

there are at least 4.6 billion people on the planet with a lower standard of living than the citizens in Mexico, at least 4.6 billion. Are we going to open our gates up at our ports of entry and bring the people in, any willing traveler, might be the way the President would phrase it? And the answer to that should be no.

We can have compassion in a lot of ways, and one of them is to promote the American way of life around the globe. Be proud of who we are, be proud of our culture, be proud of our civilization, be proud of our history, be proud of the sacrifice of our Fore Fathers, be proud of the sacrifice of our current generation that's so proudly defended us around the world in the last 5 years.

But we needed to preserve our destiny. We need to reject amnesty, Mr. Speaker, and so I think that it's essential that we build the wall and we hold together the rule of law and we preserve the middle class and remember who we're about and what we are as a people.

By popular demand, I have occasionally demonstrated the construction of a wall so the people can understand, Mr. Speaker, how it can be done. I sat down and created a design for a concrete wall because I believe that it's harder to breach a concrete wall than it is a steel fence, and I think it's cost-effective.

□ 2300

But I want to describe what I have designed here.

Whenever we build for a fence or a wall, we need to have a foundation underneath it. There will be people that will try to dig underneath it, so I designed a slip-form concrete form.

This would go in a trench. You would set a trencher in here with a specially made grading machine that would trim this out and pour this concrete footing with a notch in it, trench and pour the footing as you go, so the hole didn't have a chance to cave in. As we poured this we would just drive the machine along and it would be trenching and pouring concrete, so there would be a cured foundation for the wall that would be completed as the trench and slip-form machine moved on.

This is what it looks like from the end. This would be what it looks like from the top, the notch in the top, and that groove there, it will be obvious where I put that. So as that trench is moved along, and the foundation of this wall sets like this, then I would bring in precast concrete panels. These panels would be about 13½ feet tall, and they could be about any width, but proportionately it looks like 6 to 8 feet. We could go wider, we could go 10 feet.

Perhaps once this was cured, even the next day, come along with truckloads of precast concrete panels. They would sit on the truck like this, pick those up with a crane, swing them into place, set them down right into the notch of the foundation. Just this simple.

It would take a little bit longer, but not appreciably longer to throw this all together in this fashion. It would be constructed 12-foot high precast panel, slip-form concrete wall. It would look a lot like that. I would set that down within about 3 feet inside the border. I put some wire on top here, stabilize this thing and provide it as a deterrent.

With concrete, you can mount anything on top for sensors. You can do cameras, vibration, motion detectors, you could mount any kind of new technology on top of this concrete. It wouldn't be possible to take a cutting torch through here. If you brought a concrete saw in to cut a notch through it, the noise and the vibration would be transferred down the wall, and our sensor devices would likely pick it up, or we could deploy some Border Patrol to that location.

But as you could see, I would go inside also another 100 feet, and I would put a mesh fence up, even taller than this, so that there will be essentially a no man's land in between the wall and the fence.

There are a lot of designs that would work. This is only one design, but I designed this and put the structure of this together, and I can put the estimate together too. This can be installed for about \$1.3 million a mile.

Now, somebody was complaining about the cost of this. What is it, gold plated? Well, you can build a four-lane Interstate for about \$4 million a mile, but that's what we are paying the Border Patrol to watch the border right now.

Now, I appreciate the work that they do, and I respect the work that they do, and I support them. They need better tools to work with. This is one of them that can be helpful. This is one of the components, or a version of fence and wall is one of the components to the Secure Fence Act.

This Congress has mandated that that fence be built, and we appropriated money to it last week to the tune of \$1 billion. The year before, we appropriated \$1,187,565,000 just to round it out to even dollars. We appropriated about \$2.2 billion to building the Secure Fence Act, and that includes money for technology, for virtual fence, as well as real fence.

We need to stop the flood at our southern border. We need to dramatically slow the flow of illegal drugs across that border. It will reduce the amount of crime perpetrated and committed against Americans. It will save lives. It will save at least hundreds of lives. It will probably save thousands of lives.

It will be cost effective, and it will send a message that America is a sovereign Nation that will protect its borders, and that we will direct traffic, human traffic and contraband, through the ports of entry. We will need to beef up our ports of entry. We need to have more Customs and Border Patrol people there, and more sophisticated devices there.

