foremost art deco sculptors, Mr. Walter Hancock, the entrance to the memorial is flanked by four limestone sculptures which symbolize the most important virtues in a soldier's life: courage, loyalty, sacrifice and vision. The ceiling of the monument is decorated with mosaic tiles in the shape of large gold stars that are dedicated to our Nation's Gold Star Mothers.

Today, the St. Louis Soldiers' Memorial is an important cultural resource and gathering place. It attracts about 48,000 visitors a year, and provides the setting for more than 20 ceremonies annually, including change-of-command and retirement ceremonies, and many other patriotic events hosted by veterans groups. It is also the center of an annual Veterans Day parade which is the largest of its kind in the Midwest, drawing participants from several States and hosting more than 100 marching units.

In recent years, the city of St. Louis has relied upon the support and contributions of active military personnel and veterans to enable it to maintain this cherished monument. We all want to honor the veterans and citizens of our Nation. We should have Federal monuments to help us all remember those family members and friends who have given their lives for us in combat.

It is the right time for the Federal Government to consider acquiring the St. Louis Soldiers' Memorial Military Museum in its inventory of national monuments. I believe that a study of the monument will show it is a historically important structure with a national significance.

H.R. 1047 is strongly supported by veterans groups and other civic organizations. I hope the Members of this body will endorse this important effort to create a Federal monument to honor our Nation's veterans. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1047.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## FIRST AND SECOND BATTLES OF NEWTONIA, MISSOURI, STUDY ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 376) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of including the battlefields and related sites of the First and Second Battles of Newtonia, Missouri, during the Civil War as part of Wilson's Creek National Battlefield or designating the battlefields and related sites as a separate unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 376

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

**SECTION 1. NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY, NEWTONIA CIVIL WAR BATTLEFIELDS, MISSOURI.**

(a) SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a special resource study relating to the First Battle of Newtonia in Newton County, Missouri, which occurred on September 30, 1862, and the Second Battle of Newtonia, which occurred on October 28, 1864, during the Missouri Expedition of Confederate General Sterling Price in September and October 1864.

(b) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) evaluate the national significance of the Newtonia battlefields and their related sites;

(2) consider the findings and recommendations contained in the document entitled

''Vision Plan for Newtonia Battlefield Preservation'' and dated June 2004, which was prepared by the Newtonia Battlefields Protection Association;

(3) evaluate the suitability and feasibility of adding the battlefields and related sites as part of Wilson's Creek National Battlefield or designating the battlefields and related sites as a unit of the National Park System;

(4) analyze the potential impact that the inclusion of the battlefields and related sites as part of Wilson's Creek National Battlefield or their designation as a unit of the National Park System is likely to have on land within or bordering the battlefields and related sites that is privately owned at the time of the study is conducted;

(5) consider alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of the battlefields and related sites by the National Park Service, other Federal, State, or local governmental entities, or private and nonprofit organizations; and

(6) identify cost estimates for any necessary acquisition, development, interpretation, operation, and maintenance associated with the alternatives referred to in paragraph (5).

(c) CRITERIA.—The criteria for the study of areas for potential inclusion in the National Park System contained in section 8 of Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–5) shall apply to the study under subsection (a).

(d) TRANSMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than three years after the date on which funds are first made available for the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report containing—

(1) the results of the study; and

(2) any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 376, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT). This legislation would direct the National Park Service to conduct a study to determine how best to protect the sites related to the First and Second Battles of Newtonia, Missouri.

Two Civil War battles were waged near Newtonia which lies in Newton County, Missouri. The first, on September 30, 1862, involved 4,000 Confederate troops and 6,500 Union soldiers, and it is believed to be the only Civil War battle in which full American Indian units fought on both sides of the conflict.

The Second Battle of Newtonia occurred on October 28, 1864, and involved 1,500 Union cavalry engaging a Confederate Army returning from the unsuccessful Missouri and Kansas Campaign of Confederate General Sterling Price.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend and congratulate my colleague, Mr. BLUNT, for this bill. A hearing was held on a nearly identical measure last Congress, and that bill eventually passed the House. We strongly support H.R. 376 and urge its adoption by the House today.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 376 introduced by the distinguished minority whip, Representative ROY BLUNT of Missouri. It would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability of designating the First and Second Battles of Newtonia, Missouri, as a part of Wilson's Creek National Battlefield or as a separate unit of the National Park System.

I support this bill. I commend the leadership and persistence of Mr. BLUNT on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to, at this time, yield to the sponsor of the bill, the minority whip, such time as he may consume, Mr. BLUNT of Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and thank the subcommittee chairman and the committee for bringing this bill to the floor.

The language we are discussing today is designed to authorize a study by the National Park Service to determine the feasibility of creating a new Civil War battlefield at Newtonia, Missouri, or bringing those battlefield lands under the management of the Wilson's Creek National Battlefield near Springfield and also near the Newtonia battlefield site.

This measure is a necessary first step to determine if this battlefield, as I believe it will, fits the criteria necessary for being preserved as part of the National Park System. I believe the study will find that the two Civil War battles at Newtonia, like the Manassas Battlefield south of where we are now, hold a unique place in American history and are worthy of protection in the National Park Service system.

Two important battles were fought at Newtonia during the Civil War, one in 1862, where large numbers of American Indian troops on the Confederate side and the Union side, actually fought each other in battle. It was the largest of the rare engagements where native Americans fought on both sides in the Civil War. My understanding is that this is the place where those troops actually fought each other.

Two years later, in 1864, the last battle of the Civil War west of the Mississippi was fought at Newtonia as Confederate forces withdrew from Missouri after their defeat at Westport. Tennessee, Missouri and Virginia had the most battles in the Civil War, and this was the final battle in our State.

This legislation has really been strongly supported by the local community, as has the idea of preserving this battlefield. The Newtonia Battlefields Protection Association has spearheaded preservation efforts at Newtonia. In 2002, the association acquired 11 acres of the battlefield, along with the Ritchey Mansion, which is on the National Register of Historic Places for around $300,000. A year later, I delivered a ceremonial check for about half of that from the American Battlefield Protection Program to reimburse the local group that had put this association together.

The National Park Service rated the 1864 battlefield as a Priority I for preservation and the 1862 site as a Priority II. These sites are largely similar. They overlap in some places, but they are right next to each other.

A review by the National Park Service found the 1964 battlefield faced a greater threat from development. The not-for-profit Newtonia Battlefields Protection Association was formed in 1994 to work on funding to preserve the battlefields. In addition, the National Park Service has provided archaeological and historical surveys and assessments of the battlefield.

I think this study will answer the questions that need to be answered before any further steps are taken. I am grateful to the committee for bringing this legislation to the floor today. If this study is agreed to by both bodies, it might even be funded in this year's appropriation process.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 376.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ''COLUMBIA'' SPACE SHUTTLE MEMORIAL STUDY ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 807) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the feasibility and suitability of establishing a memorial to the Space Shuttle *Columbia* in the State of Texas and for its inclusion as a unit of the National Park Service.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 807

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the ''Columbia Space Shuttle Memorial Study Act''.

**SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act:

(1) MEMORIAL.—The term ''memorial'' means a memorial to the Space Shuttle Columbia that is subject to the study in section 3(a).

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service.

**SEC. 3. STUDY OF SUITABILITY AND FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING MEMORIALS TO THE SPACE SHUTTLE COLUMBIA.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available, the Secretary shall conduct a special resource study to determine the feasibility and suitability of establishing a memorial as a unit or units of the National Park System to the Space Shuttle Columbia on land in the State of Texas described in subsection (b) on which large debris from the Shuttle was recovered.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The parcels of land referred to in subsection (a) are—

(1) the parcel of land owned by the Fredonia Corporation, located at the southeast corner of the intersection of East Hospital Street and North Fredonia Street, Nacogdoches, Texas;

(2) the parcel of land owned by Temple Inland Inc., 10 acres of a 61-acre tract bounded by State Highway 83 and Bayou Bend Road, Hemphill, Texas;

(3) the parcel of land owned by the city of Lufkin, Texas, located at City Hall Park, 301 Charlton Street, Lufkin, Texas; and

(4) the parcel of land owned by San Augustine County, Texas, located at 1109 Oaklawn Street, San Augustine, Texas.

(c) ADDITIONAL SITES.—The Secretary may recommend to Congress additional sites in the State of Texas relating to the Space Shuttle Columbia for establishment as memorials to the Space Shuttle Columbia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

As we all remember, February 1, 2003, the Space Shuttle *Columbia* suffered a tragic failure during reentry into the Earth's atmosphere. As a result, seven crew members sadly lost their lives.

□ 1500

H.R. 807, introduced by Representative GOHMERT, would authorize a study to determine how best to protect four parcels of land in east Texas where large portions of the wreckage were recovered. In addition to specific sites identified in the bill, the Secretary of the Interior would be authorized to recommend additional sites to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation continues to mourn the loss of the *Columbia*. We support the passage of H.R. 807, an important step toward ensuring that the sacrifices made by her crew and their families will always be remembered. We commend the Congressman for introducing this legislation.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield as much time as he may consume to the author of this particular piece of legislation, the distinguished and debonair Congressman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for his kindness and sensitivity in this issue, as well as the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to properly commemorate and memorialize one of this Nation's most heroic, yet heartbreaking, tragedies. The disintegration of the Space Shuttle *Columbia* as it reentered Earth's atmosphere in the spring of 2003 deserves such a memorialization.

This legislation will serve to begin the process of appropriately honoring the gallantry and sacrifice, not only of the seven brave souls of their crew and their families, but also the vast number of citizens who worked tirelessly in the recovery effort following the catastrophe. This bill will start that process that will ultimately result in appropriate memorialization of all the selfless and heroic efforts.

Tragically, parts of the shuttle were strewn over hundreds of miles of east Texas in my district, and the commitment of east Texans in the effort to recover as much of the wreckage as possible was pivotal in determining the cause of the incident in order to save future lives.

The ultimate sacrifice was made by Commander Rick Husband, Pilot William McCool, Payload Commander Michael Anderson, Mission Specialist David Brown, Mission Specialist Kalpana Chalwa, Payload Commander Ilan Ramon, and Mission Specialist and Medical Doctor Laurel Blair Salton Clark who was the wife of my Texas A&M classmate John Clark, who himself is also a patriot as a captain in the United States Navy. John and Laura also have a wonderful son. All of these American heroes deserve a memorial befitting their devotion to their fellow man, their spirit of exploration and discovery, as well as their courage.

In the days and weeks following the tragedy, countless east Texans volunteered to help and support the tireless Federal workers who were charged with locating the shuttle debris.

Volunteers gave selflessly of their time and their resources by participating in searches, opening their homes, preparing food and serving the many people taking part in the recovery effort in towns such as San Augustine, Nacogdoches, Lufkin, Hemphill, as well as most of east Texas itself. San Augustine City Manager Duke Lyons said at the time the volunteers provided 3,000 to 4,000 meals per day in his area alone and did all that they could to provide shelter and anything else that was needed.

The legendary hospitality of east Texas was on display as business owners donated supplies, building space and other assets to support the Forest Service, FEMA, National Guard, and other governmental entities taking part in the recovery. All told, east Texans spent countless weeks supporting the 10,000 people searching for the shuttle remains.

The efforts of these constituents are best summed up by three fellow east Texans.

Texas Ranger Pete Maskunas said, ''We got to see a small portion of east Texas pull together in a big way. The people here don't have much, but we gave everything that we had. We showed the Nation that, here in east Texas, we have got a big heart, and we are here to make things a lot better for people we don't even know.''

San Augustine County Judge Wayne Holt said, ''From the smallest child to the oldest man, if you needed somebody, they were there.''

Nacogdoches County Judge Sue Kennedy said, ''The generosity and unselfish, tireless efforts by the wonderful people of east Texas were so compelling and moving that even in 2007 we are being asked to teach seminars on how to mobilize an entire area in a sudden emergency.''

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 807, the *Columbia* Space Shuttle Memorial Study Act, because those involved deserve it. Thank you again to the chairman, the gentleman from Arizona, and the ranking member.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. The tragedy of the Space Shuttle *Columbia* has touched the hearts of all of us, and Mr. GOHMERT should be commended for his attention to this.

I urge adoption of the bill.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in support of H.R. 807, the *Columbia* Space Shuttle Memorial Study Act, a bill which would direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility and suitability of establishing a memorial to the Space Shuttle *Columbia* in Texas and including it within the National Park System. This legislation is an important step toward honoring the courage and contributions of the crew of STS–107 and toward continuing to heal as a nation four years after the tragedy of the loss of the Space Shuttle *Columbia*.

Just over four years ago, the Nation lost seven heroes, Michael Anderson, David Brown, Kalpana Chawla, Laurel Clark, Rick Husband, Willie McCool, and Ilan Ramon. They were mothers and fathers, wives and husbands, daughters and sons, teachers and friends. There is one characteristic, however, that unites them all. They are all heroes in the truest sense of the word. We draw our strength and resolve from the example they set and we remain committed to our Nation's space program in their honor and because of all they have taught us. Today, we have the opportunity to further memorialize their contributions to space exploration and their inspirational lives by taking steps toward creating a

permanent memorial to them and their service on behalf of our country in Texas.

Guam has a unique relationship with one of the crew members, Lieutenant Commander William C. McCool, who piloted the *Columbia* on that fateful day. Commander McCool lived in Guam while his father served as a Navy pilot and he attended Dededo Middle School and John F. Kennedy High School. He later married Lani Vallejos of Dededo, Guam. While America lost a hero, Guam lost a son in the aftermath of the *Columbia* tragedy. Commander McCool blessed our island and indeed our country with his passion, intellect, and purpose. The people of Guam are proud to call him one of our own and will always remember him as a role model for our children. The inspiration Commander McCool has been to our people is something that will not fade and that can never be taken away.

This memorial, as a part of the National Park System, will allow future generations to learn about the sacrifices the STS–107 crew made in the name of scientific advancements. It will be a testament to their courage and dedication to their colleagues and this Nation. I hope that the memorial will inspire all those who see it to believe in their dreams and their potential to achieve those dreams.

The foundation of this country is built on the hard work and dedication of people with novel and exciting ideas. The crew of the Space Shuttle *Columbia* embodied these American ideals and believed in the need for scientific advancement and space exploration. A national memorial to their lives and dreams will continue to inspire the spirit of Americans.

Let us always remember the courage and inspiration of the seven crewmembers of the Space Shuttle *Columbia*. This memorial, situated in the state where they dedicated their careers to space exploration, will be a testament to their lives and their legacy. I thank my colleague, Mr. GOHMERT, for sponsoring this important legislation.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 807.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## BRIGADIER GENERAL FRANCIS MARION MEMORIAL ACT OF 2007

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 497) to authorize the Marion Park Project, a committee of the Palmetto Conservation Foundation, to establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia, and its environs to honor Brigadier General Francis Marion.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 497

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the ''Brigadier General Francis Marion Memorial Act of 2007''.

**SEC. 2. COMMEMORATIVE WORK TO HONOR BRIGADIER GENERAL FRANCIS MARION AND HIS FAMILY.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) Francis Marion was born in 1732 in St. John's Parish, Berkeley County, South Carolina. He married Mary Esther Videau on April 20th, 1786. Francis and Mary Esther Marion had no children, but raised a son of a relative as their own, and gave the child Francis Marion's name.

(2) Brigadier General Marion commanded the Williamsburg Militia Revolutionary force in South Carolina and was instrumental in delaying the advance of British forces by leading his troops in disrupting supply lines.

(3) Brigadier General Marion's tactics, which were unheard of in rules of warfare at the time, included lightning raids on British convoys, after which he and his forces would retreat into the swamps to avoid capture. British Lieutenant Colonel Tarleton stated that ''as for this damned old swamp fox, the devil himself could not catch him.'' Thus, the legend of the ''Swamp Fox'' was born.

(4) His victory at the Battle of Eutaw Springs in September of 1781 was officially recognized by Congress.

(5) Brigadier General Marion's troops are believed to be the first racially integrated force fighting for the United States, as his band was a mix of Whites, Blacks, both free and slave, and Native Americans.

(6) As a statesman, he represented his parish in the South Carolina senate as well as his State at the Constitutional Convention.

(7) Although the Congress has authorized the establishment of commemorative works on Federal lands in the District of Columbia honoring such celebrated Americans as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln, the National Capital has no comparable memorial to Brigadier General Francis Marion for his bravery and leadership during the Revolutionary War, without which the United States would not exist.

(8) Brigadier General Marion's legacy must live on. Since 1878, United States Reservation 18 has been officially referred to as Marion Park. Located between 4th and 6th Streets, S.E., at the intersection of E Street and South Carolina Avenue, S.E., in Washington, DC, the park lacks a formal commemoration to this South Carolina hero who was important to the initiation of the Nation's heritage.

(9) The time has come to correct this oversight so that future generations of Americans will know and understand the preeminent historical and lasting significance to the Nation of Brigadier General Marion's contributions. Such a South Carolina hero deserves to be given the proper recognition.

(b) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK.—The Marion Park Project, a committee of the Palmetto Conservation Foundation, may establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor Brigadier General Francis Marion and his service.

(c) COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE WORKS.—The commemorative work authorized by subsection (b) shall be established in accordance with chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Commemorative Works Act'').

(d) USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS PROHIBITED.—Federal funds may not be used to pay any expense of the establishment of the commemorative work authorized by subsection (b). The Marion Park Project, a committee of the Palmetto Conservation Foundation, shall be solely responsible for acceptance of contributions for, and payment of the expenses of, the establishment of that commemorative work.

(e) DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS.—If, upon payment of all expenses of the establishment of the commemorative work authorized by subsection (b) (including the maintenance and preservation amount provided for in section 8906(b) of title 40, United States Code), or upon expiration of the authority for the commemorative work under chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code, there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of that commemorative work, the Marion Park Project, a committee of the Palmetto Conservation Foundation, shall transmit the amount of the balance to the Secretary of the Treasury for deposit in the account provided for in section 8906(b)(1) of such title.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section, the terms ''commemorative work'' and ''the District of Columbia and its environs'' have the meanings given to such terms in section 8902(a) of title 40, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Brigadier General Francis Marion commanded the Williamsburg Militia Revolutionary Force in South Carolina during the Revolutionary War.

He is distinguished for his innovative warfare techniques, his pivotal victory at Eutaw Springs in September 1781, and for his commanding the first racially integrated troop force. General Marion is perhaps even better known by the nickname given to him by an exasperated British commander, the Swamp Fox.

H.R. 497, introduced by Representative JOE WILSON, would authorize a private entity, the Marion Park Project, to establish a commemorative work in Washington, D.C., to honor General Marion. The memorial is to be established pursuant to the Commemorative Works Act and is to be privately funded.

Mr. Speaker, the House approved identical legislation in the last Congress, and we strongly support H.R. 497 today.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise to support H.R. 497.

H.R. 497, introduced by Congressman JOE WILSON of South Carolina, would

authorize the Marion Park Project to establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia to honor Brigadier General Francis Marion.

The work authorized by this legislation will be completed with private funds provided by the Marion Park Project and not by the Federal Government. Congressman JOE WILSON and Congressman HENRY BROWN should be commended for sending us such an outstanding bill.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 497.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield as much time as he may consume for this wonderful project honoring General Francis Marion, better known as the Swamp Fox in the Revolutionary War, to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. I certainly thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 497 is an important bill for my constituents in South Carolina's First Congressional District. I thank my colleague and friend Congressman Joe Wilson for introducing this important piece of legislation.

General Francis Marion is an important part of the history of South Carolina, and the national forest bearing his name is located within my congressional district.

Francis Marion commanded the only Revolutionary force in South Carolina and was instrumental in delaying the advance of British forces by leading his troops in disrupting supply lines. General Marion's tactics, which were unheard of in rules of war at this time, commanded lightning raids on British convoys, and then he and his forces would retreat into the swamps to avoid capture.

British General Tarleton stated that ''as for this damned old swamp fox, the devil himself could not catch him.'' Thus, the legend of the Swamp Fox was born. His victory at the Battle of Eutaw Springs in September of 1781 was officially recognized by Congress.

H.R. 497 seeks to authorize the Marion Park Project and the committee of the Palmetto Conservation Foundation to establish a statue of General Francis Marion on Federal lands in D.C. in Marion Park at no Federal Government expense.

I was proud to work with Natural Resources Chairman NICK RAHALL and Ranking Republican DON YOUNG to assist in the passage of this bill for my constituents of South Carolina's First Congressional District and for all of South Carolina, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 497.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, anything that deals with some place called Eutaw Springs in South Carolina has to be a good project. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Congressman WILSON for this legislation, Mr. BROWN as well, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SPRATT and Mr. BARRETT from South Carolina for introducing the bill that we have just finished.

I also want to, before I yield back, thank the gentleman from Utah, the ranking member, for assisting in bringing the pieces of legislation we had today forward.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased we are today considering the "Brigadier General Francis Marion Memorial Act". It is with the support of the entire South Carolina delegation that I reintroduced this legislation in January.

Brigadier General Francis Marion well represented the State of South Carolina and our fledgling Nation with his brave service in the Revolutionary War. As a South Carolinian, I am proud his legacy has been honored with a memorial park in Washington, DC. Yet, I feel strongly that a statue of the "Swamp Fox" should be erected on its premises. Passage of this bill is a crucial first step in making this dream a reality.

I would specifically like to thank Ken Driggers and Nancy Stone-Collum of the Palmetto Conservation Foundation. Additionally, I would like to thank the South Carolina Humanities Council for supporting John McCabe, the historian who originally had the vision to honor the "Swamp Fox." John created the Francis Marion Park Project to assist with fundraising and planning once this bill is enacted. The National Park Service also deserves recognition for their guidance through this important process.

The House of Representatives originally passed this bill in the 109th Congress, yet it failed to be considered by the Senate. It is my hope we can enact this legislation during the 110th Congress and erect a memorial befitting General Marion.

Today I was presented a copy of The South Carolina Encyclopedia, edited by the noted historian Walter Edgar. The book is a project of The Humanities Council, ably led by Director Randy Akers. Presenting the book was Bob Hazel of West Columbia who is former Council Board Chair who was elected to the board of the Federation of State Humanities Councils. South Carolina was the site of more battles and skirmishes than any other province during the American Revolution.

General Francis Marion is a significant entry in the encyclopedia with highlights beginning on page 591:

Marion, Francis (1732–1792). Soldier. Marion, of Huguenot descent, was born in St. John's Berkley Parish, the youngest of six children born to Gabriel Marion and Esther Cordes. A planter, Marion in 1773 built his home, Pond Bluff, about four miles south of Eutaw Springs, a site now beneath the waters of Lake Marion. He commenced his military career in the parish militia in 1756 and joined the campaigns against the Cherokees (1759–1761), rising to the rank of first lieutenant. Having served in local offices, he was elected in 1775 to the First Provincial Congress. Commissioned a captain in the state's Second Regiment in June, he participated in the capture of Fort Johnson in September. As a major, Marion distinguished himself at the Battle of Sullivan's Island (June 1776), after which he was commissioned a lieutenant colonel in the Continental army.

With a militia commission as a brigadier general, Marion organized a partisan force in the Pee Dee region. Between August and December 1780, in an otherwise dismal period for America, Marion gained national recognition for his actions at the Great Savannah (August 20), Blue Savannah (September 4), Black Mingo (September 29), Tearcoat Swamp (October 26), Georgetown (November 15), and Halfway Swamp (December 12–13). While some counts place the number of ''Marion's Men'' at more than two thousand, his band generally consisted of considerably fewer than that and included Continentals. Marion's nickname, the ''Swamp Fox,'' reportedly came from the infamous British officer Banastre Tarleton, who, unable to snare Marion, called him a ''damned old fox'' and swore that ''the devil himself could not catch him.''

Marion's small-scale hit-and-run tactics disrupted supply lines, intercepted communications, and hampered the enemy considerably. In December 1780 he established a camp on Snow's Island between Pee Dee and Lynches Rivers and Clark's Creek. Conditions improved by the spring of 1781, when Marion became a vital part of General Nathanael Greene's combined operations in South Carolina. In 1781 Marion's troops participated in the battles at Fort Watson (April 23), Fort Motte (May 12), Quinby Bridge (July 17), Parker's Ferry (August 13) and Eutaw Springs (September 8).

After a penniless Marion, whose plantation had been ruined, was awarded a gold medal, a full Continental colonelcy, and command of Fort Johnson in Charleston harbor. He served in the S.C. Senate in 1783–1786, 1791, and 1792–1794 and was elected to the 1790 state constitutional convention.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 497.

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 Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 497.

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. GRIJALVA. 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.

## RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

## AFTER RECESS

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

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings

will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 995, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 497, by the yeas and nays.

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

## EXTENDING AUTHORIZATION FOR THE AMERICAN VETERANS DISABLED FOR LIFE MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 995.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 995, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—390

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

NOT VOTING—43

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Barton (TX)
Bono
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
DeGette
Diaz-Balart, L.
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Fattah
Goode
Graves
Hunter
Issa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kilpatrick
Lantos
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Miller (NC)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Neal (MA)
Peterson (PA)
Rush
Slaughter
Stark
Tauscher
Tiahrt
Towns
Waters

□ 1901

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## BRIGADIER GENERAL FRANCIS MARION MEMORIAL ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 497.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 497, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—390

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)

Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—43

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Barton (TX)
Bono
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
DeGette
Diaz-Balart, L.
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Fattah
Goode
Graves
Hunter
Issa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kilpatrick
Lantos
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Miller (NC)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Neal (MA)
Peterson (PA)
Rush
Slaughter
Stark
Tauscher
Tiahrt
Towns
Waters
Westmoreland

□ 1912

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I could not be present today, Monday, March 5, 2007 to vote on rollcall vote Nos. 119 and 120 due to a family medical matter.

Had I been present, I would have voted:

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 119 on motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 995, a bill to amend Public Law 106–348 to extend the authorization for establishing a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor veterans who became disabled while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States;

"yea" on rollcall vote No. 120 on passage of H.R. 497, the Brigadier General Francis Marion Memorial Act of 2007.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to official business I was unable to vote on Monday, March 5, 2007. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on Final Passage of H.R. 995, To Amend Public Law 106–348 to Extend the Authorization for Establishing a Memorial in the District of Columbia or Its Environs to Honor Veterans Who Became Disabled While Serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, and "yea" on Final Passage on H.R. 497, the Brigadier General Francis Marion Memorial Act of 2007.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN 110TH CONGRESS

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110–29) on the resolution (H. Res. 202) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Tenth Congress, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 700, HEALTHY COMMUNITIES WATER SUPPLY ACT; H.R. 569, WATER QUALITY INVESTMENT ACT; AND H.R. 720, WATER QUALITY FINANCING ACT OF 2007

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee intends to meet Tuesday, March 6, to report rules for floor consideration of H.R. 569, the Water Quality Investment Act; and H.R. 700, the Healthy Communities Water Supply Act. It is anticipated that the rules will require that amendments be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration.

Members who wish to offer an amendment must preprint their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the close of business Tuesday, March 6, to ensure that their amendments are printed prior to consideration of the bill on the House floor.

Amendments should be drafted to the text of H.R. 569 or H.R. 700 as reported by the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. The bills are posted on the Rules Committee Web site. Amendments should be drafted by Legislative Counsel and also should be reviewed by the Office of the Parliamentarian to be sure that amendments comply with the rules of the House. Members are also strongly encouraged to submit their amendments to the Congressional Budget Office for analysis regarding possible PAYGO violations.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee intends to meet this week to report a rule that could limit the amendment process on H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007.

Members who wish to offer an amendment to this bill should submit 55 copies of the amendment and a brief description of the amendment to the Rules Committee in H–312 in the Capitol no later than 12 noon on Wednesday, March 7.

Amendments must be drafted to the bill as ordered reported on March 1 by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. A copy of that bill will be posted on the Web site of the Rules Committee. Amendments should be drafted by Legislative Counsel and also should be reviewed by the Office of the Parliamentarian to be sure that amendments comply with the rules of the House. Members are also strongly encouraged to submit their amendments to the Congressional Budget Office for analysis regarding possible PAYGO violations.

□ 1915

## TEXAS INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, March 2, 2007, marked Texas Independence Day. 171 years ago that day the Texas Declaration of Independence was ratified by the Convention of 1836 at Washington-on-the-Brazos in Texas.

The Texas Declaration of Independence was produced literally overnight. Its urgency was paramount because while it was being prepared, the Alamo in San Antonio was under siege by Santa Anna's army of Mexico.

Immediately upon the assemblage of the Convention of 1836 on March 1, a committee of five delegates were appointed to draft the document. The committee consisted of George C. Childress, Edward Conrad, James Gaines, Bailey Hardeman, and Colin McKinney. It was briefly reviewed then adopted by the delegates the following day.

It started off echoing the lines of the American counterpart with the words: "When a government has ceased to protect the lives and liberty and property of the people . . . "

It spoke of numerous injustices inflicted upon the people of the State,

then known as Coahuila y Tejas: the elimination of the State's legislative body; the denial of religious freedom; the elimination of the civil justice system; and the confiscation of firearms, which was one particularly intolerable act among Texans.

Finally, it stated that because of the injustice of Santa Anna's tyrannical government, Texans were severing their connection with the Mexican nation and declaring themselves "a free, sovereign, and independent republic . . . fully invested with all the rights and attributes" that belong to independent nations; and a declaration that they "fearlessly and confidently" committed their decision to "the Supreme Arbiter of the destinies of nations."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that Congress and this whole country join all Texans in honoring these brave men who stood up for liberty and freedom 171 years ago.

## MORROW COUNTY ROADS AND ACCESS TO PUBLIC LANDS

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the failure of Congress to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act is a breach of faith to more than 600 forested counties and 4,400 school districts across our great country.

There are more than 400 miles of paved road in Morrow County, Oregon, where every county road leads to a national forest. Loss of this program and funds means no portion of any paved road will be replaced and basic maintenance will stop. One of the most expensive roads for the county to maintain runs through the Umatilla National Forest and is a designated scenic byway.

Without county payments, people won't be able to safely access their public lands, and the hope of a new outdoor recreation economy to replace the lost timber jobs goes unfulfilled.

County Public Works Director Burke O'Brien says: ''We are not the ones who stopped our sustainable Federal timber harvest. However, now we are being forced to lose even the funds promised to replace the lost forest revenues.''

My colleagues, Congress must keep the Federal Government's word and its promise to the timbered communities. It is time to get a hearing and a markup and to pass H.R. 17. Time is running out for forested timber communities.

## ANNOUNCEMENT OF UGANDA RESOLUTION

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the dire situation in Africa that does not receive the attention it deserves.

Today, along with Senator RUSS FEINGOLD, I introduced a concurrent resolution that I hope will eventually bring some peace to the ravaged region of northern Uganda. Specifically, it calls on the Government of Uganda and the so-called Lord's Resistance Army to recommit to a political solution to the conflict in northern Uganda and to recommence peace talks that are vital.

It also urges immediate and substantial support for the ongoing peace process from the United States and the international community.

Mr. Speaker, the tragedy in Darfur rightfully has been receiving a great deal of attention as of late. But to the southeast of that region, another tragedy has been developing for nearly two decades. More than 200,000 Ugandans have died from the violence and disease brought about by the conflict between the Ugandan Government and the LRA.

What is particularly disgusting about this conflict is the forced recruitment of children by LRA. The boys are turned into killing machines and the girls into sex slaves.

Former U.N. Under Secretary General Jan Egeland has called the crisis in northern Uganda the biggest forgotten humanitarian emergency in the world today.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELCH of Vermont). 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.

## 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 48th day since a great injustice took place in this country. On January 17 of 2007, two U.S. Border Patrol agents entered Federal prison to begin serving 11- 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 border into Texas. The smuggler's van contained $1 million worth of marijuana.

These agents never should have been prosecuted, but they are now handcuffed in Federal prison.

The U.S. Attorney's Office granted immunity to the smuggler and prosecuted the agents almost exclusively on the testimony of an admitted drug smuggler who claimed he was unarmed. The drug smuggler received full medical care in El Paso, Texas, was permitted to return to Mexico, and is now suing the Border Patrol for $5 million for violating his civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, he is not an American citizen. He is a criminal.

Mr. Speaker, countless citizens and dozens of Members of Congress want to know why our government is on the wrong side of this case. Over the past 6 months, Members of Congress have repeatedly petitioned President Bush to pardon these agents.

Since the agents' conviction, new details continue to emerge that call into question the prosecution and the outcome of this case. Recently, I sent a letter to the President detailing the troubling revelations that the prosecutors in this case may not have provided crucial evidence to the defense. This evidence includes a Homeland Security memo that states two supervisors at the scene knew about the shooting, but failed to report it. This contradicts the prosecution's claim that the agents knew they did something wrong and tried to cover up the shooting.

Since then, Drug Enforcement Agency, DEA, reports have also revealed that the Mexican drug smuggler brought a second load of 752 pounds of marijuana, but the prosecutors succeeded in keeping this information sealed from the jury and the public.

Citizens across this country and Members of Congress want to know why does the U.S. Attorney's Office in western Texas choose to go after law enforcement officers while protecting illegal aliens who commit crimes in this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, every day that these men remain behind bars is a travesty of justice. Because the President has so far refused to stand up for justice in this case, last month Agent Ramos was assaulted in prison.

But, Mr. Speaker, the President has the power to immediately reverse this injustice by granting a pardon to these two innocent men.

And, Mr. Speaker, before I close, I want to say that the American people have rallied behind these two Border agents who are heroes in this country, not criminals. And it is time that this White House wake up and listen to the American people.

## HONORING THOMAS F. EAGLETON FOR 50 YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

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

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, this evening I would like to speak about a true statesman that we have lost in our country and in my home State of Missouri. We lost, over the weekend, former U.S. Senator Thomas F. Eagleton. Not only was he a true statesman, but he had a giant heart, a powerful intellect, and a keen wit.

He leaves behind his wife, Barbara, whom he married in 1956, two children, son Terence and daughter Christie, three grandchildren and a brother.

Not long ago, friends gathered in St. Louis and celebrated 50 years since Senator Eagleton had entered public service. And he had many chapters in an amazing life. He served his country honorably in the United States Navy,

stationed at the Great Lakes Naval Training Center from 1948 to 1949, continued on to graduate with honors from Amherst College in 1951 and Harvard Law School in 1953.

He was admitted to the Missouri Bar in 1953; proceeded in a series of offices, beginning, he was elected as the youngest circuit attorney in the city of St. Louis in its history at the age of 27. He followed that by being elected the youngest Missouri State attorney general at the age of 31, and the youngest Lieutenant Governor of the State of Missouri by age 35.

He went on and in 1968 was elected to the United States Senate representing Missouri. In his first term in the United States Senate, at the age of 42, he was selected by George McGovern to be his Vice Presidential candidate. And while he was only that nominee for a few days, and he will be known as such in history, he went on to serve three terms in the United States Senate, sponsoring legislation, varied, but of great importance to our country, the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts, an amendment which halted the U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War, and as the chief author of the Federal War Powers Act that limits the authority of the President to conduct war without congressional approval.

After an amazing career in public service, he came home to St. Louis, and there he gave back to his community, to new generations of people to encourage them in public service, to new generations of students. He was a professor at Washington University in St. Louis and St. Louis University where he shared his vast knowledge and experience with young people who will be our leaders of tomorrow.

To others in public service, myself, I am fortunate to say, included, he was a great mentor, example and friend. He never failed to promote the people and the notions that he felt strongly about.

In his private life in St. Louis, he was well known for acting with regard to the civic good and giving back to his community. He worked to bring the St. Louis Rams to St. Louis, and recently, in the 2006 elections, was a chief advocate for Missouri's amendment to the Stem Cell Initiative which passed by a vote of the people.

□ 1930

In downtown St. Louis, our new Federal courthouse is named after Senator Eagleton. It towers in our downtown just west of the famous St. Louis Arch. Thomas Eagleton's career and life towers in our country as a great example for all of us, whether we are involved in public service or not.

He was legendary for writing lengthy notes to people. I will treasure those notes that he has sent to me; those notes, that advice, that wise counsel that he shared with so many.

The impact that he has had on young people, their leadership for the future and what he has given to our great State and our country, he will be sorely missed but very well remembered.

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.)

## DR. MICHAEL ELLIS DEBAKEY, FATHER OF CARDIOVASCULAR SURGERY

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor of the House tonight to ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1154. This bill designates a Congressional Gold Medal for the famed Houston heart surgeon, Dr. Michael DeBakey. This legislation has been introduced by my good friend from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), but I feel it is incumbent upon me, as one of the physicians of the House of Representatives, to come to the floor and talk about how important this award is for this individual because, truly, Dr. Michael DeBakey changed the face of medicine forever in this country. His motto, as always, was, ''Strive for nothing less than excellence,'' a motto that we might adopt in the House of Representatives today.

Dr. DeBakey received his bachelor's and his M.D. degree from Tulane University in New Orleans. While in medical school, Dr. DeBakey invented what became known as the roller pump, later to become a major component in the heart-lung machine used in open-heart surgery. This was a groundbreaking development because previous mechanical pumps had destroyed so many red blood cells in the mechanical action of pumping. The roller pump was truly a visionary change that Dr. DeBakey popularized when he was still in medical school in the 1930s.

He completed his internship at Charity Hospital in New Orleans. Charity Hospital, unfortunately, is no longer with us because of the ravages of Hurricane Katrina. Dr. DeBakey completed his residency in surgery at the University of Strasbourg, France and the University of Heidelberg in Germany.

He volunteered for service in World War II and subsequently was named director of the Surgical Consultants' Division of the U.S. Surgeon General's Office. His work during that war led that office to the development of the Mobile Army Surgical Hospital, so-called MASH units, those indeed that were popularized by movies and television shows back in the 1970s and were the forerunners of our forward surgical combat teams that have saved so many lives in Iraq and Afghanistan today.

He helped establish the specialized medical and surgical center system for treating military personnel returning home from war, subsequently known as the Veterans' Administration Medical Center System.

But it was at Methodist Hospital in Houston where Dr. DeBakey performed many of his groundbreaking surgeries, including the first removal of a carotid artery blockage in 1950, the year that I was born; the first coronary artery bypass graft in 1964; the first use of a ventricular assist device to pump blood and support a diseased heart in 1966; and some of the first heart transplants in 1968 and 1969.

He developed the self-contained miniaturized left ventricular assist device to pump blood for a diseased heart, something that is in use to this day. The techniques used to miniaturize the device's inner workings were developed with engineers working on the Nation's space program at nearby NASA.

He served as an adviser to nearly every United States President for the last 50 years. Think of that, Mr. Speaker: The medical adviser to every United States President for the last 50 years, as well as to heads of state throughout the world. He traveled, famously, to Russia in 1996 to consult on the surgery for Russian President Boris Yeltsin.

During his professional surgical career, he performed more than 60,000 cardiovascular procedures and trained thousands of surgeons who practice around the world. His name is affixed to a number of organizations, centers for learning and projects devoted to medical education and health education for the general public.

But think of this, Mr. Speaker, Dr. DeBakey also underwent an operation that was named for him. I picked up a copy of the New York Times last December and read a story about how Dr. DeBakey had undergone the surgery that he himself had described many years before. In fact, Dr. DeBakey admitted at that time that, although he knew he was ill, he never called his own doctor, and he never called 911. Quoting here, ''if it becomes intense enough, you're perfectly willing to accept cardiac arrest as a possible way of getting rid of the pain,'' he told the New York Times. A wonderful, pragmatic individual.

He helped establish the National Library of Medicine, which is now the world's largest and most prestigious repository for medical archives.

Mr. Speaker, as we talk in this Congress about the need for improving the computer technology for medical records and medical information, Dr. DeBakey was on the forefront of that while most of us were still in grammar school.

In 1969, he received the highest honor a United States citizen can receive: the Presidential Medal of Freedom with Distinction. In 1976, his students founded Michael E. DeBakey International Surgical Society.

His contributions to medicine and his breakthrough surgeries and innovative devices have completely transformed our view of the human body and its longevity on this planet. At age 98, he deserves the highest award that Congress can bestow: the Congressional Gold Medal.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring H.R. 1154, introduced by AL GREEN of Texas.

## WALTER REED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the conditions that we have been hearing about on the care of our veterans at Walter Reed Outpatient Care.

Walter Reed is the first stop for many of our brave men and women returning from Iraq. These soldiers risked their lives defending this great Nation. They have lost friends in combat, and they have seen countless comrades lose limbs and suffer horrible wounds. They expect no reward in return for their bravery.

Unfortunately, the treatment they have received when entering the outpatient care is substandard. Conditions at Walter Reed Building 18, even though they are being improved today, should have never gotten to that condition.

We have all read reports on the matter; so I will not go into all of the details.

Mr. Speaker, if these conditions existed in the public, the authorities would have quickly been notified. However, the mismanagement of care does not end with Building 18. Many of our veterans are lost in the system once they are transferred to the outpatient care. Case files are being lost. Head trauma victims are not receiving the level of managed care they require. Non-English-speaking families are left to navigate through the red tape that exists at Walter Reed and, I am sure, many other veterans' hospitals.

The management at Walter Reed is directly responsible for these conditions, and I know those are changing now. But, again, we must make sure this does not happen again.

Congress has the ability to improve the situation for our new veterans. We are all aware of the benefits of health information technology. Health IT allows patients to move throughout the health care system in an easy manner. If Health IT was implemented at Walter Reed, our veterans would be able to move from inpatient to outpatient care without the fear that their records would be lost. The benefits our veterans would receive if health IT is implemented far outreach the cost of the system.

Many of our Iraqi veterans are coming home with head injuries. Roadside bombs and IEDs are responsible for this increase. These veterans require constant care and supervision. Many of them have lost cognitive abilities. In some of the worst cases, veterans are barely aware of their surroundings.

Let me say this: I know a lot about head injuries. Going back 13 years ago, my son was shot in the head, received traumatic head injuries, and he was left partially paralyzed. We were lucky. His mom was a nurse. She knew how to go through the system. He was also lucky that I had training in physical therapy. People understand, he was only 26 at that time, as many of our soldiers that are injured. They don't need just 3 hours of physical therapy a day; they need 4 in the morning, 4 in the afternoon, and then they need their families around them to take care of them in the evening time. It is hard. It is difficult work. But I know our young men and women are able to do this. The families need to be trained on how to work with their children that have head trauma.

But, again, it is up to us here in Congress, and I know there are hearings, but we must come up with answers on giving the treatment to these veterans with head injuries and to all our veterans that go through Walter Reed.

You cannot expect someone to go onto the campus and think that they are going to remember that they have an appointment the next day. You can't expect them to understand even sometimes where they are at that particular moment.

This has been treatment that we know how to give, and why we haven't given it to them I do not understand.

I know that Walter Reed is one of the best hospitals in the Nation, as long as you are in the hospital. But when you come out, that is where we are losing our veterans through the cracks. It is unacceptable, and we in Congress have a responsibility to make sure it doesn't happen.

During the Vietnam War, our military came home, and, unfortunately, we did not honor them the way they should have been honored. I thought we had learned our lesson.

The brave young men and women representing this country have done a wonderful job, and for us to even let down any kind of health care treatment for them is a black mark on this Congress and certainly on us, the United States of America.

I know the President has put a commission in place. I have been around here long enough to know, enough commissions. We need action. We can do it. That is what we are very good at, getting down to the bottom of it and putting in action. We can't have these veterans wait any longer.

Let me say this: Every day, Members of Congress get on the floor and say what a wonderful job our men and women are doing. Every day we honor them. And yet all of us have let them down. That is not acceptable. I hope that we will do better in the future. The future has to be now. The time has to be now. We cannot wait 2 to 3 to 4 months for a commission report.