But if we can't stop the bleeding at our border, there is no amount of enforcement that we can do in the interior that will be effective. The best description I have heard is the description by Dr. PHIL GINGREY, a Congressman from Georgia, who has worked the emergency room. His description is if you have a patient come in the emergency room when they are bleeding all over the place, and they are bleeding from multiple wounds, and they are bleeding all over the floor, the first thing you don't do is grab the mop and the bucket and start to clean it up. You stop the bleeding. That's what you do.

We have a tremendous amount of bleeding on our southern border. We have got to stop the bleeding, stabilize the patient, and then we can have a debate on how to clean up the mess. It is a tremendous mess here in the United States, because the Federal Government hasn't enforced the immigration laws to the level it needs to, and that has been an open permission slip that has been granted now to a number of the employers who have taken advantage of it. They have hired the cheap labor.

The third thing is birthright citizenship, automatic citizenship that is a magnet for 350,000 pregnant mothers every year who come here to have their children in the United States. It's not a constitutional right, it's a practice to grant them citizenship here because they are born in the United States. Those things work against our sovereignty. Those things work against the middle class, those things would be against the rule of law.

I am going to continue to advocate that we construct this double fence of wall on the southern border, that we complete it and we follow through on the congressional mandate, and we insist that the administration follow through. We need to do border enforcement first, employer enforcement second. When we get those things done, we will have stopped the bleeding and shut off birthright citizenship as the other bleed. Then we could have a debate in this Congress about how to clean up the mess, and it is one, one tremendous mess.

That's my advocacy, that's my policy, that's where I stand.

I appreciate the privilege to address you tonight.

### 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for the remainder of the time until midnight.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to come before the House once again. I am glad to be here with my good friend Mr. ALTMIRE.

As you know the 30-Something Working Group, we come to the floor weekly, talk about issues that are facing the Nation, and also give a report on

what's happening and what's not happening. We are hoping to do good things on behalf of the American people, and we hope that we can build a relationship with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Republican side of the aisle, to help pass the American agenda.

Mr. ALTMIRE and I usually have some opening comments, and then we usually get into a conversation about some of the issues that we are facing this week, about some of the ongoing issues.

Over the weekend, I took the opportunity, because Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. RYAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. MURPHY, who are part of the 30-something Working Group, we do meet, and we talk about issues that we want to bring before the Members.

I can tell you there are 47 major measures that have passed this floor with a bipartisan vote of 79 percent, so that means that 75 percent of the issues that have passed this floor have had bipartisan support.

I see that we have one of our charts here to show, under the Democratic Congress, that Republicans all along, we were saying in the 109th, 108th Congress, some of them really wanted to vote for the priorities of America and move this in a new direction.

But obviously the Republican leadership in the 109th, 108th, going back even further, did not want to bring those issues to the floor. But when they were brought to the floor, the 9/11 Commission Recommendations, H.R. 1, passed with 299 votes with 68 Republicans voting affirmative; raising the minimum wage, H.R. 2, again, passed 315, passed with 315 votes here with 82 Republicans voting along with Democrats.

The funding to enhance stem cell research, H.R. 3, 257 and 37 Republicans; making prescription drugs more affordable, H.R. 4, 24 Republicans joined the majority of Democrats, passing that measure by 255; cutting student loan interest rates in half, H.R. 5, 356 votes in favor, passed the House with 124 Republicans joining the Democratic leadership on that vote.

□ 2310

And creating long-term energy initiatives, H.R. 6, 264, with 36 Republicans.

And Mr. Speaker, I think it's also important to be able to outline the fact that we want to move in a new direction. And so far, the President has signed the following: The first increase in the minimum wage in almost a decade, which will take effect on July 24 of this year. This is not fiction; it's fact. And it will be fully phased in. It will mean a raise of \$4,400.

And also, we passed tax incentives to be able to help small businesses; \$3.7 billion in additional emergency funding for veteran and military health care. This is \$3.4 billion in additional funds for military readiness also, including armored vehicles and also to

meet the National Guard shortfalls that they have been experiencing over some time.

Emergency funding to keep hundreds and thousands of children in 11 States from losing their health care. That's very significant.

Overdue funding to repair and complete flood areas of Louisiana and Mississippi, and also, assisting other gulf coast communities, schools and universities to rebuild and recover from Hurricane Katrina Rita and also Wilma.

Overdue disaster aid to American families and ranchers, more than 80 percent of the funding that they were looking for they were able to receive through this Democratic Congress.