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

(Mr. DREIER 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO 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 Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## THE COUNTDOWN CREW: COUNTDOWN TO THE TAX INCREASE BY THE DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, we have come to the floor tonight again, my colleagues and I, to talk about something that is of great concern to us, great concern to the American people. And that is that, in just 1,398 days, there will be one of the largest tax increases in American history, over $200 billion, and that is going to occur if the majority party does not extend the tax cuts that the Republicans put in place in 2001, 2003 and extended some of them in the last Congress.

But that is going to happen. This huge tax increase is going to occur in America. And the Democrats don't have to do anything but run out the clock. If they sit on their hands, sit on the ball, we will see, in 1,398 days, as I said, one of the largest tax increases that the American people will have ever experienced.

Some of my colleagues on the other side have talked about the change that took place in this body, and there was a change. But I don't know anybody in America, nobody that I talk to in the

Ninth Congressional District of Pennsylvania or across Pennsylvania, that voted to see their taxes get increased.

Over the last several months, over the last few years, several years actually, we have seen this economy move forward creating jobs. In fact, over the last 4 years, this economy has created 7.2 million jobs.

□ 1945

It is because of those tax cuts that we put in place. The unemployment rate in America is at 4.6 percent. It is the lowest average unemployment rate in the four decades that we have experienced over the last three or four years.

Once again, if we don't extend these tax cuts, the American people are going to see more of their hard-earned dollars being sent off to Washington. If you look at a family of four that makes $40,000 or so combined income, has two kids in their family, if we don't extend these tax cuts, if the majority party, the Democrats in Congress, don't extend these tax cuts, people in that income range are going to see an increase of about $2,000 or $2,200 a year.

Some in this body may think that is not a lot of money, but I know to the hardworking people in central Pennsylvania that earn $40,000 in income, $2,200 is a lot of money. You can take that money and that is a nice down payment on a car. You can buy a new washer and dryer machine. You can save that money for college for your children. If you take that $2,000 or $2,200 a year over the next 10 years and invest it in a mutual fund returning about 5 percent income, that would grow to $30,000 in the next 10 years. That is a significant amount of money to send your child off to one of the higher education institutions in our country.

I think that the majority party ought to take a lesson from one of their own. Back in the 1960s when President Kennedy came into office, he cut taxes. What happened was that the economy grew and revenues to the government grew. We look back at history to President Ronald Reagan in the 1980s. He did the same thing. He cut the tax rates. The economy grew, it created jobs, and, lo and behold, more revenues flowed into the Federal Government.

That is again what we did in 2001 and 2003. We cut taxes, and history has repeated itself. This economy is one of the strongest economies in U.S. history. We are getting record levels of revenue coming into the government. So what we need to do is to continue to keep those tax rates low, extend those tax cuts.

Unfortunately for the American people, and that is one of the reasons we come to the floor on a weekly basis and talk about this, to make sure we bring the attention to the American people, make sure they are aware of what is going to happen, the Democrats, they said it very clearly in their campaign rhetoric in 2006, that the leader of the Ways and Means Committee, the new chairman, has said time and time again during that campaign election that he didn't know of any of President Bush's or the Republican tax cuts that deserve to be extended.

One of the first things they did when they became the majority party is they made it easier, not harder, but made it easier to raise your taxes. When the Republicans controlled the House, we made it the rules of the House that you couldn't raise taxes unless you had a three-fifths vote in the House to raise taxes. One of the first things the Democrats did was to make it easier. They decreased it to a simple majority to raise your taxes.

They put in place PAYGO. It should actually be PAYTAXGO, because it is going to make it easier for them. They are not going to touch any existing programs, but on new spending they are going to have to offset any new spending; and the way to offset that, the easiest way, is to increase taxes. I believe, as I believe many Americans believe, that that is what is going to happen.

The American people need to know this. We hope that people are tuning in and listening to us as we talk about this. We call ourselves the Countdown Crew. We are 1,398 days away from this huge tax increase unless the American people speak up, unless the American people talk to their elected officials and say they are not going to stand for a tax increase.

We have created a Web site, and we would love for you to e-mail us and let us know, give us your story of how the tax cuts, whichever one, whether it was the child tax credit, or the accelerated depreciation, dividend tax cuts, the death tax, which one of these tax cuts has benefited you. We would like to hear your story so we can talk about it.

There are millions and millions of Americans out there, young and old, low and medium income, that have benefited by these tax cuts. Our Web site, I guess it is our e-mail, is countdowncrew@mail.house.gov. Once again, there are some stories tonight. Later on in the evening we will be sharing with you that people around the country have sent us e-mails about how important these tax cuts are to them and how detrimental it will be to their small business or their family or communities across America.

I am pleased to be joined tonight by one of my colleagues from Kentucky, Mr. DAVIS. I yield to Mr. DAVIS to talk about some of these issues tonight.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Thank you, BILL. I appreciate the leadership you have taken on this issue. The one thing that our group is consistent in is all of us have come from the small business world. All of us have come from that arena that creates the jobs in America, pursuing a vision, pursuing opportunity.

For those who have just joined us, you have joined the Countdown Crew. You can join us at countdowncrew@mail.house.gov. We have gotten thousands of e-mails from around the United States based on the first few evenings that we have been talking about the impact of positive, progressive, pro-growth economic policies that allow working families to keep more of what they own and create incentives for small businesses.

As we go into the time right now, the reason we are called the Countdown Crew is because of the fact that unless legislation is passed to extend the tax cuts that have been so bountiful and so beneficial to the American people, to the United States economy, in creating millions of jobs, those tax cuts will expire at the end of 2010 and every working family in the United States is going to receive a tax increase.

And 1,398 days from now, there will be a tax increase on every working family. A family of four making between $30,000 and $50,000 a year will have a $2,092 tax increase imposed upon them. That doesn't come with additional legislation being passed. In fact, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from New York, has said that he is not going to introduce any tax legislation to extend those tax cuts and they will expire. So for everybody watching tonight, your tax bill is going to go up by a minimum of $2,000.

When you think about what that means, let's look at the other side, the positive side of the Republican policy, the conservative policy of allowing people to keep more of what they earn.

First, by keeping more of what you earn, it is invested in causes that are important for you, whether it is put into your home, whether it is put into your family, whether it is saved for education, whether it is invested in a new car, in clothing. We can think about any wide variety of issues, but those are the dollars that fuel the economy.

I believe very firmly we see it in the numbers, that when people are allowed to keep their own money in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks by extending those cuts in a time of war, that we have seen unprecedented economic growth take place in this country and a recovery that shows right now industrial productivity, our manufacturing productivity in the United States, is at an all-time record high, which is an amazing thing as the United States economy continues to churn along. In fact, the growth that has taken place in the United States economy in the last 3 years is greater than the entire economic output of China, which is the largest potential economic competitor to us in the long run.

The reason that I share this is because it has made a difference in the lives of ordinary people. When folks are allowed to keep more of what they earn, they are going to make sure that those dollars are accomplishing things

for their family, especially over the long term.

I would like to tell one story as we begin tonight that I think typifies the success that can be seen by allowing people to keep more of their own money. As BILL said, this is not a partisan issue. John Kennedy cut taxes and had economic growth take off and record revenues come into the Treasury. We have allowed people to keep more of what they earned, and what happened this past year, record revenues have come into the United States Treasury. And the real issue is controlling spending, not taking more of people's hard-earned dollars.

Well, pursuing that vision was something that BILL SHUSTER has done. It was something that I did back in the early 1990s starting my business, helping our manufacturing companies compete and keep their jobs here in the United States.

One person who I would like to highlight tonight, a man who has become my friend, but also somebody who pursued that vision himself, was a man named George Hammond. He runs Hammond's Automotive. He started with its first operation in Covington, Kentucky, over 20 years ago. He took that chance that many Americans take to pursue the American Dream.

He started off with a mechanics shop. The reason that his automotive shop grew in customers was not by popular advertising, it wasn't by media, it was by word of mouth, because the character of George and all the folks who worked with him demonstrated a desire to care for their customers and to make a difference, and they got more business and they grew. They opened a body shop.

Suddenly, the things that they began to encounter were the regulatory system that was increasing costs upon them as they were repairing cars. But even with that, he continued to grow beyond the impact of the regulatory system, hiring more people.

As a result of the tax policy that has taken place over the last 6 years, where people are allowed to keep more of their own money, unlike sending it to bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., where we may not know how it is going to be spent, George took that and he reinvested it. He reinvested it in his people, in training, and most recently opened another business in Burlington, Kentucky, moving out into the suburbs from Covington where he is reaching more and more people, all by word of mouth, and there a following that is going with that.

But I don't know what would have happened to George Hammond if he did not have that flexibility, if he had the tax increase that is coming down the road at the end of 2010, in 1,398 days. He probably wouldn't have had that opportunity to grow his business and create that opportunity.

But instead of raising taxes, we have created taxpayers with this policy. This is a family-friendly policy. That is a policy that allows people to pay for college tuition. It allows them to invest in their children's future. And for George Hammond, not only did it benefit him, but it benefited all of the employees, now going into a second generation of employees with three different business units that are creating jobs, creating a future for folks right there in Boone County and in Kenton County, Kentucky.

Mr. SHUSTER. How many people does George employ?

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. It is a typical small business where he has over 25 employees.

Mr. SHUSTER. That is small business personified, that 25 people. Those are the kinds of stories that I think we need to bring out.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I think the one thing that he has experienced, too, the discussions that we have had when I have taken my F–250 pickup truck in or our Chevy Astro van to get worked on, the one thing we talk about is health insurance. And I remember as a small business owner having to deal with the issues of the high cost of health insurance, dealing with tax policies. He has gone the extra mile to help his people, probably similar to some the experiences that you have had.

Mr. SHUSTER. Absolutely. I didn't mean to interrupt you, but I just wanted to know what size business that was and make sure the American people know that we are talking about people in their neighborhoods, in their communities, that employ 25, 30, 50, 100 people and that start from small and turn these enterprises into successful businesses. In most cases, my experience has been those small business owners, they are the backbone of the community. They are the ones that give to the local little league team. They are the ones that contribute to the hospital and the hospital boards. They are the ones making sure their communities are wonderful places to live, or are helping to make sure they are wonderful places to live.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I think that is a great point. George is an institution in the community. The one thing is that his attitude toward service has spiraled down to his employees, to their vendors, and that kind of dedication and devotion is I think not necessarily found in the very large corporations that are out there. It is those small businesses, like you say, that are connected.

For those folks who are watching, we invited you to join the Countdown Crew. You can contact us at countdowncrew@mail.house.gov. We encourage you to tell us your stories, your thoughts, your desires for policy.

In particular, what we are seeing over and over again in hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of messages that are shared back to us is the impact of a positive economic policy that allows people to keep more of what they earn. What we have coming, if we don't take action, if the House doesn't pass legislation by the end of 2010, every working family in this country is going to have a $2,092 increase. So many benefits are going away.

What we want to do is keep positive policies that empower people, create jobs, and create a future.

With that, I yield back to the gentleman.

□ 2000

Mr. SHUSTER. As soon as next week, the Democratic majority will be introducing their budget. It is my guess that they are going to spell out exactly how they are going to increase taxes on the American people to pay for that budget. They are going to have a choice. The choice is going to be either to continue the tax policies which have resulted in record job growth, 7.2 million jobs over the last 4 years, 40 quarters of an expanding economy; or they are going to choose to put the brakes on the growth of this economy by raising taxes.

I am going to predict tonight that if they decide to choose to raise taxes, which all indications lead me to believe they will, the brakes will go on this economy in very short order.

One of the important reforms that we as Republicans made when we were in the majority was to reduce the taxes on dividends and capital gains. In past history, dividends and capital gains were sort of viewed as only the fat cats in society, only the wealthy get to benefit by a reduction in taxes on dividends and capital gains. But that is not the case today.

Over 60 percent of the American population is invested into mutual funds and the stock market, into various other financial vehicles. It is widespread in the economy who invests and who can benefit from a decrease in the tax on dividends and a cut in the tax on capital gains.

Prior to 2003, tax cut dividends were subject to individual income taxes up to 38.6 percent on top of corporate taxes of 35 percent. It was double taxation. The corporations in America that you invested in, if you invested in General Motors or you invested in Wal-Mart and they made a profit, they got hit with a 35 percent tax increase, and then they paid out their dividends to the millions of people from all walks of life who invested in those corporations, and the dividend, it was hit at a tax rate of 38.6 percent or below. Among developing countries, only Japan has had higher tax rates on investment income than us.

In 2003, the top individual tax rate on dividends was cut by more than half down to 15 percent. Starting next year, there will be no dividend tax at all for lower income Americans which is absolutely essential to continue growth in this economy.

In addition, capital gains tax increased, with the top rates on long-term capital gains dropping from 20 and 10 percent down to 15 and 5 percent. The 5 percent rate will drop to

zero next year for those in the bottom two tax brackets. Again, for families in the middle and lower income that have investments, they are not going to be taxed on those types of investments, or it is going to be significantly decreased.

Those lower tax rates have promoted a strong and growing economy, and has created 7.2 million new jobs. Our job creation in the last 4 years is greater than the European Union and the Japanese economy combined. This has been an economy that has grown strong and created millions and millions of jobs.

Again, if the Democrats fail to extend the tax relief, in 2010, those rates will return to where they were before we lowered them, and the American people are going to experience significant tax increases.

Because seniors rely on income from investments, they have benefited greatly from those lower taxes. That is why it is important. They are one of the key groups in our economy that have benefited by it.

The Treasury Department has estimated that 8.5 million seniors saved an average of $1,144 on their 2005 taxes as a result of lower rates on dividends and long-term capital gains. And $1,100 goes a long way towards buying something new for your home, whether it is a washer and dryer, or whether it is a senior giving it to their grandchildren to help them out as they make their way in the world and go to college and try to get an education.

According to the Tax Foundation in an analysis of IRS data, more than half of all taxpayers over the age of 65 received dividend income in 2004. Over half of the folks over 65 years of age are receiving dividend income. That is double the national average for all taxpayers.

Seniors also rely upon capital gains income. That same Tax Foundation report found that while nationally less than 13 percent of taxpayers claim capital gains income in 2004, that figure cost 30 percent, a third for taxpayers between the age of 65 and 74, and more than 27 percent for those over the age of 75. Seniors benefit greatly by the dividend and capital gains tax cuts.

On May 10, 2006, Flora Gramma Green, a national spokeswoman for the Seniors Coalition, described the importance of lower dividend tax rates for seniors living on a fixed income. She said, ''When I planned for my retirement, I needed the dividend income just to have a secure retirement. I am not wealthy. I worry every day if I will have the money to buy the gas I need to get to the doctor, I worry if I will have the money I need for proper nursing care as I get older, and I worry that the monthly income I plan for will stretch far enough each month to let me pay my bills. The millions of fellow seniors who benefit from this tax reduction are in the same boat I am in. We need this tax break just to continue the safe and secure retirement that we planned for.''

Those are the words of a senior who is certainly involved in the fight to continue to keep these tax rates low, to see that the tax rates are extended so that in just 1,398 days, which will be January 1, 2011, which is a short period of time away, we will see this $200 billion tax increase, and it is going to cut across all income spectrums, from low income to high income.

These folks are going to have to send more of their money to the Federal Government and not be able to put it back in the economy, creating jobs in the most efficient way that an economy can create jobs.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. One thing I would highlight, a few examples to share just from back in our district, and feel free to jump in with your experiences from Pennsylvania, growing up in the Ohio Valley and seeing our industry having problems competing, I know one of the choices I had when I left high school was to go in the mills or go in the military. I am so glad I went in the military because when I came back years later, those mills were gone. The environment had changed dramatically, and expectations had changed dramatically.

The people who are allowed to keep more of what they earn are going to invest it locally and invest it in their family. As our dollars stay in our community, there is going to be increased opportunity.

In northern Kentucky where I live, in Kentucky's Fourth District, which runs on the south side of the Ohio River, right across from Cincinnati, we have one of the largest air hubs in North America, the Cincinnati-Northern Kentucky International Airport. Being in Kentucky, we are very proud of the fact that Cincinnati's airport is located in the great commonwealth of Kentucky, but there is a story which affects the Tristate area in a profound way that has taken place over the past couple of years.

Delta Airlines, one of the great flagship carriers of this country, has a major international hub located there. They also have a home grown regional carrier, Comair, which started out as a small commuter airline, which has grown into quite a presence.

They have gone through a very, very tough time over the past several years, since 9/11, dealing with the fluctuations in fuel prices and the issues of security costs, the challenges that have been faced in the economy turning around. The tax cuts that have been so beneficial to America's families that have created 7 million new jobs, that have allowed people to keep more of what they earn, on average between $2,000 and $3,000 per family in this country, has had a direct impact on this company.

The reason I want to highlight Delta and Comair and all of the businesses in our region, they have gone to great lengths to sacrifice and do something different than other airlines have. Rather than cutting their pensions for the expediency of institutional investors on Wall Street or other creditors, they worked with their creditors and all of their vendors not only to keep the airline going at a world class level, but to make sure that they kept their benefits and pension plans in place for their employees.

The commitment of the employees have been so great through all of this. Many of them have made tremendous sacrifices. The one thing I can see is that these employees who are making 40 percent or less than what they were making 1 year ago, 2 years ago, are now suddenly faced with not only having substantial reduction in their income to keep their job moving, but, in 1,398 days, according to this regressive policy, they are going to have an additional $2,092 on average added on top of those families.

I think it is entirely unreasonable because the impact can ripple all of the way across the economy, not only in terms of demands on those families, but the consuming families, some of the ways people spend that money, is travel. They travel for business. They buy products from companies that fuel that business travel economy. One of the great gateways to Florida, people traveling to vacation in the south from different parts of the United States, are flying on low-cost fares from Delta through Cincinnati and other gateways in the region. And that $2,000 on average per family will have an impact on that aspect of the economy, too.

You might ask, why are you bringing this up? Our economy is so complex, so interconnected, we are so interdependent on one another, by having a significant impact on one side will eventually have an impact on the other side. It is kind of an economic butterfly effect, not in the extreme like the proposition in chaos theory, but it will create a lot of chaos in our economy.

Another benefit I will share, I have a very good friend who is head of the Manufacturers Association, a committed, small business community executive, named Rick Jordan, who is chairman of the board of our Gateway Technical Community College which focuses on advanced manufacturing and information technology education to train our next generation workforce.

He is also the president of LSI Industries, which does extremely innovative engineering for lighting systems and retail display systems. One of the companies that has been driven by an increase in consumption in a very literal and physical sense is a big client of theirs, is Dairy Queen. Because people have had a little more discretionary income, they are able to meet their needs, and they want to take their family out for that treat, that hamburger, that ice cream. It just doesn't end there. When they hit the drive-through and they get that Blizzard for their kids, then it starts through the supply change and works its way back.

LSI, being one of our premier businesses in the Cincinnati-North Kentucky area, has their employees manufacturing all of the signage for all of the Dairy Queens in this competitive environment in the entire country. They won that contract because of the increased growth that has taken place when, over the last 4 years, when the full impact of this positive tax policy has been felt.

As we share other stories, I think those are two, one from manufacturing, from the leisure industry, from transportation, from the restaurant industry, which show this connectedness.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to mention his full name, but I had a conversation with a gentleman today who is a local businessman and employs about 120 people in one of my counties back in Pennsylvania. I am just going to call him Harold. I had a conversation with Harold on the phone today, and it was about the negative impact of these tax increases if we don't act on them.

As I was talking to Harold, he has been in business. Actually, his father started the business. Harold has been in it for 40 or 50 years. They started out with a couple of dump trucks and a bull dozer. Today they have a tremendous amount of equipment. They are an excavating business. They employ 120 people. But Harold's wife, Delores, just had a health scare, and so Harold has been looking at the business and what would happen if he were to pass away.

He said, you in Congress need to pass the death tax because if you don't, if I pass away, it is going to cost his children millions, up to several millions of dollars in taxes that they are going to have to pay in Federal and State tax, mainly Federal tax, to keep the business. He said, my children won't have access to that kind of cash, so they will have to liquidate the business if I were to die.

There are thousands of stories like that across America, that we need to make sure that we are extending the death tax and making sure that small-business owners like Harold and Delores, if they pass away, that their children will not have to liquidate a business because you have 120 families that they employ making a good living, living in rural Pennsylvania, that are potentially not going to have jobs if that were to happen.

Also, something that I think is important, as you mentioned, you were a small business owner, and I was a small business owner before I got here. Harold is the kind of guy in Pennsylvania, he is one of the pillars of the community. He is the guy that is always contributing to the community, giving back, whether he is on the hospital board or the economic development board. He is the guy making sure that he is contributing to the local Boy Scouts, to the Little League, making sure that the firemen have money, that he is supporting their efforts to raise money as they struggle to keep their ambulance and fire service going.

Those are the kinds of people, small-business owners, that have been in business for many, many years, that give back to their community, give back to their community and give back to their community.

□ 2015

Those are the kinds of people and those are the kinds of communities that are penalized with a tax like the death tax that would cause a business, one of the pillars of the community, to have to liquidate to raise the money to send it down here to Washington, to come into the Federal Treasury, and it would go out again probably 50 percent or 60 percent less of what came in. It would be less efficient than Harold being able, or Harold's family being able, to give back to the community and get the most impact out of a dollar.

Again, those are the kinds of people. I had a lunch with a gentleman in a similar business as Harold, gentleman by the name of Dave I will call him, who is the same type of person, started a business, told me about growing up on the farm in rural Pennsylvania, saying he did not have any money; he did not know any better. But he started out a with a flatbed truck hauling coal from the coal region of northeastern Pennsylvania back down to central Pennsylvania. That is how he got started, and today he has 200 employees, three different businesses, and is another gentleman who gives back to the community again and again and again.

That is what we are talking about. That is what makes America great, coming from a poor farmer to a prosperous business owner and a pillar of the community. Again, that is what makes America great. These are the kinds of people all across this country we have to make sure that we are not penalizing for being successful.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I think you have hit the nail right on the head there, and for those who just joined us, you are watching the Countdown Crew. You can contact us at countdowncrew@mail.house.gov. We come to the floor the first night of every vote to talk about the positive impacts of tax policies that let people keep more of what they earn, keep more of what they own by default, and ultimately create the jobs and create a future for folks here.

Most folks do not realize that with the vote that took place, changing the House's Congress in 2006, put us on the clock for a tax increase that will come. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the tax-writing committee in the House, has said that there is no tax cut that he sees that is worth keeping.

I think that shows a blindness to the dramatic economic impacts that have hit where we are at all-time manufacturing productivity and all-time low unemployment that is remarkable in these times, that we have created 7 million new jobs. What is going to happen in 1,398 days is a tax increase that will hit the average working family in this country with a $2,092 tax increase, and that will happen without any legislation being introduced.

The way the prior tax cuts were drawn, we would extend them every 2 years. That extension right now appears to not be happening. On behalf of the Countdown Crew, we would encourage you to write your Member of Congress to encourage your Member for the district that is represented by you watching at home to make sure that those are extended.

More than that, we would like to hear your stories, if you would send to us countdowncrew@mail.house.gov and tell us what you have done with that additional money. We have heard stories of folks who have been able to meet personal needs, start businesses and create jobs. The goal of a constructive government policy related to revenue is not to raise taxes, not to create taxes for their own sake, but to create taxpayers to have an empowering policy that lets people work, pursue their vision, and pursue opportunity in the long run.

Probably one of the most interesting stories that I can share I think has a little bit of humor in it. If we go to a shopping mall in the United States right now, you can look out and see there is always a group of kids somewhere in the mall, the Goth group, that is dressed in black, black shirts, black shoes, black pants, black hair, black garments that they will have on them.

There is a little secret that I will share with America's youth and the Goth movement tonight. The color black, the person who owned the patent on the color black comes from the Fourth District of Kentucky. A brilliant chemical energy engineer named Bill Stoeppel some years ago discovered that there was a real problem in manufacturing waste in paints and in dyes for clothing and paint for the automotive industry. He developed a unique solution dispersion to carry the graphite that would be that color black. He named his little company Solution Dispersions. He took the idea from the experience that he had. He ended up buying a company that at one point he worked for. He started another facility in this business and it grew. He had an exclusivity, made a very, very small profit on processing this graphite for the large coatings and coloring companies that support our manufacturing industry around the United States.

Right there, in Cynthiana, Kentucky, is the headquarters of the color black. The reason I bring that up is there is one person, one man, who has created hundreds of jobs in different parts of the country and also is fueling a supply chain at a reduced cost to be able to compete not only domestically but

internationally as well, with strong and high-quality products.

He did not just stop there and bury his money in the ground. The profits that he made he reinvested in his community. He was one of the people that you had alluded to earlier when you talked about Harold. Well, Bill was one of those pillars of the community that worked with the hospital and the school system, was somebody that was active in the Rotary Club, made sure that the hospital board had resources and assets, and he also invested back in the land, a personal love of his. He was ranching quality, very high quality grade, again creating more jobs and opportunity and participating in the consumption economy.

Many of those opportunities literally have the chance to go away on December 31, 2007. When we talk about tax policy, oftentimes there is a misnomer, this class warfare idea, that it is always the super-rich who get off or the rich who get off and do not pay their burden, that it is always unfairly pushed down on working families and on the poor.

The truth of the matter is with these tax cuts the ceiling was actually moved up. The burden was moved up. Millions were taken off the tax rolls. A new tax bracket was created for 10 percent which will disappear, a transitional tax bracket for those who were coming into the workforce, who are moving upward.

There is a $1,000 child tax credit that is coming. Just in my family alone, when that went from $500, and that was set a long time ago when $500 had a different value in the economy than it does now, to $1,000 that made a difference. Patty and I have six children. Right there that is a $3,000 tax increase to my family that will take place at the end of 2010.

The marriage penalty is going to be restored, and I think practically the one thing that we must do is make sure that we have policy that is friendly to families, that encourages jobs, and encourages and strengthens the family. By putting the marriage penalty back in place, it actually makes it more profitable to be single, and I think that flies in the face of our American values here.

You mentioned the estate tax earlier. It is a pernicious tax that confiscates money from families once that money has already been taxed. It is not the super, super-rich of the world, the Bill Gateses of the world, the multibillionaires of the world. They are not the ones that are going to have to worry about paying that. It is the small business owners who have capital-intensive businesses. It is going to be farmers, small manufacturers that have the most dramatic negative effect from that.

We had one took place in my county that is a perfect example of this, a farmer. When the patriarch died, they did not understand. They loved farming. They wanted to focus on that business. They did not understand the impact of an estate tax, having a farm in a growing county with appreciating real estate values. Because they had gotten some incomplete legal advice, they came to find out that they literally were going to have to sell half of a farm that had been in the family for five generations because they wanted to keep farming just to pay the tax bill. I think that flies in the face of American values. It flies in the face of creating opportunities.

Mr. SHUSTER. Absolutely. You talked earlier about the stories that we want to have sent to us, talking about real-life stories out there in America, how these tax cuts have helped them or what they are feeling in the economy or what they are feeling about their government. You can e-mail us at countdowncrew@mail.house.gov. That is countdowncrew@mail.house.gov.

I received an e-mail, and I wanted to read some of it to you. It is from Kent Berry, who is a small business owner from Gravel Ridge, Arkansas. I have never been to Gravel Ridge, Arkansas. It is about 15 miles north of Little Rock; and over the past months, Kent has been watching us.

Kent says he is swamped by Federal tax regulations which are driving him down. He goes on further to say: ''More and more I feel that the deck is stacked against me. I witness so much nonproduction being rewarded with money which I had to struggle to remit. I'm beginning to feel that the American Dream is an optical illusion. I'm starting to envision the American Dream a lot like the carrot and stick. I keep pressing but it ain't gettin' no closer.''

Kent continues: ''I'm no constant agitator or perpetual malcontent, but I do enjoy C–SPAN and I did hear your e-mail address several times, and I'm writing to say that I'm struggling here.

''Government, like a lot of things, is a good thing. But like all good things, moderation.''

And as Kent points out there, he is struggling out there because he has got a small business. He works hard to earn the money that he earns, and then he has to turn around and pay a tax bill that is bigger than he can probably handle. If we do not extend some of these tax cuts, the tax bill is going to be even greater for Kent.

I know his story and his feelings are like millions of Americans out there that want to make certain that if they are going to invest their capital, if they are going to invest their blood, sweat and tears into a small enterprise, that they have the ability to get a return, that they have a ability to save some money, that they have an ability to make sure that their family lives a little better life than they have.

This is the American Dream, as we have talked about a couple of these folks from your district and some from mine, that they start from meager beginnings and with hard work, with ingenuity, they grow a business and become significant parts of their communities, giving back to their communities. Those are the types of people that we want to make sure that they are not penalized, that they are not driven out of business because they have to have some big tax bill when they pass away, you know, whether it is taking that money and investing it into a mutual fund so they can get a nice dividend back and they are not overburdened with taxes, whether they take their company or their business or their property and sell it and do not have an oppressive capital gains tax.

As you mentioned, most Americans do not take the money and bury it in the backyard. They put it back into the economy. They invest it in a mutual fund. They invest it into another business or a property that builds something, but that money goes back into the economy to create jobs and to hopefully when they invest that money create a return for them so they can continue to live a good life.

Again, through my district, there are a number of people. I have mentioned the name before, a B.C. Stone, another one of those operations started out in a garage. I visited with those folks about a week or so ago. They started out in a garage and today with a couple of employees, and today they employ 70 people. Their business is prosperous. It is growing over the last 4 years, and Travis Collins, one of the owners, says it is directly because of the various tax cuts that we put in place. The economy is moving, booming, and so his business right along with it.

As I mentioned before, he has taken on an old hotel in my hometown of Everett, Pennsylvania, an over 110-year-old hotel, and he is restoring it and turning it into a 12-bedroom hotel with a first-rate restaurant in it. By doing this, he hopes he is going to make some money, but he really wants to give back to the community and this beautiful, small town that he grew up in and this hotel, quite frankly, was dilapidated. He is putting a fresh face on it, and he is going to try to attract people to come into the community, to spend money through tourism.

Again, these are the kinds of things that happen when you allow people to keep more of their own money. They invest it, they grow their business, they try to create jobs and make their communities better places to live and to work.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. One of the things that relates to that, too, is that money just does not end at the personal savings account or even at the grocery store, the auto shop or dealership, or the Dairy Queen for that matter, as we mentioned earlier.

There are others who are very, very dependent upon the benefits, the profits of these small businesses, the revenue from salaries, from jobs that are created, and that is all of our public servants.

I have a daughter who is now doing her student teaching practicum. She is

getting ready to go out and become a public school teacher in our district. Her salary ultimately is paid by the salaries of those who are employed, who own houses, who have jobs, who can contribute to the payroll tax in the community. Our policemen, our world-class law enforcement that we have, is funded. All the training that they receive is funded by taxpayer dollars that come from folks who are out in the economy, who are in jobs that are creating that value. They are creating that tax revenue that comes into the government, that pays for them. We have to make sure in order to keep them strong and to keep them well-funded we have to have a robust and strong economy.

□ 2030

The key to keeping those services world class, whether it is in education, whether it is public safety, whether it is even funding our military at a Federal level; a strong and robust economy is critical to that in the long run, because the entire supply chain, the entire chain of individuals is interconnected. We are in a society, in an economy, where everybody is connected, one to another, in some way. It is not just a circle of folks that we interact with, but it is those that we interact with. That chain moves on and on throughout the entire economy, rippling back and forth in a very positive way, in all, ultimately, being very beneficial.

I have two friends who are in the insurance business. Ironically, they are both not only good friends and strong supporters of mine, they are extremely active in the community. I think the only place that they are not working in concert together is with insurance offices. Bob Boswell and Bob Kelly of Florence, Kentucky, are literally across a mall road together.

But they get along well together, they work together on projects to benefit the community. They see it firsthand, introducing folks to financial planning. As they are trying to build a future, they are trying to look to the future for retirement savings. My friend, Dale Viniard, who is an insurance agent in Crestwood, Kentucky, was one of the very first people that Pat and I met when we moved to East Crestwood, Kentucky, at the opposite end of the district, experiences of people having a concern over their ability to provide for their family and the future, having that ability to make sure that they can have a job, make an income and ultimately have some type of retirement, build that nest egg.

When you touched on the impact of the capital gains tax earlier, I think it's a huge, huge issue, because the majority of Americans now don't have these defined pension plans like somebody might have gotten 50 years ago, working for the large automotive company. Because most people are coming out of the small business world that creates 88 percent of the new jobs in this country. Their retirement plans are going to be in some form of deferred compensation of 401(k). Some type of retirement savings are diversified, spread over different types of investments. In most cases, they will have some degree of control over that.

Just the change in these taxes could have a dramatic impact on senior citizens. They could literally see their tax burden double overnight when they seek to access their retirement funds just to live.

Again, once that money comes out of the economy, it is not creating jobs. That investment is there; not only is it benefitting them, but it is creating jobs for the future.

Mr. SHUSTER. Just in our closing minutes here, I want to reiterate, first of all, say we have been getting up here for the last several weeks talking about the coming tax increase, unless Congress and the Democratic majority acts, which will occur in 1,398 days, which will be January 1, 2011, and that occurs in 2008, some of the taxes, if they are not extended, will expire, 2009, 2010. Again, we want to hear from citizens around the country that have benefitted by these tax increases, tell us your story about your small business, how it has grown or how you started it.

You can get those stories to us at the countdowncrew@mail.house.gov. We want to hear those stories. Again, I want to close with just talking about what's going to happen with the dividend and the capital gains tax cuts if we don't act.

January of 2010, those rates will go back up. As I mentioned earlier, when folks think about those dividends, whether you have a mutual fund, you have an IRA, you have a 401(k), you have some pension fund out there. By and large, if not all of them, almost every one of them, is dependent on investments to put income in and pay out to the beneficiaries.

Prior to a 2003 tax cut, dividends were subject to an individual tax rate up to 38.6 percent and on top of a corporate tax rate of 35 percent. Those types of rates are coming back unless this Congress and unless this Democratic majority acts. In 2003, the top individual tax rate on dividends was cut by more than half, down to 15 percent; and starting next year, that dividend, no dividend tax on income, on lower-income Americans. That is substantial.

In addition to capital gains tax decreased with the top rates on long-term capital gains dropping from 20 and 10 percent down to 15 and 5 percent, and, again, the 5 percent rate will drop to zero next year for those in the bottom two tax brackets.

If the Democrats fail to extend this tax relief, again, in 2010, they are going to come back, and anybody out there in America that is retired, anybody out there, as I said, that has a 401(k), a mutual fund, they are going to be taxed at a higher rate on those dividends. So it is important that we act. That is, again, why we come to the floor once a week and remind the American people that this tax increase is coming.

You need to talk to your Member of Congress. I do not believe that anybody in the November elections voted to increase their taxes, and your Member of Congress needs to hear about it. We have to stop it because we want to see this economy continue to grow and to prosper.

Does the gentleman from Kentucky wish to close? The gentleman from Texas arrived, too.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Thank you. For those of you joining us at the end here, you are with the countdowncrew@mail.house.gov. Our motto is create taxpayers, not taxes. We want to allow you to keep more of what you earn, because when your dollars are in your pocket or in your community, it is creating America's jobs and advancing the economy.

One person who has joined us tonight is a former certified public accountant from the great State of Texas, and his name is Mike Conaway. We have worked together on numerous issues in the committees, and I think that he would like to share something for a couple of minutes here.

Mr. CONAWAY. Just to set the record straight, I am still a CPA. I am keeping my license current,

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. We were hoping you were a recovering CPA.

Mr. CONAWAY. Because, as you know, I am only one election away from being back in public practice. So maintaining my credentials that I have used for 30-plus years is important. Part of that work I did was with taxpayers, folks who actually make money and then pay taxes on that money.

There is nothing inherently moral or immoral about a tax rate. The number in itself is not magic. We have gotten ourselves into a real ugly box in comparing or contrasting or linking spending issues with particular tax rates. In my view, those are entirely two different issues all together.

We ought to determine what we ought to spend and what that appropriate amount is and then figure out how to collect the minimum amount of taxes needed to spend that. To the extent we try to link tax cuts on one type of a taxpayer to spending in other areas is a false argument. It is a straw man that is irrelevant in the grand scheme of things. I can assure you that the Federal Government's accounting system does not put cash from this particular tax rate into this bucket that is only spent on welfare; from this tax rate into one bucket, only goes in the Defense.

Cash is fungible. I think we should reformulate the debate away from this idea that there is some link between the specific tax rates and specific spending issues, because I believe that is just a false argument, and it leads us down a bad path. Let's focus on what we ought to be spending in a variety of

areas, whether it is defense or health care whatever it might be, let's figure out what the right amount is for that area. Then let's look for a system that allows us to collect that in a straightforward, easy to comply with, fair basis. I don't think our current Tax Code meets any of those criteria.

I have made a living for a long time helping people comply with the complexity of it. You know, a lot of my colleagues are in the same boat. But this current system is unworkable, and it leads us down the wrong path.

As you have mentioned, we are now under 1,400 days away from the largest tax increase America has ever seen with the expiration of the current tax rate and the current tax schemes as it relates to the death tax.

We don't know if those are the right ones or not, but they are the ones we have got. The ones we have had in place since 2001, I think, in no small part have contributed to the growth of this economy, have contributed to taxpayers being able to have more of their own money, to put that investment back into their families, businesses and other things. The current tax rates are working, and to the extent that they expire and have automatic increases is unfortunate.

I understand we are about out of time. I appreciate getting to join you late in the hour.

Mr. SHUSTER. We certainly appreciate you coming here over the past several weeks. It is always good to have a CPA on the floor to be able to correct us when we spout off a number that is not quite accurate. You have been able to do that a number of times with us. We appreciate it.

I just want to point out again to people that may be watching tonight, such as a CPA, a small business owner. I was a small business owner. We all have children. Your children, I know, are grown now.

Mr. CONAWAY. Grandchildren.

Mr. SHUSTER. But it is important in America that small business owners and families are not burdened with these heavy taxes. We have to keep them low.

I think the gentleman from Kentucky might have a final passing word.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I want to thank everybody for joining us. For those of you who are regulars and are corresponding with us, we appreciate your joining us and contacting us at countdowncrew@mail.house.gov.

We believe that the key is not raising taxes; it is creating taxpayers to project economic growth and opportunity for the future. Our backbone is of small business owners that have created the jobs, created the vision, have created the innovation that have help make this country great. We want to continue standing by you and the working families of America.

With that, Mr. Speaker, we yield back the balance of our time.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARCURI). The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

## THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days with which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject matter of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHAUD. At this time, I know the gentleman from Wisconsin has another meeting he has to attend, so I would recognize the Congressman STEVE KAGEN from Wisconsin.

Mr. KAGEN. Thank you very much, Congressman MICHAUD. I certainly appreciate being with you this evening, especially after an enlightening hour of finding out that really they weren't borrowing and spending money.

But, indeed, this is the class of 2006. We were elected to take a positive change in a new direction. We are not the party of borrow and spend and borrow and spend. Because as you all know, the first two letters of borrow and spend are B and S. We are here this evening to talk with you about our trade policies. Indeed, our foreign trade with China has become entirely a negative number.

In this brief slide, the 2006 trade deficit will show you that the United States is losing. We have lost $233 billion a year in 2006. In the first 2001 numbers, $83 billion deficit has mushroomed to $233 billion.

In 2006, China ranked as the fourth largest export market for the United States and the second largest import market. They are our trading partner. We have had the American century, and now we are moving into what will become the Chinese century. But we should be ordered in the rule of law, and unfortunately for us here in the United States, we suffer because they are not following all of the laws.

In a recent article in The New York Times, it reads in part that the Chinese's real advantage results from subsidies. They include government grants for modernization, low-cost loans, debt forgiveness, tax breaks for export or businesses and subsidies for suppliers of wood and pulp, something we are keenly aware of in Wisconsin, in my district, which used to be known as Paper Valley.

According to government data available from the Chinese government themselves, more than 70,000 illegal seizures occurred of private property, of land in 2004. In 2003, the Chinese admit that 168,000 occurrences of seizures took place.

□ 2045

Well, this is what happens in a Communist country, and it is to their advantage.

The subsidies: According to our own U.S. Trade Representative, ''The Chinese subsidies at issue are widely available and offer significant benefits, particularly through income and value added tax breaks. They make it harder for U.S. products to compete with Chinese products, not only in the U.S. and Chinese markets but in any market in the world. They accomplish this by providing a competitive advantage to a wide range of Chinese exports, including, for example, various steel products, wood products, such as hardwood, plywood and paper products, and by providing incentives for Chinese firms to purchase domestic products instead of those from the United States.''

United States' manufacturers and exporters are suffering because there is another trade partner of ours that is not following the rules. Indeed, 15 to 20 percent of all products made in China are counterfeit materials. They need to follow the rules.

On this slide is a measure of their unfair trade. There are three things primarily that China is not complying with: currency manipulation, their yuan is below where market prices would bear the price; illegal subsidies; and illegal grants, grants given to companies that have no intention of paying them back. And what can we do about this? We really need balance in our trade deals. We don't need free trade; we need fair trade.

How do we fix an unfair trade deal? We need new leadership in the administration. We need a President and an administration that is interested in fair trade. And what must we do? We must establish fair trade and export our values, not our jobs. After all, if we don't make anything in America, we simply won't have anything.

Mr. MICHAUD. Thank you very much, Congressman KAGEN. This has definitely been enlightening. I really appreciate all the charts that you have. And you are absolutely right, the American people want the new direction for this country and are very pleased particularly with the freshman class, yourself leading the charge to make sure that we do have fair trade agreements. I want to thank you for your time coming to the floor this evening to talk about this very important issue.

I would now like to recognize another freshman Member of the 110th Congress class, the gentleman from Illinois who has taken a real leadership role as well on trade, but also on veterans affairs issues where he replaced a former colleague in this body, Lane Evans, who has been a mentor and has been a leader also on veterans' issues. I would like

to yield to Congressman HARE of Illinois.

Mr. HARE. Thank you, Mr. MICHAUD. And I want to thank you for your leadership on this whole issue of trade. I was here last week, as you know, and we were talking about the Employee Free Choice Act. And I spoke then as a former labor organizer about the difficulties working men and women have in being able to join the union. Tonight I am here, and I want to tell a brief story, if I could, about what I think this whole trade situation boils down to.

In my district, we have a city called Galesburg, Illinois. It was the home of Maytag, manufacturing washers, driers and refrigerators; 1,600 very talented men and women worked in that factory. On two different occasions, the workers of that plant gave pay concessions back to keep that plant open. The State of Illinois, my home State, gave Maytag $24 million in State taxes for renovations to keep the factory there. The plant, about 8 months later, announced that it was moving to Sonora, Mexico.

The CEO said it was because of several things, but the bottom line was they could make more money manufacturing in Sonora, Mexico, for cheap labor. And 1,600 of those people are out of work, and 1,000 more recently followed a few weeks later in Herron, Illinois, from another Maytag facility. And the CEO of that corporation said, ''You just have to understand, Congressman, I am in the business to make money for my shareholders. I don't really care about the people of this city and the educational system and what happens to them, and the small businesses that feed into Maytag. I am here to make money.''

Well, I am here tonight to say a couple of things on this whole issue of trade. First, let me say, I said this on the campaign trail, Congressman. I am a card-carrying capitalist; I believe in trade. We have to have trade. I am not a protectionist, an isolationist. But I do know this. As my colleague, Representative KAGEN, said, we have to have some fair trade.

Under this NAFTA agreement, it was tough enough to lose those jobs, but we negotiated that; we, meaning our trade folks, negotiated a 5-year head start for those Maytag jobs in Mexico, gave the Mexican government a 5-year head start on refrigerator products. Now, how are you going to compete?

I went to an editorial board, and I remember saying to the publisher of the newspaper, if your competitor across the river had a 5-year head start on subscriptions and advertising and being able to get the news out each and every day, and you could not publish for 5 years, do you think you would be at a distinct disadvantage? He said, ''Absolutely.''