Emergency wildfire funding, to be able to assist communities that have been waiting on Federal response, and also benchmarks for the Iraqi government and requiring the President to report the progress of the war to the Congress more than two times.

I think it's important to also state the many of the things that we've done here in the House, Mr. Speaker, without needing Presidential approval. We restored pay-as-you-go budget discipline for the first time in 6 years in Washington and received praise from major fiscal watchdog groups.

Also, passed a budget balanced by 2010 with no more deficit spending and no taxes after 2 years of Republican leadership failure to agree on a budget.

I think it's also important that we outline that we've imposed very strict ethics rules in the history of the House; also guaranteed that the House will operate as a green Capitol. I'm glad we have the chair of the Appropriations Committee that deals with the House, House Administration with us, the chairwoman.

Also, the Speaker has convened a National Summit on America's Children, and we're beginning to link Federal policy and law and cutting-edge research as relates to bring development; and also restored Congressional oversight, saving tens of millions of dollars that are being wasted here.

I think it's important that we also outline that stem cell research bill, supported by two out of three Americans, which offers hope for many, many families, is sitting on the President's desk right now waiting for action, Mr. Speaker.

And also, a bill ending the politicizing of the appointments of U.S. attorneys.

I can go on and on, but I think, as it relates to an opening, I think we're off to a great start, Mr. Speaker. And I think it's also important for the Members to realize that, for us to not only end the war in Iraq, but for us to be able to fulfill the dreams and the needs of the American people and those that are in harm's way, that we have to move in a bipartisan way. And when we can't move in a bipartisan way, then we have to take the majority of this Democratic majority that we have now to be able to get 218 votes to be able to carry out the will of the people.

Later on, since Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ has joined us, and I know Mr. ALTMIRE has something to add, too, I want to talk a little bit about the President's address, the President's radio address, because I think it's important that we address these issues as they come up. We should not allow any statement or any speech to go unchallenged because I think the American people, it's time for them to be leveled with. And I can't wait until this thing rolls around again, when we get into open discussion, because this is the good part about the 30-Something Working Group is that we do get an opportunity to kind of volley the ball around.

Mr. ALTMIRE, Happy Father's Day, belated Father's day, sir.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Thank you. Same to you. I had a wonderful Father's Day with my two children, and I'm happy to be back on this Monday night. And I did want to add some levity to the evening, because people watch late night television. We're here; it's after 11:00. And the gentleman perfectly set me up by talking about the President's radio address. So I wanted to read a quote from the President's radio address that, for those that know history and for those that don't, I'm going to remind them of some of the history. They're going to find this quote to be quite entertaining. And this is the President's radio address.

"In the weeks ahead, my administration will continue pushing for earmark reform and holding the line on Federal spending. The American people do not want a return to the days of tax and spend policies. They expect accountability and fiscal discipline in Washington, D.C."

Now, certainly, we don't disagree with that statement, but for those that understand the history of this administration, they can understand why some of us might be amused to hear the President saying such a thing, because I would remind my colleagues, if they need reminding, that prior to President Bush taking office, the 4 years immediately before his term, his first term, we had had 4 consecutive years of budget surplus, surpluses that were forecast as far as the eye can see.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office scored the 10-year projection of surplus at over \$5 trillion of surplus.

So President Bush comes into office, there's every reason to expect these surpluses are going to continue.

Well, what have we seen in the 6-plus years that this President has been this office? Well, we've seen six consecutive budget deficits, deficits that before the Democrats retook control of Congress, were forecast as far as the eye can see. And this has been the biggest spending administration in over the past 6 years before this year, the biggest spending Congresses in the history of this country.

So for the President to get on the radio and come before audiences and lecture the Democrats on fiscal responsibility, and I would re-read that last

statement on what he says the American people expect, "They expect accountability and fiscal discipline in Washington, D.C."

Well, over the course of that 6 years, the President added \$3.5 trillion to the national debt. Now, keep in mind what I said earlier, that the projection before he took office was, over the 10-year period, we would have over \$5 trillion in surplus. But, instead, in just 6 years, he had an \$8 trillion turnaround, from \$5 trillion on the plus side to \$3 trillion on the deficit side.

And I would suggest, if you had said to an economist going into that term, figure out a way that this is possible, how can a President, using economic policy, working with the Republican-controlled Congress, have a \$8 trillion swing from surplus to deficit, most economists would have said, oh, that's impossible. You can't possibly mismanage the economy in such a way that you could have that poor of an outcome. Well, unfortunately, we have.