So here is what I think we need to do, in plain and simple language from a former clothing worker: I think we have to stop this exportation of manufacturing jobs across this country. And we have to be not just angry about it; we have to say: I am more than angry. I am now going to do something that we haven't done before. I am going to raise my voice and I am going to tell my elected Members of the Congress of the United States that if you vote to send our jobs overseas, we are going to vote to send you back to your district permanently, because in this business, we are supposed to be here to represent people.

The job of a Member of the United States Congress, to me, is standing up for ordinary people, and I am tired of seeing our jobs shipped overseas. And, more importantly, the American people hopefully watching and listening tonight are tired of their tax dollars being spent to subsidize those jobs being sent to Sonora, Mexico, where, by the way, the people down there have no trade unions, don't have enough money to even purchase the products that they are making. And I believe that all of us, whether you are a Republican or Democrat or Independent, have seen the hemorrhaging.

In textile, in my industry, thousands of jobs are gone, not because people couldn't do it, but because they can't compete against 18 cents an hour. It is impossible. Not simply because these people were getting benefits and other things that they desperately needed so they can do like I did and buy a home and put their kids through school and go to college and do the right thing; these are veterans of our country who have fought and defended it. They come back and had a job that was taken away from them, not because of anything they did wrong.

So here is what I propose: How about a little corporate responsibility? But how about, let's tell our trade negotiators that we want trade, but let's make it fair and free? Let us don't negotiate our manufacturing jobs overseas. And, by the way, let me just say, I have a lot of agriculture in my district, and farmers are the last group brought to bear on the trade negotiations. They are never brought to the table. I think we have to have, as Representative KAGEN said, an administration and a Congress that says to the trade negotiators, look, we want trade; we want to be able to negotiate a decent standard of trade for our folks. But we will not do it by simply abdicating our manufacturing base, whether it is in steel or textile or automobiles, whatever it is, because there are hundreds of thousands of people in this country, and not every one of them is going to sit behind a computer terminal the rest of their life and work. They want to be welders. They want to produce steel. They want to produce automobiles. They want to cut men's suits like I am wearing tonight that, by the way, was made in Chicago, Illinois, by working men and women.

So I would just encourage everybody this evening as we have this debate on trade that, from my perspective, I ran on this issue, and I am going to be a Congressman on this issue. I am not going to vote for a trade deal that is going to send one more job overseas. I am not going to vote for a trade deal that abdicates the responsibility, and to go back to my district and as some people say, well, you know, we are in a global economy. It is high tech. Well, I understand I am in a global economy. I wasn't born yesterday. But I also know, to those men and women from Maytag that don't know what they are going to do for their health care now that it is gone, for health care, their pensions that are on the line that they are losing, those people from KSIH that lost their jobs simply because they happen to be a union plan and maybe made a bit too much money; I say to those folks that, today, this Congress needs to stand up for working men and women. It needs to say we want trade in this country. We will work very hard to make sure that we have the ability to export our products, but at the same time, the one product that we are no longer going to export in this country is the men and women and their futures and their children, because there is no place for that in fair and free trade.

With that, I just want to thank the gentleman for allowing me to speak this evening for a few moments on this issue. I believe very deeply in this. The great news about being a freshman is sometimes we don't come with the best prepared speeches. I think we speak a lot from the heart. But I can tell you this much, from a former clothing perspective, in our union, there is a movie called, ''The Inheritance,'' that talks about how the union was formed. And at the very end of it, a little old man looks into the end, and I would say to our friends on the other side of the aisle who don't want to work with us on this straight policy, he says, ''You think this is the end? My friend, this is only the beginning.''

This 1-hour tonight is the beginning of changing trade policy in this country and in this Chamber. And I am honored to be part of it.

Mr. MICHAUD. I thank you, Representative HARE, for your leadership role in this as well.

If I understand your comments correctly, you are not against trade deals, but you want to make sure that they are fair trade deals. And I really appreciate your perspective. But especially just coming off of a campaign, being a freshman Member working up in your State of Illinois, you know what is going on.

I think, all too often, once people get here in Washington, D.C., they tend to forget what is really happening in reality. And reality is, we have lost over 3 million jobs nationwide because of our unfair trade deals, and we have got to bring equity back in that. So I really appreciate your leadership in that role and look forward to working with you as we move forward to make sure that we do have fair trade deals here in this Congress.

It is now my great pleasure to introduce another freshman Member who has also taken a leadership role, from Iowa, Congressman BRUCE BRALEY.

Mr. BRALEY. I would like to thank my friend from Maine, and also my friend from Illinois who happened to bring up the issue with the Maytag jobs. And I think this leads us to another topic that is not discussed very often in terms of some of the hidden costs of our current trade policy.

The former world headquarters for Maytag was located in Newton, Iowa. And I grew up about 30 minutes from Newton, Iowa. I got my first driver's license at the Jasper County Courthouse in Newton, Iowa. Over 150 years ago, my great, great grandfather, George Washington Braley, walked from up in your neck of the woods from Vermont all the way to Iowa and settled in Jasper County. And Maytag has been a foundation of the economy in Jasper County for many, many years, and Mr. HARE talked about the plant in Illinois, the Maytag plant that lost many of its jobs to Mexico.

What happened about 10 years ago was, in an effort to develop competition between competing Maytag factories for the Neptune washers, it was decided that there were going to be incentives offered by the State of Iowa and the State of Illinois in the competition to keep those jobs in America. And so the legislature in Illinois and the legislature in Iowa both went to work to pass special tax statuses for expensing of manufacturing equipment to make it more attractive for those companies in Iowa and Illinois to be able to compete for these new Neptune washers.

Unfortunately, as we have seen, that competition was short-term only. And the Maytag headquarters no longer exists in Newton, Iowa. The Maytag jobs in Illinois have now left for Mexico. And we are seeing the impact that this trade policy that we have pursued for the past decade is having on American workers.

And, like my friend from Illinois, nobody I talk to, my friends in labor, my friends in small businesses and manufacturing, thinks that trade is a bad thing. We need to encourage trade, because that is what creates job opportunities for American workers. What we are talking about is making sure that our trade policies are fair and balanced. And one of the unique things that I have seen since I came here is that we seem to see more and more small- and medium-sized manufacturers and labor coming together and talking about a need for a comprehensive reform of our trade policies.

One of the things we know is that the Constitution gave this body, Congress, an important role to play in international trade, and one of the problems with the fast-track trade promotion authority that previous Congresses gave to the chief executive was that, in a sense, it involved an abdication of our responsibilities to be an active partner in setting trade policies. And what that means is that we have also abdicated some of our responsibilities to the workers of this country, to the workers of international countries where trade laws and workers rights are not held to the same high standards they are in the United States. We have penalized American manufacturers because of environmental regulations they are required to comply with in this country that are not imposed upon foreign manufacturers. And we have seen the exploitation of workers and human rights in other countries that allow goods to be produced at slave labor conditions and severely undercut the market for those goods on the international economy.

□ 2100

So I am here tonight with my friends to talk about why it is important that, when we go forward from this point, looking at the trade policies, not just for the current administration, but for future administrations, no matter which party happens to occupy the White House, it is important for us to look back on the historical role that Congress has played in making sure that our trade policies reflect the same basic values that made this country great in the first place. And so that is why I am here to talk about how we, as a body, have to step up to the plate and share our fair share of this responsibility moving forward.

And to my friend from Maine, where I know these policies have had a dramatic impact in a lot of different manufacturing and foreign good sectors, I would like to yield back and ask about some of the difficulties that his constituents have encountered in this same area.

Mr. MICHAUD. Well, I thank the gentleman for his discussion on this issue. You brought up a very good point. You had mentioned fast track. And I think what a lot of people don't realize is the fact that fast track only allows Congress two options, to vote ''yes'' or ''no.'' We have no options to amend this trade deal. We just have to vote ''yes'' or ''no.'' And we are abdicating our responsibilities by allowing fast track to occur, which hopefully, with a new Congress and a new direction, when we look at trade deals, we will be able to change fast track so that we can have an opportunity to make sure that we do have fair trade deals.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MICHAUD. I yield.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Were you serving in this body when fast track was authorized?

Mr. MICHAUD. No, I was not. I was serving in the Maine legislature, and I was opposed to it then. I am opposed to it now, especially when you see what damage fast track has caused to this Nation, what it has caused to our manufacturing. Maine alone, over the last 6 years or so, we lost 23 percent of our manufacturing base alone in the State of Maine. Certain labor market areas had unemployment rates over 30 percent. It has really devastated the State of Maine because of these unfair trade deals, and it is all related to the unfair trade deals.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. We know from history that timber has always played an important role in the economy of your State. How has the timber industry been affected because of what is happening in the global marketplace for timber and lumber sources from other areas that don't have to comply with the same types of restrictions we talked about earlier?

Mr. MICHAUD. As far as industries in the State of Maine, timber, the paper industry have definitely been devastated the most when you look at trade deals. We just actually had a few weeks ago Moosehead Manufacturing which closed its doors because of the imports from China. So it has had a negative impact primarily in the paper and in the timber industries.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. One the things that we often don't talk about when we talk about the loss of jobs overseas is the direct impact it has on the communities where those jobs depart from. And one of the things that we know, in talking about the sad story of Maytag in Iowa, is that at the time Maytag still functioned with its corporate headquarters in Newton, Iowa. They contributed almost $1 million a year just in property taxes alone to the city of Newton and Jasper County. That is just one small component of the many intangibles that we don't talk about with these trade policies and how they impact the communities that we represent over the long term.

One of the other things we know is that a lot of people who work in those good-paying jobs take on leadership roles in their communities as volunteers, as coaches, as mentors; and when they have to leave because they don't have a place to work anymore, all of that intangible benefit that contributes to the quality of life in a community leaves with them. So I think that sometimes we focus too much on the pure economic costs of these jobs that go overseas, and not enough on the real human costs that goes along with them.

Mr. MICHAUD. You are absolutely right. As a matter of fact, when you look at what is happening, a lot of municipalities, their primary business has been hit because of unfair trade deals. It has that rippling effect to other businesses within the community, but also the family structure. When you look at the fact that when Mills filed bankruptcy, and I have seen it in my own town, the divorce rate actually goes up. The alcoholism goes up, and you are losing that structure, and that is why we have to make sure that we do have fair trade deals.

As we heard earlier today from Congressman HARE, he is not against trade deals. He just wants to make sure that they are fair trade deals. And that is

what we have to do as a Congress is to make sure that we do have fair trade deals.

I am very pleased to see that a lot of Members, new Members of Congress who have just come off the campaign trail, when they were campaigning, they were talking to their constituents, and they heard a lot about loss of manufacturing here in this country because of the trade deals. So I am very pleased to see that we have such a large group of freshmen Members on the floor this evening to talk about trade deals and what they are doing to this country, or what they are doing to their individual districts.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I think a good example of that was one of the first things I did after becoming a Member of Congress was look at caucuses I could join that were going to be beneficial to the constituents that I represent in my district. One of the caucuses I joined was the Steel Caucus because there is a steel plant that has a direct economic benefit to employees in my district.

And one of the things I was struck by at the meeting that I went to, a breakfast meeting of the Steel Caucus, was it was bipartisan. There were representatives of the steel industry, of labor, and everybody was there to talk about the same problem, and that was cheap steel from China flooding the U.S. and international markets.

And one of the things that came up during those discussions, again in a bipartisan sense, was the myth of the so-called level playing field, which is that U.S. manufacturers who play by the rules, provide good, high-paying jobs with decent benefits, comply with environmental regulations, treat their workers fairly, are not on a level playing field when it comes to competing with Chinese competition and other parts of the world economy because other countries do not play by the same rules.

So I think one of the things that we need to be talking about here is how we can work in a bipartisan spirit to develop those coalitions that have a direct benefit for American workers, American manufacturers, American employers and consumers of these products, because we all are literally in this together.

Mr. MICHAUD. You are absolutely right. And actually speaking about in it together, we have been joined by another freshman Member from Pennsylvania, freshmen Member JASON ALTMIRE, who has also taken an interest and a leading role in the whole trade deal. I would like to yield to Mr. ALTMIRE for his comments.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I would like to thank the gentleman from Maine for his leadership on this issue. This is a critical issue.

And you mentioned a lot of us are freshmen, like the gentleman from Iowa, who are just coming off the campaign trail from a few months back. And I come from a district in western Pennsylvania, just north of Pittsburgh, and I have six counties going along, three of them go along the Ohio line, and the other ones go just north of Pittsburgh. And I would think you would be hard pressed to find a district in this country that has seen more damage done by the global marketplace than Pittsburgh over the past 30 or 40 years, and more recently over the past dozen or 15 years since NAFTA was passed in 1993.

And just for some historical perspective for what I am going to talk about, and I know you have mentioned it already, the country as a whole lost three million manufacturing jobs since NAFTA was agreed to in 1993. And that is one out of every six manufacturing jobs that existed in this country at that time. I don't think we can draw any other conclusion but that that was not beneficial to this country and had the effect of job loss. I mean, it is self-evident.

Now, manufacturing jobs are disappearing in Pennsylvania as well. We can trace about 100,000 jobs lost in Pennsylvania as a direct result of NAFTA. And of course when you get into indirect result, that number is much higher.

Now, there has been a loss of 210,000 manufacturing jobs total, 24 percent decrease in the State of Pennsylvania over just the past 6 years. That is total. That is not just NAFTA. That is all these trade agreements. So we have lost a quarter of our manufacturing jobs in just the past 6 years.

Now, in my district just last week, this has unfortunate significance that just last week we lost 85 workers from Wheatland Tube, a large manufacturing plant in my district; 85 workers were released on February 26. And this is just the latest in a series of downsizing that has taken place there.

And I would put in a mention of Congressman TIM RYAN from Youngstown, who is very involved in this issue as well. And he came over to Wheatland Tube with me during the campaign, and we met with some of the workers and the leadership there at that time, and they expressed their concerns about China and their inability to compete in a fair way with what is happening in China. And here we see only a few months later that 85 workers have now lost their jobs as a result of what is happening.

And I would mention this quote from the vice president from Wheatland Tube last week. He said, ''We are not seeing relief from Chinese imports, and we are not going to sit around and wait for that relief. We need to right-size the company.'' And this is just one example.

Again, I have six counties in western Pennsylvania, and we are seeing this certainly all over the district and all over western Pennsylvania. But right there at Wheatland Tube, unfortunately, it hit home just last week.

Now, the onslaught of foreign subsidized goods that are illegally dumped in the U.S. is just one of the many problems that we are seeing that has not been addressed by this administration. And certainly these trade agreements are doing nothing about this. And the administration that has put forward CAFTA and some of the other more recent trade agreements continues down the same path.

And I can tell you that, with the possible exception of health care, there was no issue over the 18 months I spent on the campaign trail that came up more often and was of greater concern than these trade agreements in western Pennsylvania. So the American people have spoken on this issue. I can tell you, for sure, they spoke in my district, and I know they spoke in Mr. BRALEY's district. And we are going to hear from Congresswoman SUTTON later and Mr. ELLISON as well.

I think this is an issue whose time has come. It cannot be ignored any longer. These trade agreements have been detrimental to America. And none of us are saying we should bury our heads in the sand and ignore the global marketplace. What we are saying, as Mr. HARE eloquently put it earlier, is that we need to have trade agreements that represent fair trade. And fair trade means having the trading partner make some effort, at least an effort, to come into compliance with environmental laws, with workers' rights, certainly child labor laws. These are things that have been completely left out of these trade agreements. So we find ourselves just giving away the store and shipping those jobs overseas, as Dr. KAGEN's chart so eloquently illustrated.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALTMIRE. I would.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania has a fondness for college football so I am going to root this question in that. One of the great football players at Iowa State University when I attended there in the mid-to-late 70s was a gentleman named Tom Perticone from Clareton, Pennsylvania. And while Tom was playing football at Iowa State, the movie ''Deer Hunter'' was very popular, which was filmed in and around Pittsburgh general area, and also near Clareton. And one of the things that film depicted so well was the whole culture of the community where a life's history has been devoted to a particular industry and how everything revolves around it. And we have seen that in my home community of Waterloo, Iowa, near the old Rath Packing Company, where a virtual community of businesses and services formed around the factory, and everyone's lives were tied up in that.

And I was hoping that you might be able to shed some light on the very real, personal toll on the culture of those communities in your district that have seen this dramatic shift, and how employment is available to the people who graduate from high school and don't have the same opportunities they did 15 years ago.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Well, in a word, it has been devastating, and we have seen the results. I talked about Wheatland Tube. I grew up about 100 miles from that plant, in a river town that was across from a big Allegheny Ludlam plant, which is where all the families worked. If you lived in that town, that is where you worked. And, unfortunately, things have not gone so well over the past couple of decades, both at that plant and another Allegheny Ludlam plant that I have in my district, and much of it has to do with these foreign trade issues. And as a result, now, when you travel through these communities, they used to be so vibrant and had a downtown that you could go through and it was hustle and bustle and there was activity. A lot of them now are ghost towns because we have seen the impact and the job loss that has resulted from the downfall of the steel industry 20 and 30 years ago, but more recently, the other heavy manufacturing that has been shipped overseas.

□ 2115

So it has been devastating to these communities, and you would only need to take one drive through much of my district to see the impact, because you can see the remnants of some of those plants. In many cases, they have been razed, and it is a brownfield site. But you can see the difference, and you can imagine what it used to be like 30 and 40 years ago and, in many cases, more recently.

I was just going to wrap up my portion by talking about what is coming next before us. And, again, none of us oppose the idea of trade. Fair trade is beneficial to both parties by definition. That is what we are talking about. But as the administration puts forward the Peruvian Trade Agreement, Colombia, Panama, and certainly fast track renewal, which the gentleman from Maine was talking about, we need to consider the fact that Congress, Representatives of the people, need to play an active role in these trade agreements. And, unfortunately, that has not been the case, which is why we have ended up with such one-sided agreement. So, as we consider those issues with Peru and Colombia and Panama and Presidential fast-track authority, I for one am going to support the working Americans of this country for fair trade practices.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I really appreciate your willingness to come to the floor this evening. I know you care deeply about this issue, where it has affected your district dramatically, and your willingness to speak up for the working men and women and businesses here in this country to make sure that they have a fair shake at these trade deals. So thank you for your leadership. I look forward to working with you as we move forward to deal with these issues.

Now I would like to recognize a gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), who is also a member of the freshmen class, but he brings a uniqueness from the State of Minnesota as far as the effect that these unfair trade deals have had on the State of Minnesota and the businesses and the working people within Minnesota.

I yield to the Representative from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the Member from Maine for his excellent leadership, looking out for the hard-working people of this whole United States.

It is true, I am honored to come from the Fifth Congressional District of Minnesota, but as I stand before you tonight, Mr. Speaker, I am honored to associate myself with the Member from Maine, with the Member from Ohio and Pennsylvania, because working people all over America need a fair trade and balanced trade situation. We can no longer abide doing trade deals which essentially support environmental policies that degrade other nations, that degrade workers in other nations, and that degrade human rights in other nations, and then thereby give other nations a competitive advantage over us because of the exploitation and ignoring important environmental regulations. And it is all very important because we need leadership tonight, Mr. Speaker, leadership which is willing to stand up and be counted for the American people, leadership which will not go with the wind but will actually change the wind. That is the leadership we need at this time.

Let me say that we need a trade policy that does three things, basically: respects workers' rights and their dignity; protects our fragile environment; and upholds basic human rights. Today's trade policies in America do only a few of those things but very little of what we need.

What we see is a continual erosion at the very heart of America: the middle class. It started first with the elimination of our manufacturing jobs. And I now represent Minnesota, the Fifth District of Minnesota, but I started life out in Detroit, where I saw plants closing on a daily, weekly basis, and I saw jobs outsourced on a weekly basis. But now what we see is a situation in Minnesota where that has taken hold and we see jobs leaving left, right and center, and it has got to stop.

The global economy has evolved to a large extent and is reminiscent today of the Robber Baron era, where huge transnational companies scour the planet for the cheapest, most exploitable labor and the most lax environmental standards. We have the opportunity to change that in Congress, and we must change it.

But what kind of global economy do we want? The answer to that question must be determined and will be determined to a large extent by the rules incorporated in free trade agreements that define so much of the global economy. By what we decide in this Chamber, we will determine the shape of the global economy.

If we want sweatshops in the global economy and the continued erosion of our middle class, we could continue negotiating and passing trade deals with no protection for workers or the environment. Trade deals that threaten the prevailing wage laws. Trade deals that could force us to privatize public services.

But if we truly believe in a global economy that lifts the living standards at home and around the globe, one that seriously values the environment on which all life depends, then what we must do is we must do better. If we want a better global economy that lifts standards everywhere, we need to change our approach to trade agreements as we enter into this fast-track arena coming up.

First, we need to put an end to the fast-track trade negotiating procedure which previous Congresses have ceded to the Executive branch. The Founding Fathers wisely delegated that role exclusively to the branch of government closest to the people: the Congress. And we have the perfect opportunity to take back our constitutional responsibility by allowing fast-track promotion authority to expire in June. We can and will put forward a different, more humane method of negotiating international trade agreements, but it is time for fast track to die a rightful death.

Secondly, we must stop passing more trade deals designed to spread the sweatshop model of the global economy. It has become clear that NAFTA, after 13 years of real-life experience, has not worked. It has cost us a million manufacturing jobs, left Mexican workers without rights and still working for wages far below the Mexican poverty level. It has displaced more than 1.5 million Mexican farm families, leaving many with no alternative but to migrate north for a better life.

The same applies to CAFTA and the pending Peru and Colombia ''free'' trade agreements. Colombia is distinguished by being a country where trade unionists are assassinated more than in any other nation in the world.

Instead, we can construct a new global economy built on generosity and inclusivity; one that raises living standards and supports the vast and growing global middle class. But we can only do it by casting off the failed policies of recent decades and by building the middle class.

The choice is ours. The choice is clear. It is time to reclaim Congress's free trade authority and our country's, and the world's future.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

And we will work closely with you as we move forward to make sure that what trade deals we do pass in this Congress are fair trade deals. I want to thank you very much for your leadership and interest in this area.

Mr. ELLISON. Fair trade.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I now would like to yield to an individual

who is also a member of the freshmen class but an individual who definitely has done a yeoperson's job in dealing with this trade issue. She knows the trade issues inside out. She has been a leader. She has organized the freshmen class to send a letter to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL, because of the concerns about trade.

And, Ms. SUTTON, I want to really thank you from the bottom of my heart for what you bring to this whole debate as we debate the trade deals, and I look forward to working with you over this Congress to move forward to make sure we have fair trade deals.

So, Mr. Speaker, I now yield to Ms. SUTTON.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for those kind remarks and for yielding.

I thank you also not just for your leadership on behalf of the Members here, but I thank you for your leadership on this issue for the people that I represent, the good and fine folks of Northeast Ohio, from Lorraine to Akron to Barberton. This is so meaningful and so important, what we are doing here tonight and what we need to do, this Congress, to ensure that they have a better chance in this world.

It is crystal clear, not just from the discussion tonight but from what we see when we go home to our districts and we look across America, that our trade policies are not benefiting America's workers and America's businesses as they should. And there is a lot of angst and anger out there. People are really concerned.

The trade policies don't work for the average folks, but they also don't work, and I have to emphasize this, for American businesses as they should.

Working families in my congressional district in the State of Ohio and our Nation continue to face mounting job losses and a tumultuous economy. We have heard the numbers before, but they bear repeating.

Since 2000, we have lost 3 million manufacturing jobs nationally. And, unfortunately, 200,000 of those jobs have been from my home State of Ohio.

Now, it is clear that Congress needs to act. When things aren't working, we should change direction. And that is why I am so proud of these new Members whom we have had the opportunity to hear from today and the leadership that they are exhibiting to take this Congress and this country into a direction that will work for the American people. We can't stand idly by and watch our jobs go overseas and our families suffer at home and our trade deficits soar.

I want to point out that I, like so many of the others who have spoken before, feel it is very important to say I am not opposed to trade. You know, sometimes when we start having discussions like this, people try to pit you into one category or another. They like to say you are either for trade or you are a protectionist.

Well, this is not a question about protectionism versus trade. This is a question about the rules of trade, and this is a question about what rules we think should be in a new trade model that will allow for trade to be engaged in fully and fairly by this country but require that others play by the same rules.

Trade can benefit American businesses and workers, and it can be a tool to help developing countries that are looking to access our markets. I hold out hope, and I hope it bears out, that I will have the opportunity in this Congress to vote for a trade agreement that lifts up our working families at home and abroad; a trade agreement that protects our environment at home and abroad; and a trade agreement that has strong and enforceable provisions, ensuring that all partners are playing by the same rules.

Now, we have heard some discussion about fast track already this evening. And my colleague Representative BRALEY and Congressman MICHAUD, you have identified this as such a critical issue coming up very quickly, set to expire in June. And I can tell you that, on behalf of those I represent in Northeast Ohio, I, for one, will not be supporting its renewal.

Fast track has been a raw deal for many American workers and businesses. Fast track takes away the accountability and oversight that Congress has been given under the Constitution to deal with trade. And, frankly, it has left us in a position with misguided and downright shameful trade policies that we have today.

If we had not had fast track, Congress could have been in a place to play a significant role in shaping the trade agreements while it still might have made a difference. The problem with fast track is, by the time it gets here, all we get to do is say whether we are going to vote ''yes'' or ''no'' for what is a bad trade deal.

We need to move in a new direction on trade. It is a moral imperative, and our fight begins with ending fast track. But there are other concerns that we have talked about on the trade horizon, such as the deals with Peru and Colombia and Panama. And these agreements, they have been modeled after the same flawed model that NAFTA gave us. And NAFTA was responsible for 50,000 jobs losses in Ohio. It is no longer hypothetical. We don't have to wonder what is going to happen with NAFTA. NAFTA has been a disaster for the people I represent and for this country.

So while we continue to get these harmful trade agreements forced down our throats, we have failed to address many of the trade problems we face with China and Japan and Korea and others. And while our trade deficits soar to the tune of a record $800 billion, which I have to tell you is not a record we should be happy with, with these nations, our wages in our Nation stagnate and hundreds of thousands of jobs have been displaced.

What is it about these failed trade policies that those who continue to push them don't understand? This is not acceptable, and we cannot allow this race to the bottom to continue.

□ 2130

I thank the gentleman very much for his leadership. I thank you on behalf of those I represent. I will continue to work with you as much as I possibly can to develop a new trade model, one that will work for American workers and businesses.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady. You are absolutely right, it is these flawed models that continue to come up after the NAFTA model and all these other trade deals. Until you change that flawed model, we are still going to get these bad trade deals continuing.

You mentioned the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. I don't think there is any fix for this agreement. I think it is highly offensive that the Bush administration would even negotiate with a country that is infamous for the highest rate of trade unionist assassinations. More than 2,000 labor union activists have been murdered in Colombia since 1990; 60 assassinated in 2006 alone. I think that is just unconscionable.

I agree with Congressman Sandy Levin when he says that we have to look at these flawed models that are out there. These side agreements that people are talking about, they are not going to work. They don't have the force of law.

I think we definitely have a long ways to go before we have trade deals that I can support. And with the freshman class we currently have under your great, fantastic leadership, I applaud them, and encourage that each and every one of you continue to speak out on this issue, because it is an issue that is important to the American people, it is an issue that is important to our businesses, workers in this country, but it is also an issue that is very important when you look at our security and immigration.

When we heard the NAFTA discussion, when they passed NAFTA, we were encouraged; I was not here, but Members were encouraged to vote for it because it would help with the illegal immigration problem with Mexico. The problem has not been solved. It has gotten worse because the NAFTA agreement has not worked the way it was supposed to work.

So I look forward to working with you and the rest of the freshman class, along with other colleagues who are interested in this trade deal.

Speaking about other colleagues, another gentlelady from Ohio as well, Congresswoman KAPTUR, who has also been a strong leader in the trade debate over the past 5 years that I have been here, and she has been a tremendous advocate for making sure that we have fair trade deals, I see she has some charts up there with a lot of red

ink. I assume that is probably the trade deficit that she is going to talk about.

I yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. KAPTUR. Congressman MICHAUD, Congresswoman SUTTON and Congressman BRALEY, I wanted to come to the floor tonight and say it is so wonderful to have you here in this beloved House, to try to course correct on a direction that the United States has been heading in the wrong direction now for over two decades. And with the new energy that you represent and the new leadership, I have no doubt that when fast track comes up for reauthorization later this year, we are going to stop it dead in its tracks and begin turning our country around again.

I just wanted to run to the floor just for a couple of minutes to put some notes in the RECORD and to say that for 23 years Congress has really doled out to the executive branch our trade-making authority under Article I, section 8.

If you go back to 1975 when fast track was first passed, the United States had trade balances up until then for almost the entirety of our history. Then as you look at each succeeding agreement, whether you go to 1993 and NAFTA, we were already amassing trade deficits after the first fast track was passed back in the seventies.

Then when PNTR with China was passed, plus NAFTA, plus all the other agreements that were signed, we moved into the most historic deficits represented by the lost jobs that Congresswoman SUTTON talked about, that Congressman BRALEY talked about, Congressman MICHAUD you talked about and personally lived through.

So we have seen real wages stagnant with those jobs lost. We have seen our jobs move overseas to the lowest-wage countries in the world, the most undemocratic. We have seen child labor flourish. We have seen bonded labor come back into our country as a result. We have global warming taking hold as our environmental regulations are really overturned under agreements like NAFTA. Illegal immigrants stream across our borders because they are treated like they have no value in their home countries. Our trade deficit continues to soar, and the drug trade locks in heavily.

So I wanted to come down tonight and present some of these figures and say that there is a pattern to history now. You are like the second wave. You are coming in here. Those of us who fought so hard against NAFTA in 1993, those of us who tried so hard to course-correct, we never had the votes. Unfortunately, it was so close; it was so very close. But people hadn't lived the washout. You now represent places that have experienced the results of this.

So we look forward to this coming vote this summer. It is such a joy to have you here, and I just wanted to thank you for your really determined leadership and for the people who voted you here so that you could come to Washington and make a difference. We so very, very much need your voices here.

When Fast Track expires at the end of June this year, Congress can reclaim our authority granted by Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution "to regulate commerce with foreign nations." For 23 years, Congress and the working class watched the executive branch commandeer U.S. trade policy. We also saw real wages stagnate, American jobs move overseas, child labor flourish, global warming take hold, illegal immigrants stream across our borders, our trade deficit soar, and the drug trade thrive.

Like many of us here, I receive thousands of letters, phone calls, and e-mails from my constituents asking me to take action on these important issues.

While there is no one cause for any of these problems, Congress cannot ignore how U.S. trade policy impacts the full range of issues affecting Americans and the world. Congress must respond to the American people who demand action from us.

Congress has yielded enough power to the executive branch. If we renew Fast Track and continue to cede our Constitutionally-granted authority, we will only render ourselves more helpless in the face of a broken immigration system, economic instability, an environmental crisis, and a burgeoning drug trade.

Our previous trade agreements may not have been the sole causes of these emergencies, but trade policy is the key to solving them.

Congress needs to examine the root causes of our immigration problem and the exploitation of workers across the Americas. When the leaders of U.S., Mexico, and Canada signed NAFTA 14 years ago, they turned their backs on working men and women across the continent. The agreement continues to chip away at the U.S. economy, leaving millions jobless and accumulating a staggering and growing trade deficit with Mexico, now totaling a record $64.1 billion for 2006. At the same time, NAFTA ravaged the Mexican economy and destroyed the farming and agricultural sectors. This so-called "free trade" agreement has prompted hundreds of thousands of Mexicans to look for an escape from their worsening destitute circumstances to the U.S., and in doing so they risk their lives, the unity of their families and their futures.

U.S. trade policy upsets more than just our immigration crisis. Our faltering trade policy has also contributed to the global environmental emergency. When the Bush Administration entered into CAFTA, they did so with countries which rarely enforce their already limited environmental policies. Many of my constituents have already contacted me about the devastating environmental consequences of the Peru Free Trade Agreement. How can Congress fight global warming in the U.S. while allowing our trade rivals to destroy the rain forests and retain lax emissions standards? We must use trade as a tool to protect the environment, not to pillage it.

Lopsided flawed trade agreements weaken our economy. Since NAFTA's passage, over one million U.S. jobs were sucked into Mexico. Because of PNTR, more than 1.5 million jobs shipped out to China. After two centuries of trade surpluses, NAFTA ushered in an era of soaring trade deficits, even after proponents promised us bigger surpluses.

More recently, President Bush's trade policy in particular has caused more damage to our trade accounts. The trade deficit has climbed to record numbers each year since he took office in 2001. From $362 billion his first year to a whopping $763.6 billion last year, this President has been selling the U.S. to the highest foreign bidders.

Our constituents are calling Congress to action. Without the authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations, Congress cannot effectively respond to these crises.

Congress must stand for free trade among free people, and ensure that all Americans have access to middle class jobs at middle class wages with health and retirement benefits that cannot be rescinded. We must oppose Fast Track, reclaim our negotiating authority from the executive branch, and answer the pleas of the American people.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, we are headed on a collision course. If you look at our budgetary deficit, we have the largest budgetary deficit in our history. The debt limit was increased to $9 trillion. We have the largest trade deficit in our history, which continues to rise because of these unfair trade deals. And if Congress does not get a handle on both the budgetary deficit and our trade deficit, we will no longer be the superpower that we are today.

When you look at our budgetary deficit, over 45 percent of that is owned by foreigners, China being one of them. If you look at our trade deficit with China, we saw charts earlier where it is skyrocketing.

When I hear my colleagues talk about the fact that we are going to put trade assistance funding in there so that we can retrain workers, they don't want trade adjustment assistance. They want their jobs. That is very important for them.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further on that point, recently, about a week ago, Hershey Chocolate announced it was going to move its operations out of Pennsylvania to Mexico. They have already been testing those Hershey Kisses, those big ones they are making down there now and the taste has changed. I am thinking, where is the old Hershey bar that used to taste so good?

You look at all the jobs in Pennsylvania associated with all the dairying that goes on and then the processing. They say that they are going to save the tourist center, but it won't be real any more, because the jobs won't be there, both in the plant itself and in the countryside that provides the raw product into Hershey.

So you ask, why are we allowing ourselves to be hollowed out like this? Wall Street is really in a pitched battle with Main Street across this country, and we have to fight here to save those middle-class jobs.

Mr. MICHAUD. Absolutely. Congresswoman SUTTON mentioned earlier the fact this is not just a workers' issue; it is a business issue. The United States Business and Industry Council has been very supportive, very helpful with the Kaptur trade deal. They are going to be very helpful I think when you look at fast track and other areas. So this isn't

just working people issues; it is business issues. A lot of people try to put workers against business. It is not that issue at all. It is these unfair trade deals.

I would like to ask Congresswoman SUTTON a question, if I might. How would you address this issue: We hear all kinds of times the issue, you are a protectionist. What is your response to that?

Ms. SUTTON. Well, again, this is the way those who like what is going on with our trade deals, and those would be more or less the multinational companies who are very involved in helping to push them, whenever we start talking about this and the real impact and the real effects, they like to call you names like protectionist.

That is how they shut the debate down; but we can't allow that to happen, because, again, this is not a question of protectionism versus trade. It is a question about what are the rules of trade going to be.

We just have to keep saying that, because there are going to be voices out there that would like people to believe otherwise. But all we are talking about is what kind of rules of trade do we believe should be engaged in.

Mr. MICHAUD. That is very good. I know we are running out of time. I do want to thank you, Congresswoman SUTTON and Congresswoman KAPTUR, for your leadership in this role, and I really appreciate the hard work that everyone is doing on this issue, especially our freshman class.

As Ms. KAPTUR had mentioned, the freshman class has really come forward and really taken on this issue, taken an interest in this issue, I think primarily because you just came off the campaign trail. You heard what people were talking about out there. It is important for Members who have been here for a while to listen to you as freshman Members because you definitely have a lot to talk about when it comes to this trade issue.

We have seen it firsthand. As I mentioned earlier, I worked at the mill for over 28 years, and I have seen firsthand what NAFTA has done to my town, my community, to individuals who worked in the mill.

So I want to thank each and every one of you for taking an interest in this very important issue.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker: I am proud to join many of my House colleagues today to present a strong voice in opposition to renewing Fast Track trade negotiating authority in any way, shape or form.

Fast Track allows the President to negotiate trade agreements without input from Congress. In addition, Congress is prohibited from amending any trade agreements reached under Fast Track authority.

Cynically repackaged as "trade promotion authority" in 2002, under President Bush's watch, Fast Track has been utilized to unjustifiable ends. Wages are flat, our trade deficit has skyrocketed and good-paying manufacturing jobs have been lost by the thousands.

Increased imports from low-paid workers abroad, combined with threats made to workers by companies to move operations overseas, drive American workers' wages down. Through the 1950s and 1960s, the American middle-class grew and prospered. In 1973, the average U.S. worker made $16.06 an hour. Today, after adjusting for inflation, that same worker would make only $16.11 per hour.

In stark contrast to hourly wages, average U.S. worker productivity has nearly doubled over the same period. Clearly, the divide in America between the "haves" and "have-nots" is growing, and the richest few, along with multi-national corporations, are the big winners under our nation's flawed trade policy.

Up until 1973, the U.S. experienced relatively balanced trade, with small trade surpluses being the norm ($1.9 billion surplus in 1973). Since Fast Track was granted in 1974, the U.S. had a trade surplus in just one year (1975). Now, in 2006, our nation's trade deficit has skyrocketed to over $760 billion.

Our trade deficit has more than doubled since President Bush took office. For 2001, our trade deficit was $362 billion. Last year, our trade deficit reached yet another new record high at $764 billion.

Since WWII, good paying manufacturing jobs have been the driving force behind our nation's robust middle class allowing families to own homes, send their children to college and gain access to quality, affordable healthcare.

Since President Bush took office, the U.S. has lost 3 million manufacturing jobs. Michigan alone has lost 213,000 manufacturing jobs, or about one-quarter of the state's manufacturing jobs.

My record is clear. I voted against the Trade Act of 2002, which mistakenly granted this Administration "trade promotion authority." Now, it is time for Congress to put the brakes on the Bush Administration's failed trade policies and come to our senses to realize the damage done. First, we must not make matters worse. Congress should reject the pending free trade agreements with Peru, Colombia and Panama. My colleagues should not be misled. Fast track trade negotiating authority is not required to negotiate or approve free trade agreements.

Second, we need serious, thoughtful review of our nation's trade policies and their impact on wages, jobs and our trade balance. Pitting American industries against one another, political gamesmanship, and manipulation and sloganeering must come to an end so that Congress and the Administration should get down to business.

The United States is a world leader, and we must enact trade policies that truly encourage positive standards and quality of life for both the United States and our foreign partners. Reject renewal of Fast Track trade negotiation authority, so we can get back to sensible and fair trade policy.

## SOLUTIONS TO TRADE PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARCURI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege to be seated here in this Chamber and listen to the presentation over the last probably hour and a half or so. It is quite interesting as I listened to the presentation made by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and the concern about the imbalance in trade, which I am concerned about, and the argument that we need not necessarily free trade, but fair trade.

As I carefully listened to the 60-minute presentation, I hear some things that are wrong, and I agree with some of them, as a matter of fact, most of them, but I heard no suggestions on how we are going to fix this, except ask the administration to do it better and get it right.

I think it is important for us, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to identify these issues that we are going to call problems that we should also step forward and have the will and the foresight to present some solutions.

So in the time I have had here to listen now, I will just present some solutions that I would have liked to have heard from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, because I think we ought to be here to fix the problems we have.

First, I don't have quite the same number of trade deficit that the gentlelady from Ohio presented in the poster here just a little bit ago. I recall that 2 years ago, actually now 3 years ago, our trade deficit was a minus $617.7 billion. Last year it was a minus $725 billion. Her number was slightly higher than that. We should by now have the records for the 2006 trade deficit. I have not had access to that number, and I note the gentlelady from Ohio didn't present a number for the 2006 trade deficit, but it had been increasing about 20 percent a year for several years.

I heard no evidence that convinces me that NAFTA is the only reason. In fact, I will submit that there are a number of other reasons that we have a trade deficit. I would challenge my colleagues, join with me in some of these solutions that I will present here.

But before I do so, I am just going to go back and review some of the remarks that were made and then respond to them with solutions rather than lamentations, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman from Wisconsin called for fair trade. He showed a poster that has a minus $233 billion trade deficit with China. I don't dispute that number. I expect that is as very close, if not as accurate, a number as there is out there. But that is a portion of and not even a majority of our trade deficit that we have from a global imbalance.

Then the gentleman from Illinois made the statement "We need fair trade." Fair trade in fact was called for by I believe every one of the speakers, and at least no one disagreed with that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I refuse to allow my staff to use the word "fair." In fact, I refused to let my children use the word "fair" as they were growing up, because I know something that most Americans know, and that is anyone who has raised two or more children knows there is no such thing as fair.

If you are going to use ''fair'' and be able to define the word ''fair,'' you have to be talking about a county fair or a State fair or some other type of gathering where people display their wares, because the term ''fair'' is not definable; it isn't universally understood. So one person's idea of fair is another person's idea of a injustice, and it will be ever thus.

We can talk about justice and equity, and we can talk about using the equal enforcement of trade agreements and laws, and I think we should do that; but to even try to define what we would like to do with a term like ''fair,'' we have chosen the vaguest term that there is in the dictionary and the one that submits itself to anyone's redefinition of it.

Also the statement was made that we have no options, we have to vote these fast track trade agreements up or down. That is not true. Yes, they come to the floor as unamendable, but a couple of years ago, maybe 3 years ago, I amended two unamendable trade agreement, and I did so in committee.

□ 2145

These were trade agreements that had to do with Singapore and Chile. Ambassador Zoellick had negotiated immigration agreements into those trade agreements. And so with the wisdom and tenaciousness of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), we brought those trade agreements before the Judiciary Committee, and although they were unamendable trade agreements, up-or-down, to be voted on, we had a mock markup in committee. And in that mock markup, I was successful in getting two mock amendments put on the mock bill. And when we finished with our analysis of the trade agreements that had been negotiated by the U.S. Trade Representative and had perfected the trade agreements in the process of going through the mock markup, the U.S. Trade Representative then, even though it was supposedly impossible to go back and reopen those negotiations, reopened those negotiations and adapted those two amendments into the trade agreement, and we struck out the immigration language out of the trade agreement. It had no business. It had no place there, and that is one way you can effect a change if you disagree with the trade agreements.

But it sounds to me like the people that are speaking here are against all trade agreements no matter what they might be. They will always be able to oppose any agreement no matter how it is defined because they will always reserve the right to redefine their own term called fair. It will be, it isn't fair. We can't do it because it is not fair. Well, you have to be more specific than that.

As I listened to my colleague from Iowa talk about the Maytag issue at Newton, and that has left a big hole in the central part of Iowa, and I look back on the 34½ years of my marriage, and there has never been anything but a Maytag washer and dryer in my home washing clothes for our family. That is deep in our heritage, and we are loyal to the brand.

But part of the equation also was that, when it came time to resolve the labor disagreements and to settle the salary and benefit and pension plans, the burden of that was just too high to be able to hold the jobs in Iowa. It is too bad, but those were some of the circumstances that no one over here uttered, when you get collective bargaining and it drives the package up so high; when you overplay your hand, you lose the company. You don't have the option to back down, and the union doesn't come forward and say, I will be happy to take a $2 or $5 pay cut, or maybe we will negotiate the health care plan or do a package that has to do with our contribution versus our benefits, defined contributions versus defined benefits plan, that stuff is hard to get when you have a lucrative labor agreement, collectively bargained agreement, those types of agreements could not be resolved favorably to Maytag. That is one of the reasons why we no longer have Maytag centered up in Newton, Iowa. I think we need to talk about that.

Yes, these jobs are going overseas. But, also, Maytag made an investment overseas to go over there and make washing machines to sell to the Chinese. They invested initially $70 million in that plant. And, finally, after some years of trying, they couldn't make it work and pulled out of that investment.

There are many, many different components to these transactions. It isn't just simply American corporations, that they are simply greedy capitalists and that they quickly move our industries overseas. They are reluctant to go. But we set up the burden of taxation and regulation. And then you have the compensation packages of the collective bargaining agreements; and that being the environment here in the United States, having then to compete against the cheaper labor overseas. All of those things work against us, not just the corporations deciding to make a decision that is simply based on greed. That is not so, Mr. Speaker.

Also, the argument, the gentlelady from Iowa said our trade deficits soar, we need a new trade model. I heard no proposal of what that new trade model is. It is criticism, but it is not a solution. We need to provide solutions.

The other gentlewoman from Iowa talked about Hershey is moving out and going to Mexico. I am saddened to see that go. But some of my colleagues who have been here a number of years have had an opportunity to put a fix in place so we could sustain, could have sustained some of these businesses that we are losing, and we could still sustain many of these businesses today if we could get to work and roll up our sleeves and do the right thing for real tax reform.

That would be to simply bring forward H.R. 25, the FAIR Tax. And that eliminates the IRS and the Income Tax Code, so it eliminates personal and corporate income tax. It eliminates the tax on your interest income, your dividend income and your capital gains. And it eliminates the AMT. It takes the tax off your savings and investment, and your pension and Social Security. It does all of those things.

One of the things I would think my colleagues would want to do if they are concerned about the trade deficit, I would think that they would want to border adjust the taxes so we weren't operating here in the United States at a disadvantage, having to put taxes on the cost of our goods and be competing against imported goods from overseas that do not have that tax component in there. That is part of what they are talking about, is unfair trade, subsidized goods was the term used by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the onslaught of foreign subsidized goods.

Well, they may be subsidized goods, and I am sure there is a definition that can be applied to that, but we do the opposite. We put the tax burden on everything that we manufacture in this country, on materials and labor, and it has to be built in and embedded in the cost of the things that we sell, because corporations, companies that are in business to sell a good or a service or any combination of the two, do not pay income tax. They can't pay income tax. They collect it from people. The end user, the last stop on the retail chain, are the ones that pay the taxes, but it is collected through the companies that sell the goods and the services, and then they transfer it to the IRS in the form of corporate income tax, business income tax and sometimes the personal income tax of the executives and the shareholders as well.

Corporations and businesses don't pay taxes; they collect it from real people. The consumer is the last stop on the retail dollar. Once we can get our minds around that absolute truth, then we can begin to talk about how we can work together to border adjust our taxes and become a more competitive Nation again.

The studies that we have had done indicate that the components boil down to this: On average, 22 percent of a product that is on the shelf for sale here in the United States, 22 percent is the embedded cost of the tax structure that the company that is producing that product has to build into the price. So that says, if you are selling a widget and that widget is a dollar, 78 cents is the cost of the widget and 22 cents is the cost of the tax.

If you put that on some more expensive items, go from the $1 widget to the $30,000 vehicle, and we have millions of dollars worth of vehicles coming into the United States every year. Some of our trade deficit, I can tell you, would be $800 million worth of Mazdas that

come over from Japan every year, made in Japan, put on ships, brought here, off-loaded into the United States and marketed on our dealers' lots, $800 million. As that price goes up, and that is a couple-of-year-old number, we could be into a billion dollars, and that would be one-700th of our entire trade deficit because we are buying Mazdas but we are not exporting Chevys or Fords back to Japan. If we sent a billion dollars worth of Chevys or Fords to Japan instead of them sending a billion dollars of Mazdas to us, then we pick up a two-for, and we reduce that trade deficit by $2 billion, not $1 billion.

But if you put a Chevy and a Mazda on a dealer's lot and each has a sticker price of $30,000 and they are comparable vehicles, comparable quality and accessories that are built into that price so the competition will establish that price and they are selling against each other at $30,000; if we pass H.R. 25, the FAIR Tax and we cease taxing all productivity in America and we put the tax on sales instead of income, a national sales tax, that $30,000 Chevy, the price of it goes down.

If you take the tax component out, you take 22 percent out of that $30,000 Chevy, and it takes us into that area of $23,400. The Mazda stays at $30,000.

When we put our tax back in, we have to build it back in, the sales tax on the price, now the Mazda goes up by 23 percent, and it ends up as a $39,000 Mazda. That is the amount you would write the check for to drive it off the lot. But you would write the check for the Chevy or the Ford at $30,400. That is an $8,600 marketing advantage that we would gain simply by getting rid of the IRS and the Income Tax Code and put our tax back on sales and allowing these companies and competition to drive the embedded tax component out of everything that we are producing here in America.

That gives us a 28 percent marketing advantage here in the United States. So when foreign companies are competing against American manufacturers, they would have to look at that huge 28 percent advantage that we would have. I can tell you, there would be a lot more products produced in the United States.

I will take you back to the $800 million worth of Mazdas coming over from Japan by ship every year. Those cars are made in Japan. A lot of the components are put together in Japan, and wherever you make something, that is where the labor and jobs are. When we are purchasing from a foreign country, we are transporting and exporting our job market there.

Now, that is true for everything that we are purchasing that is a good from a foreign country. Those jobs, whenever we send money overseas and purchase a good from a foreign country, we are also transferring jobs there.

We pass the FAIR Tax, those jobs come back home, many of them, and we hold most jobs here. We end up with a 28 percent marketing advantage, and it does a number of other things. That is, it doubles our economy in 10 to 15 years. It fixes our balance of trade, that minus-$725 billion, probably a larger number now, because we can compete not only here better, and we will be pulling jobs back here and creating more jobs here in the United States, but also our export markets. Many times the export markets turn on a 1 or 2 percent margin.

We pick up instantaneously a 28 percent advantage from where we are right now if we can take the tax component out of the products that we are selling. So we do a number of good things. We hold our manufacturing base here. We hold our jobs here, especially our blue collar jobs, the jobs like Hershey and Maytag, that are leaving America. These are manufacturing jobs after manufacturing jobs. Those kinds of jobs stay here. We create more jobs here. These are American-made products, and the dollars will stay here. As those dollars stay here, they turn over seven times in a community, as the economists tell us they do. They create more and more and more jobs. Pretty soon we would have that trade deficit gone. We would end up with a trade surplus. We would end up with a healthy, robust industrial base in America and a strong economy that would be doubled in 10–15 years.

If we do that, the rest of the world would have to stand up and take notice. We are already the most dynamic economy the world has ever seen. But we have a problem, a series of them. But, Mr. Speaker, the problem I am speaking of is the problem of going back and indexing Alexander Tyler's statement, that when a democracy realizes it can vote itself benefits from the public treasury, on that day the democracy ceases to exist.

We are at least 44 percent of Americans not paying income tax. If we go to a national sales tax, a FAIR Tax, that does a number of things, but it untaxes the poor, and I will get to that in a moment. But it also makes taxpayers out of every consumer in America. And we are all consumers.

Each time we step up, and I think of little Johnny stepping up to the counter, and he is going to buy his baseball cards, and he is going to put a couple of dimes up there for Uncle Sam. Those children from little on up will understand that the Federal Government is expensive, and they will know that they are funding the Federal Government, and they will be buying into the Federal Government. And they will also be advocating for let me have a few less services and let me keep a few more of my dimes. That penetrates into young people.

I remember a story told by a candidate for Congress in last summer's primary election. He had a little son; I believe his name was Michael. Little Michael had saved up his money. Little Michael, he picked up his box of Skittles, and he had counted out 89 cents for the box of Skittles.

□ 2200

So he put his money up on the counter with the box of Skittles, carefully counted out 89 cents, and the lady at the check-out register rang it up and said that will be 96 cents. He did not have anymore money. He got that look on his face of what am I going to do; they are 89 cents; I have 89 cents. The lady said, well, with the tax. Little Michael turned to his dad and said, Dad, I have to pay tax on Skittles? Yes, that is what you have to do if we eliminate the IRS and the Federal income tax code. You could be a consumer who chooses when to pay your taxes, and like little Michael, pay taxes on Skittles at age seven or eight or less, and realize how expensive the Federal Government actually is.

That changes the psyche of an entire culture. People that are always looking to the Federal Government for a solution begin to realize they are funding the Federal Government and they are part of the solution. They are bought into this.

Going for a national sales tax, a consumption tax, a fair tax, Mr. Speaker, does everything good that everyone else's tax policy does and more besides, and that is not just my words. Those are also the words of one famed chairman who has been the lead guru on economics here in America for a lot of years.

It fixes everything that you can fix with a tax policy. It fixes everybody, all the pieces that come along here, puts them all together and does more besides. It border adjust taxes and it provides incentive for savings and investment. It doubles our economy in 10 to 15 years. It repairs our balance of trade and puts it on a surplus of balance of trade, and this growing economy then, on top of that, Mr. Speaker, it solves our deficit, our deficit in our revenue that we have here, our deficit spending because, when the economy doubles, we are going to have a lot more dollars that come flowing in here.

We replace the payroll tax, the Social Security, the Medicare and the Medicaid, with a consumption tax portion. I advocate for a 23 percent embedded tax that is made of these components. I said I would get back to this.

Three percent of that 23 percent provides a rebate into everybody's household to untax everyone in America up to the poverty level. So let us say the poverty level is $20,000 for a family of four, and I think the number is actually $18,500 for a family of four. They would pay about $458 in a month in taxes if they were going to consume to the level of their income. So this 3 percent goes into a fund, and immediately at the beginning of every month, it would do an automatic transfer into each household as registered by the Health and Human Services for the level of sales tax that that family would pay just up to the poverty level. So anybody that is living at the poverty level or below pays no tax, pays no national sales tax, but those that start

spending above that, above that $18,500, they start then paying the sales tax on that until you get to someone like I presume Bill Gates would be a rather robust consumer, I do not know that, but if I were he, I would be a robust consumer. People of that kind of income will be the ones who will pay the highest percentage of tax off their income. This is progressive, but also, it untaxes the poor. The first 3 percent collected is the portion that goes in to untax everyone up to the poverty level, and then those of us who spend more than the poverty level will pay our fair share of taxes going on up. That is 3 percent.

Eight percent goes to replace the payroll tax, Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, so that we no longer have to have that most regressive kind of a tax. That is a very regressive tax on especially the lower income people. There is no exemption for you if you are only making $10,000 a year. You are going to take the .0765 percent times two, and that is 15.3 percent, multiply that by your $10,000, and you are going to give up $1,530 to the payroll tax even if you only make $10,000 a year.

So you can see, Mr. Speaker, that is a 15 percent tax on some of the poorest people in America. We eliminate that tax and put it back on consumption. And by the way, when people max out on Social Security, the most wealthy people are paying at a lower rate on the payroll tax than the poor are among us. So payroll tax is a very regressive tax. We replace it with 8 percent. We untax everyone up to the poverty level with 3 percent, that is 11, and then to replace the income tax itself and be revenue neutral that takes a 12 percent embedded tax. That is how we get to 23.

This plan works. Every time I turn this rubrics cube around and look at it another way, it looks better and better and better, but my colleagues over here are content to stand here night after night, give us a list of lamentations on what is wrong with the President, the administration, the previous majority, the decisions that have been made here in this Congress over the last 15 years on trade. They argue that free trade is fine as long as it is fair trade, but I did not hear anyone advocate for any trade agreement that they ever agreed with. So that makes us trade isolationists unless they can come forward with some real changes.

Well, I will submit that I can support trade agreements. I can support them, Mr. Speaker, if we can have smart trade, but also, we need to have a more competitive environment for America's producers. That means pass the fair tax.

Also, a couple of years ago, I was sitting over in China. As I watched the negotiations go on and engaged in them, I saw the eyes of the negotiators on the other side of the Pacific Ocean, and I watched their smiles and I watched their heads nod. We were talking to them about the billions of dollars of intellectual property that is pirated by the Chinese, and it is essentially a national standard. At least there is so much of it that goes on, there is not a punishment going on for it, this standard of stepping in and stealing our intellectual property as quick as it comes on the market.

We might have a Hollywood movie that comes out and before the premier, the DVD has been pirated by the Chinese and it is on the streets in its black market version, undercutting the intellectual property and the creativity of Hollywood. Those things happen.

The copyrights and also the patents and the trademarks, those 3 pieces of intellectual property are consistently and persistently and strategically pirated by the Chinese. The Russians, too, only the Russians just are not as good as it yet, and they are getting better.

As I listened to those negotiations and as we put pressure on them over there to bring criminal charges against those who are stealing U.S. intellectual property rights and selling Rolex watches, fake Rolex watches would be another example that brings to that mind's eye, Mr. Speaker. As we put pressure on them to bring criminal charges and civil charges, they said to us, well, we are fining people for stealing U.S. intellectual property and we are moving forward more aggressively to enforce. So I asked them for a report on those fines, and they gave me 150 pages. It was all in Chinese, Mr. Speaker, so I did not really have the ability to determine that except that, by their witness and their verbal presentation to me, they had levied some fines for X number of yuan, Chinese dollars, but we also know that a government-owned company, that if it is owned by the government and if the government fines that company, it is like me deciding I am going to fine myself and I will take a couple of dollars out of this pocket and put it over here in this pocket. Makes no difference to a Communist State and State-owned businesses if the State fines the company. The State is the company, and so those statements did not move me very much, Mr. Speaker.

Then I asked about criminal charges, and they said, yes, we have brought some criminal charges and we are getting more rugged with our enforcement. So I asked the point blank question: Who have you locked up in jail? Who is in jail today because you are stealing our intellectual property? And of course, the answer was, Mr. Speaker, well, we have not locked anybody up just yet, but we are moving forward to enforce.

Well, I came to the conclusion that the Chinese saw it as a price of doing business. The cost of doing business was to smile and nod and speak nice and make nice to Americans that are over there that want to alleviate the burden of the pirating of the U.S. intellectual property rights and that they will continue smiling and nodding and hosting Americans as long as we are willing to come over there to complain, but nothing is going to happen. Nothing is ever going to happen unless we bring some leverage against them.

So I will submit a second solution for the folks over here and ask them: Do you care to weigh in on this? I would be happy to yield to you, and I hope you come to the floor at a later time, too, or we can get together and you can sign on to some of this legislation that actually provides solutions to the problems that you so articulately laid out here tonight.

But one of these solutions is this. Direct the U.S. Trade Representative to conduct a study to determine and evaluate the loss to American intellectual property rights holders to the Chinese for the pirating of those intellectual property rights. Once that amount is quantified, and Mr. Speaker, I can tell you it is in the billions, then direct the U.S. Trade Representative to levy a duty on all goods that come from China in an amount equivalent to be able to recover the complete loss that American property rights holders have sustained because of the piracy of their property rights and to distribute those proceeds back into the hands of the people that hold the copyrights, the trademarks and the other intellectual property rights.

That is another concrete solution that I would lay out here for the folks that come to the floor and talk about what is wrong but do not provide a solution and do not provide a way to fix things and turn them around and make them right, Mr. Speaker.

I did not necessarily come here tonight, though, to talk about the shortfalls of the presentation that was made by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I came here tonight, Mr. Speaker, to talk about a great big issue that we have to face in this country.

As I stand here, this being the week beginning the 5th of March, it has been my understanding for some two to three weeks that the senator from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, was preparing to introduce a, I will put it in quotes, a ''comprehensive'' immigration bill sometime the week of the 5th of March. I am hopeful that that does not happen, at least coming out of him, the subcommittee chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee of the Judiciary on the Senate side.

We saw what they did last year over in the Senate and actually passed, and it was an abysmal piece of policy, Mr. Speaker. Now they are winding up to try it again, same person or persons, same face, same philosophy. That same philosophy is amnesty first, enforcement maybe never.

I remember Senator KENNEDY standing out here on the Mall just on the West side of our West portico when we had demonstrators by the tens and perhaps hundreds of thousands last spring. He said to them, and these demonstrators, many were not lawfully present in the United States, one can presume I

think accurately, and he said to them, some say report to be deported; I say to you, report to become an American citizen.

That was the clarion call of the left wing liberals and the voice of Senator KENNEDY calling for people, come to America, come here illegally and when you are here, we are going to pave the way for a path to citizenship for you and hand over to you all the benefits of American citizenship.

Well, I say to Senator KENNEDY, if your mantra is amnesty, those of you who stand on amnesty, you deserve to be branded with the scarlet letter A for amnesty and treated as such because amnesty undermines the rule of law in this country.

These are some pillars of America that are essential for us in order to be able to sustain ourselves and sustain ourselves into the future. In order to identify those pillars of American civilization, we need to look back and identify what has been some of the roots of American exceptionalism. Why are we an exceptional Nation with such a dynamic economy? Why have we been so robust as a people?

There are a number of reasons, but one I would point out is that because we have brought in immigrants from all over the globe, because it was difficult to get here, because many of them had to sell themselves for seven years to pay off their passage to the United States, to work off the cost of that ride aboard ship across from Western Europe, for example, the people that had that sense of a dream, the sense of wanting to come here to realize their American dream, to raise their families here, they also had that sense of adventuresomeness.

Within all of that, the dream, the industriousness, the creativity, the sense of adventure, that desire to join with us in our manifest destiny as we settled a continent in lightening speed, all of that was the vitality that came in with our immigration. We were able to skim the cream off of the crop in Nation after Nation after Nation. Donor Nations gave up a measure of their most vital population because they came here so they could spread their wings and they could excel.

□ 2215

That is one of the pillars of American exceptionalism. Without belaboring that point very much any more, another pillar of American exceptionalism has been the foundation of our Constitution, which is drafted based upon the principles that you will find in the Declaration. And in the Constitution are our basic rights, freedom of speech, press, religion, assembly, and the second amendment rights, the right to keep and bear arms, and what used to be in our fifth amendment, the right to property, which says, ''nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.''

But now after the Keloe decision, it says, ''nor shall private property be taken without just compensation,'' the for public use words have been eliminated from the fifth amendment by the Supreme Court in the Keloe decision.

But up until that time, the sanctity of property rights rode right along with the sanctity of our first amendment rights, and we have done a good job of defending our second amendment rights. Throughout this is the vitality of America, because we have individual rights that are guaranteed, and they are passed down from God to each one of us. Then the individuals, we the people, then hand that responsibility over to our elected representatives to represent us in places like this House of Representatives.

But we have guaranteed rights, and those guaranteed rights and the rights of due process and to be protected from discrimination in a court of law have given us a sense of justice and a sense of the rule of law that gives every American, every American citizen and those who aspire to be American citizens, solid ground on which to stand, confidence that it is predictable into their future so that they can invest capital, borrow money against their property, be able to pay off the mortgage, be able to reach for the stars and dream, create and become an entrepreneur, be one of those people that really makes a big difference and realize their fortune and their dreams. These are some of the foundations of American exceptionalism, but the rule of law is a foundation for it.

If we grant amnesty to people who broke the law to come here, then we have undermined the rule of law. If we undermine the rule of law, we don't have the culture for a strong America any longer. We have lost a pillar for what makes us great.

So to reward law breakers does exactly that. As I listen to people that come in and testify in the immigration subcommittee meeting, I will often hear people; there will be those that come in and say, well, I was a beneficiary of the amnesty in 1986. I came in illegally when Ronald Reagan signed the amnesty bill; there was supposed to be some say as low as 300,000 that would get amnesty. I recall about 1 million, but we know that went over 3 million who received amnesty because the fraud was so rampant.

The document forgers kicked into high gear. For everyone that got a designed amnesty in a legal fashion, there were others who by hook and crook got their amnesty. But all of them are for amnesty today if they happen to be alive and still in this country, and so are their families and their friends for amnesty. They say, well, it is not a hard thing to figure out. It was good for my dad or my mother or my brother or my uncle. Look, they are here in America, and they are doing well.

Why shouldn't we give amnesty to other people, because it has been good to us. Now that is a very simple equation and not a very rational thought process but, for every one we grant amnesty to, there will be several who will say, I think that is a good idea because my friend or my relation thought amnesty was a good idea.

If this becomes amnesty for 12 million or 15 million or for 20 million or more, and they bring in their extended families at the tune of maybe as many as 273 for every anchor baby that comes into the United States, we won't just have 12 or 15 or 20 or more million who have no respect and, in fact, contempt for the rule of law; we will have 100 or more million that will have contempt for the rule of law.

That then would utterly destroy the rule of law in America. We would go back to a third world kind of country where the rule of law doesn't work down south in places like Mexico, Honduras, El Salvador, Colombia. It is the rule of who has the power and who has the guns.

I see that my friend and colleague from Texas, the wonderful doctor, whom I seek his counsel quite often, especially on these technical issues, has arrived on the floor. I would be happy to yield as much time as the doctor from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), would consume.

Mr. BURGESS. I would thank the gentleman for yielding. Certainly, I was sitting in my office and watching you, watching your discussion with the American people tonight. I am always so grateful that you take the amount of time that you do to come to the floor and explain things to people in simple commonsense language that the average person can understand. I heard your discussion, of course, on fundamental tax reform. As you know, I am committed also to fundamental tax reform.

I knew that you wouldn't want your good friend Steve Forbes to think that you had forgotten all of the good things he had told us in a meeting about his flat tax. So I just wanted to remind the Members of Congress that in addition to H.R. 25, which deals with a consumption tax, there is also another approach to fundamental tax reform, which is H.R. 1040, what a clever number and scheme that is, which is the resurrection, if you will, of the flat tax that was previously espoused and popularized by former majority leader Dick Armey, and, of course, the subject of the ever popular book by Steve Forbes, the ''Flat Tax Revolution.''

I am not sure how many weeks it has been on the bestseller list, but it certainly should have stayed on there for weeks at a time.

This really meets the criteria, meets the test that was set forth by the President at the start of his second term for a simple, fair, pro-growth tax. The flat tax almost immediately eliminates the marriage penalty. It repeals the death tax. It abolishes the alternative minimum tax. If there was ever a time to consider the abolishment of the alternative minimum tax, it is today with more and more middle class

people being pulled into that type of unfair taxation. It eliminates multiple taxation of investment income, and it allows for immediate expensing of business equipment.

This bill, H.R. 1040, which is a voluntary election for a flat tax, it is not a requirement. If someone has constructed their time and their talents and their financial portfolio towards compliance with the IRS code, God bless them, my hat is off to them. But if they would rather take a more fundamentally sane approach to their family's finances, to their business's finances, and wish to elect a flat tax system, this should be available to them.

My concern is that we don't trust the American people enough, that if we gave them the opportunity to coexist with the IRS code as it exists today, it is completely unintelligible and not understandable by anyone with any level of education, or we gave them the opportunity to elect into a simple flat tax that they would choose to do so.

In fact, the gentleman from Iowa is quite aware that, since November, the elections in November, we have heard a lot of discussion from the other side of the aisle about the so-called tax gap, the tax gap being that $350 billion which is assessed by the IRS but never collected.

Well, what are the reasons it is not collected? To be sure, there is some fundamental dishonesty that exists in some people. But some people just look at the IRS code and say it is too complicated, I am going to ignore it and hope it goes away, I am not going to deal with this, and they are caught, and they are punished.

It is a shame that has to happen. If they were allowed the option of having a simple pro-growth system, such as the fair tax, such as the flat tax, I think the American people would be all the richer for it.

I just want to point out one passage in Mr. Forbes's book, which does not deal so much with the bill that I introduced, and I know it is going to surprise the gentleman from Iowa to hear that, but in 1989, a Senator requested a revenue forecast from Congress's Joint Committee on Taxation, on a hypothetical tax increase, raising the top rate to 100 percent. There is a flat tax, 100 percent on incomes over $200,000. The Joint Committee on Taxation responded by forecasting increased revenues of $204 billion in 1990, $299 billion in 1993. Incredibly, the Joint Committee on Taxation failed to recognize or at least assume that people would continue to work and work hard even if every penny of their income was taken away in income taxes.

I suggest that that indicates a departure and a divorce from reality that the Joint Committee on Taxation has, and it is for that reason that it is incumbent upon us to introduce measures that are, again, commonsense, straightforward measures that the American people can understand and get behind.

I notice that the speaker from Iowa had gone on from talking about taxation to talking about issues dealing with immigration. I will just say that we have had a lot of discussion in this Congress since Congress convened in January about the 9/11 recommendations or the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission from a couple of years ago.

To me, the two most important recommendations of the 9/11 Commission that have yet to be enacted, one was quite simply to build stable democracies in Middle East. I think we are doing that. We receive a lot of criticism for doing that, but that is one of the fundamental steps we must take in order to achieve stability worldwide and ultimately gain control in the global war on terror.

But the other concept, and it is so simple that it astounds me that it hasn't been taken up yet, and that is simply to secure the border. Both north and south, our American borders are not secure. They need to be secure; we deserve secure borders. The American people deserve secure borders after the ravages of 9/11, and I think that was a sensible recommendation the 9/11 Commission has made. I frankly do not understand why the House leadership has not taken that up with the seriousness it deserves.

With that, I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa and the Speaker for his indulgence.

Mr. KING of Iowa. In reclaiming my time, I thank the tenacious Texan for coming to the floor. He knows how much I revere Steve Forbes and Steve Forbes' financial acumen, as well as Alan Greenspan's. Perhaps on this subject matter it is one versus the other.

I also notice the gentleman from Texas, however compelling the argument, didn't present a list of things that his tax policy does better than the tax policy I advocate. But I think we both recognize that either is far better than what we are dealing with today.

There is nothing coming out of the other side of the aisle, particularly from the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL, except, well, we are going to figure out some ways to raise some of these existing taxes and maintain the convolutions that are within them. That is what we have to look forward to.

The stock market last week had its worst single week in 4 years. I don't think its coincidental that the tax increases that this have come out of this Congress, the Pelosi Congress, and the noises coming out of the Ways and Means Committee, particularly the Chair, have added instability to our New York stock exchange and all of our financial markets. Once the inertia of this continues, we might find ourselves in a significantly poorer situation and not very far from now.

I, also, on the immigration issue, there were some statistics that I had made a promise that I would unfold here and send this message out, and that is that we are faced with a tremendous amount of loss here in America in the lives of Americans because we are not enforcing at our border.

As the gentleman from Texas said, we need to first stop the bleeding at the border and get that under control. We need to push all traffic, both, all products, all contraband, all human traffic, through the ports of entry. We need to beef up our ports of entry.

You know, as I was sitting in an immigration hearing a couple or 3 years ago, I began to listen to the testimony about how many people died in the Arizona desert in a year.

It is a significant number then; it was about 250. Now, I think it is 400. That is sad, and it is tragic, but I, again, wonder, the 11,000 a night that sneak into the United States across our southern border, I sat down there by the fence in the dark and had the infiltration going around on either side of me, and that 11,000 a night is calculated by this Border Patrol agent who testified they stop between a fourth and a third.

And they stop 1,188,000 last year. If you do the math on that, that shows about 4 million a year get into the United States, and out of that 4 million, that works out to be about 11,000 a night.

I would expect there is someone around here that knows the size of Santa Ana's Army when he came across the river. But me being a Yankee, I have to guess at it. I think it was about 6,000 strong. It was then that when they attacked the Alamo at San Antonio. But if it was 6,000 strong or less than that when they attacked the Alamo, I would just suggest that twice the size of Santa Ana's army comes across the border every single night.

They may not be in uniforms, and they may not be marching in orderly ranks, and they may not be all of them armed, but they are carrying with them $65 billion worth of illegal drugs coming into the United States, $65 billion.

□ 2230

And we are spending $8 billion a year on our southern border. And out of that $8 billion, that is $4 million a mile, and we are getting some kind of efficiency rating of our dollars of maybe 25 percent of enforcement, and often I hear a 10 percent number from the Border Patrol people that are down there.

So what is the price to America? $65 billion worth of illegal drugs that comes out of the pockets of Americans. And the price in lives? The question that I ask and commissioned the GAO study for was, How many Americans die at the hands of those who do get across the border? And that number came out, not quite apples to apples and I had to do a calculation or two off of other government studies to match up with the GAO study from April of 2005, and it works out to be this: of the inmates in our Federal and State penitentiaries, 28 percent are criminal

aliens. And I am going to presume that if we had enforced our laws, none of them would have been in the United States.

So if you take 28 percent and you calculate that across the murders that we have in America, and that is about 16,000, a little over that, you will end up with a number 28 percent of that is 4,518 murder victims in the United States at the hands of those who are criminal aliens in the United States. You add to that the victims of negligent homicide, most of them drunk driving victims, and that is going to run 28 percent of those, that comes out to 4,746, Mr. Speaker. So you add those two together, that is 9,264 lives in America die violently every year at the hands of criminal aliens, presumably who would not be in the United States had we aggressively enforced our laws.

That is a shocking and astonishing number. It is three times the amount of victims that we had on September 11, and that is an annual number every single year.

Now, what does it cost us in dollars? Incarceration costs alone of the 267,000 illegal aliens that we have locked up in our prisons that we can count, and many of them we don't know, but we know we can count 267,000 and they will cost us in incarceration costs $6.7 billion just to lock them up.

So we are spending $8 billion on the border on our Border Patrol for maybe 25 percent efficiency; we are spending $6.7 billion to lock up the criminal aliens and hold them in our prisons. And then, on top of that, the cost to murder victims, and that number has been calculated by government numbers at $3.9 million per murder victim. That comes out to be $17.05 billion in the cost of murder victims in dollars. And those victims of negligent homicide, I have measured that a little bit smaller at two-thirds of that overall cost of the murder victim because the investigations don't go so far. That comes to $11.37 billion.

So I add these numbers up: Incarceration costs, $6.7 billion; the value of lost productivity in lives of murder victims, $17.05 billion; the value in lost productivity in lives at negligent homicide victims, $11.37 billion. It comes up to $35.12 billion out-of-pocket costs out of the United States just for those who were killed and to lock up those who kill. That does not include rape victims, assault victims, grand larceny and theft victims. That list goes on and on and on.

Sex victims is another one. We have identified about 240,000 sex criminals who are criminal aliens. And of those, they have at least four identifiable victims. So you do the math on that. It is just a few short of 1 million victims of sex crimes, and many of those are sex crimes where there is a murder involved as well.

The price to this society is unbelievable. It has only begun to be quantified. But to put it in a context, it works like this: $65 billion worth of illegal drugs is costing our economy $35 billion-plus a year, just the victims of murder, negligent homicide, and to lock up those who do the same, $35 billion.

The value of the entire oil industry of Mexico is $28 billion. We pay more for murder victims and negligent homicide victims here in the United States and plus locking them up than all of the oil revenue of a pretty good oil-producing country the size of Mexico.

And then, additionally, another $8 billion a year just to guard our southern border. And on top of that, there will be a report coming out very soon, if it is not out already, that shows that remittances is a term they use. This is a transfer of wages from mostly immigrants here in the United States, some illegal, some legal, out of the United States. That number has been going up incrementally year by year, and last year it was $45 billion a year that was transferred out of the United States in remittances, or usually wire transfers, back to home countries.

This report that is due to come out if it is not out now will show $60 billion transferred in the last year, $30 billion of it going to Mexico, $30 billion of it going to other places in the western hemisphere, but usually the lion's share of that goes into Central America and the Caribbean.

So when you look at the dollars transferred out of our society, $60 billion being sent out by labor, $65 billion paying for illegal drugs, $35 billion to pay for the cost of violent death, and $8 billion to guard the border, you can see, I think, Mr. Speaker, how massive this burden is here for the taxpayers and the victims of crime here in the United States.

And one thing that I have always wondered about crime victims is that if society really paid that whole cost, if we had to write the check for the $35 billion or so that it costs for victims, the violent death in America at the hands of criminal aliens, if we had to write the check for that, the taxpayers would be outraged if it were a line item on an appropriations bill here in the United States Congress.

But, instead, it isn't quite like that. There are costs picked up by the taxpayers, investigations, prosecutions, incarcerations. We pick those up. But the real costs comes out of the lives of the people who are their victims in great huge whopping chunks of their lives, their future, for their families, their productivity, and leaves a hole that can never be healed again.

That is the burden that is all of this, and the injustice of it comes from the psychology that the State is the one that is wronged and the crime victim is made whole when the State believes that they are whole. And the crime victim in this country by our process is seldom made whole, and as a matter of fact, maybe is never made whole.

So we have a big problem here in America. But sometimes there are faces that need to be identified, too, Mr. Speaker, and so I have gathered up some of the faces of these perpetrators. When I stand here and say 9,264 violent deaths in America, that is kind of faceless. I would point out, too, though, that maybe people were skeptical of my numbers. Maybe they think that those numbers are too high. I would ask, what are your numbers? Produce those.

But here is another way of looking at it. Violent death in America is 4.28 out of every 100,000 people. Violent death in Mexico is 13.2 out of every 100,000. That is a good, solid three times the violent death rate in Mexico as it is the United States.

Now, Mexico happens to be one of the more peaceful countries south of us. If you go to Honduras, their violent death rate is nine times that of the United States. And I don't know what El Salvador's is, they don't publish that. But when you get to Colombia, their violent death rate is 15.4 times the violent death rate of the United States. And, on top of that, the people that are coming in from those countries are young men. Young men will commit more than twice as many violent crimes as any other demographic group, in fact, significantly more than that.

And they are coming from countries that are more violent, and they are bringing drugs from those countries to the tune of $65 billion. So there is crime and violence associated with the drugs; there is crime and violence associated with young men. There are young men coming from countries that are far more violent than in the United States. And when you sit down and do the math and calculate out, if you were going to predict the crime results here in America, you would find, Mr. Speaker, that the 28 percent that are incarcerated in our prisons today that are criminal aliens probably don't represent the overall crime impact on the United States society.

But to personalize this a little bit, I have brought a few of the faces of these evil perpetrators down here to the floor. This, being one of the more evil. This is the face of Santos Cabrera Borjas. He is a 22-year-old, was a 22-year-old illegal alien from Honduras, that country that has got nine times the violent death rate of the United States. They can live with a lot higher level of violence.

Here is the kind of violence you get with one of these people. On June 4, 2006, Borjas murdered an innocent 9-year-old boy named Jordin Paudler of Georgia by hacking him to death with a hatchet. Borjas was in a car that was driving through the neighborhood, it had a wobbly wheel, and this young 9-year-old boy Jordin Paudler called out to the car and said, You have got a bad wheel on your car, being helpful, like young boys will do, like a lot of good Americans are. And Santos Cabrera Borjas got out of the car and attacked this young 9-year-old boy with a hatchet and twice split his forehead with a hatchet and left it in, as I understand it, all because he tried to help.

This is an example, and I will bring many of these examples to the floor as time unfolds, Mr. Speaker, and this is one of the faces of evil. There are many, many faces of evil. We have a big debate in front of us. I thank you.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of illness.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and March 6 on account of official business.

Mr. EDWARDS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of medical reasons.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and March 6 on account of official business.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today through March 8 on account of official business.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of a family medical matter.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and March 6 on account of official business.

Mrs. BONO (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Mr. LATOURETTE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. TIAHRT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and March 6 on account of attending a funeral.

Mrs. EMERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

## 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. CARNAHAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CARNAHAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and March 6 and 7.

Mr. SHADEGG, for 5 minutes, March 6.

Mr. AKIN, for 5 minutes, March 6.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, March 6.

Mr. SALI, for 5 minutes, March 6, 7, and 8.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today and March 6, 7, 8, and 9.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and March 6, 7, 8, and 9.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, March 6, 7, and 8.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, March 7.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 6, 2007, at 10:30 a.m., for morning hour debate.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

680. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA [COTP San Francisco Bay 06-020] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

681. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Evergreen Point Bridge, Lake Washington, Washington [CGD13-06-029] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

682. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone: USAV CANEY, Port of Ponce, Puerto Rico, United States [COTP San Juan 06-087] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

683. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Captain of the Port Sault Ste. Marie Zone, Cheboygan River, Cheboygan, MI [CGD09-06-045] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

684. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Dogue Creek, Fairfax County, Virginia [CGD05-06-090] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

685. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Pier 66, Seattle, Washington [CGD13-06-013] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

686. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; St. John's River, Jacksonville, FL to Ribault Bay [COTP Jacksonville 06-045] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

687. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Waters Surrounding U.S. Forces Vessel SBX-1, H1 [COTP Honolulu 06-004] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

688. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone Regulation; Naples Beach, FL [COTP St. Peterburg 06-043] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

689. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; San Francisco Bay, CA [COTP San Francisco Bay 06-010] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

690. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; St. John's River, Jacksonville, FL [COTP Jacksonville 06-058] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

691. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30529; Amdt. No. 465] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

692. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30523; Amdt. No. 464] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

693. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30524; Amdt. No. 3195] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

694. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, Weather Takeoff Minimums; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30521; Amdt. No. 3192] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

695. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, Weather Takeoff Minimums; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30525; Amdt. No. 3196] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

696. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30526; Amdt. No. 3197] received February 27,

2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

697. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, Weather Takeoff Minimums; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30527; Amdt. No. 3198] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

698. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30528; Amdt. No. 3199] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

699. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, Weather Takeoff Minimums; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30493; Amdt. No. 3166] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

700. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30495; Amdt. No. 461] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GEORGE MILLER: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 493. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of genetic information with respect to health insurance and employment; with an amendment (Rept. 110–28, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD: Committee on House Administration. H. Res. 202. A resolution providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Tenth Congress; with an amendment (Rept. 110–29). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 720. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorized appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 110–30). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 493. Referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than March 23, 2007.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 1308. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to permit States the option of coverage of legal immigrants under the Medicaid Program and the State children's health insurance program (SCHIP); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 1309. A bill to promote openness in Government by strengthening section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ALTMIRE:

H.R. 1310. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive the late enrollment penalty under such part for 2006 and 2007 and to fully subsidize any such penalties subsequently imposed for part D subsidy-eligible individuals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BERKLEY (for herself, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. HELLER):

H.R. 1311. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Alta-Hualapai Site to the city of Las Vegas, Nevada, for the development of a cancer treatment facility; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California):

H.R. 1312. A bill to expedite adjudication of employer petitions for aliens of extraordinary artistic ability; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MICA, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 1313. A bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to obtain a statue of Constantino Brumidi for display in the Capitol Visitor Center; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 1314. A bill to provide that only certain forms of identification of individuals may be accepted by the Federal Government and by financial institutions; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HERSETH:

H.R. 1315. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide specially adaptive housing assistance to certain disabled members of the Armed Forces residing temporarily in housing owned by a family member; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. MANZULLO):

H.R. 1316. A bill to provide institutions of higher education with a right of action against entities that improperly regulate intercollegiate sports activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1317. A bill to establish a demonstration project to train unemployed workers for employment as health care professionals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 1318. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to repeal the authority for agent or attorney representation in veterans benefits cases before the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 1319. A bill to authorize an additional use of the property containing the Mount Olivet Cemetery in Salt Lake City, Utah, that was conveyed by the United States to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association in 1909, to authorize the reconveyance of the property subject to certain use restrictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 1320. A bill to protect important existing television band devices in the unassigned, non-licensed television channels from harmful interference from new devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 1321. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve payments under the Medicare clinical laboratory fee schedule; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. McCARTHY of New York, Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 1322. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide emergency protection for retiree health benefits; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. SALAZAR (for himself and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 1323. A bill to authorize a major medical facility project for the Department of

Veterans Affairs at Denver, Colorado; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 1324. A bill to urge the Secretary of State to designate the Quds Force, a unit of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps, as a foreign terrorist organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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 Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 1325. A bill to require the Government of Iraq to match, dollar for dollar, the amount of United States assistance awarded for the reconstruction of Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 1326. A bill to promote openness in Government by strengthening section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. WATSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut):

H.J. Res. 39. A joint resolution proclaiming Casimir Pulaski be an honorary citizen of the United States posthumously; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the Tuskegee Airmen; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SHULER, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution calling on the Government of Uganda and the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) to recommit to a political solution to the conflict in northern Uganda and to recommence vital peace talks, and urging immediate and substantial support for the ongoing peace process from the United States and the international community; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H. Res. 210. A resolution commending the Appalachian State University football team for winning the 2006 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I-AA Football Championship; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky:

H. Res. 211. A resolution recognizing and supporting the long distance runs that will take place in the People's Republic of China in 2007 and the United States in 2008 to promote friendship between the peoples of China and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H. Res. 212. A resolution recognizing and honoring the 70th Anniversary of the founding of the National Association for College Admission Counseling; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WYNN (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H. Res. 213. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a United Nations Emergency Peace Service capable of intervening in the early stages of a humanitarian crisis could save millions of lives, billions of dollars, and is in the interests of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 12: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 20: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 23: Mr. COHEN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. DOYLE, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 36: Mr. BOOZMAN and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H.R. 111: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BARROW, and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 122: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 171: Mr. RUSH, Mr. WYNN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 180: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 197: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. FARR, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KAGEN, and Mr. GRAVES.

H.R. 211: Mr. SESTAK and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 241: Mr. GRAVES.

H.R. 269: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 277: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 279: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 294: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 303: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 325: Mr. HONDA and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 333: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. SHULER, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 349: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 359: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 368: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. WAMP, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 380: Mr. GORDON, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 388: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 410: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 411: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 440: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 468: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 489: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 491: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 493: Mr. WYNN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 503: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 508: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 511: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 566: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 612: Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 621: Mr. EVERETT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 625: Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 627: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 634: Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. BEAN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. SPACE, Mr. WAMP, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. WU, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 645: Mr. OLVER and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 654: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 663: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 664: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 670: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 675: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 684: Mr. KAGEN.

H.R. 695: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KIND, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 698: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SPACE, Mr. GORDON, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 711: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 719: Mr. CRAMER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. POE, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 720: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GILLMOR, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 722: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 723: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 728: Mr. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 729: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 743: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 760: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. SPACE.

H.R. 787: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 790: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 797: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 801: Mr. KAGEN and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 808: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 811: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 819: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. KAGEN, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 854: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.

H.R. 857: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 874: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 875: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 886: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 901: Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 942: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 947: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 962: Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 985: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 995: Mr. SPACE and Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 998: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1012: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 1013: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1026: Mr. POE.
H.R. 1034: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 1055: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 1061: Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 1063: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia and Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 1077: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1085: Mr. WALBERG, Ms. FOXX, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1086: Ms. FOXX and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1108: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. DENT, and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 1126: Mr. AKIN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 1132: Ms. CARSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. KIND, Ms. LEE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 1137: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 1154: Mr. REYES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mr. WELDON of of Florida.
H.R. 1155: Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 1187: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1188: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1192: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1228: Ms. NORTON and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 1246: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1250: Mr. DREIER.
H.R. 1254: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1255: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1261: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 1272: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1281: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1283: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KIND, Mr. BONNER, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. STARK, and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 1298: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1303: Mr. CLAY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1307: Mr. CARNEY.
H.J. Res. 9: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H. Con. Res. 9: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. MCHUGH.
H. Con. Res. 43: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H. Con. Res. 71: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H. Con. Res. 75: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H. Res. 37: Mr. RUSH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 67: Mr. ENGEL.
H. Res. 100: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FILNER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H. Res. 107: Mr. BOREN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. LINDER.
H. Res. 111: Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H. Res. 117: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H. Res. 118: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H. Res. 119: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 121: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H. Res. 136: Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HARE, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H. Res. 137: Mr. RANGEL.
H. Res. 143: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Ms. KAPTUR.
H. Res. 146: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H. Res. 149: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Ms. CLARKE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. CARSON, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BEAN, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H. Res. 171: Mr. GORDON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H. Res. 175: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H. Res. 179: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia and Mr. WAXMAN.
H. Res. 185: Mr. HONDA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H. Res. 186: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. WEINER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. FARR, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H. Res. 196: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. REYES, Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. FARR.
H. Res. 197: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LEE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. TOWNS.
H. Res. 208: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H. Res. 209: Ms. CASTOR.