So here, again, to have this President lecture this Congress on fiscal responsibility is simply inconsistent with the facts.

He also references earmarks in the appropriations process. And we do have Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ here, a member of the Appropriations Committee. And I know she will have something to say about this as well.

But I wanted to remind my colleagues about the history of the 12 years that the Republicans were in control of this House, from 1995 through 2006. Well, for that 12-year period, the 12 budget cycles that we had, I don't know if any of my colleagues would like to venture a guess, how many times in those 12 years do you think the Republican Congress finished the appropriations process on time? How many times were all the appropriations bills completed by October 1, which, under statute, is the beginning of the fiscal year?

The gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Would it be none?

Mr. ALTMIRE. Zero. That is correct.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. That would be none.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Zero times in 12 years. Now, interestingly, you'd say, well, it must be difficult to do then. Maybe it's not often that we're able to do this. Does the gentlewoman from Florida wish to venture a guess on the last time that the budgets were all completed on time and the appropriations were completed by October 1 in their entirety?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. ALTMIRE, at the risk of being the little girl who shoots her hand up in the first row of the classroom, that would be the last time Democrats were in control right before the 1994 switch from majority to minority.

□ 2320

Mr. ALTMIRE. Right. In the 1994 year, the Democratic Congress, the last

year the Democrats controlled Congress, the Democrats were able to complete all the budget bills, all the appropriations bills on time. The last time it has happened. Then we had 12 years of Republican rule in this Congress, in this House, and we had 12 consecutive years where the appropriations bills were not completed on time.

So it should be no surprise to any of my colleagues and other outside observers that the Republicans are not anxious to see the Democrats come back into power and right away pass all 12 appropriations bills in a timely fashion. So I was not surprised, and I suspect others were not surprised, to see the extraordinary delaying tactics that we saw take place in this House last week, with continual and repeated procedural motions, motions to rise.

And those of us that sat here at 2 o'clock in the morning on that night, we realized that this was not about substance. This was not about policy. This was merely about denying the Democrats a legislative victory because the last thing those on the other side would want is for us to come in and right away pass the appropriations bills on time, which hasn't happened since 12 years ago when we last controlled Congress.

And, lastly, the President mentions earmarks. His quote again: "In the weeks ahead, my administration will continue pushing for earmark reform."

Well, what has been the history of earmarks under the Republican Congress? Let's go back to that 12-year period, and I know the gentlewoman knows the answer; so I will spare you the question this time. In 1994, that last year that the Democrats controlled Congress, there were 4,000 earmarks, approximately, in all the spending bills combined for \$26 billion. That is what they represented. Now, that sounds like a lot and it is a lot. It is a lot of earmarks and it is a lot of money.

Well, let's compare that to last year, the last year the Republicans controlled Congress. These were the people, you recall, that last week were decrying the use of earmarks and talking about how unfair it was how the Democrats were approaching it, and we have a President now who says he is going to continue pushing for earmark reform, "continue" being the operative word there. Well, when you hear the word "continue," let's think about what happened last year. Now, recall in 1994, 4,000 earmarks, \$26 billion. Last year, 2006, 16,000 earmarks, unprecedented, the highest in the history of the country, \$64 billion of earmarks, compared to \$26 billion in 1994.

So here again, please spare us the lecture about fiscal responsibility and accountability in the appropriations process and certainly as it pertains to earmarks. We have had, over the past 6 years of this administration and over the past 12 years of Republican leadership in this Congress, the biggest-spending Congress and administration

in the history of the country. They spent more money, they ran up bigger deficits, they used more earmarks for more money than any Congress and any administration in the history of the country. So please forgive me if I view with skepticism some of the President's comments over the weekend.

And at this time I will now turn it over to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Mr. ALTMIRE.

And I am going to maybe abbreviate my view on what happened last week and just call it what it is: hypocrisy.

Where were our good friend on the other side of the aisle when they controlled this process for 12 years? And I am not going to spend a lot of time on the process because that is all they have because if they allow the debate to turn to the substance of the legislation, the substance of the appropriations bills that we are moving forward and will pass off this floor, with the vast majority of them supporting it because they have to, because when they admit that the substance of the legislation that we are putting forward in the Homeland Security bill, in the military construction bill, in the other bills that will be coming forward to this floor, they have to admit that not only are they good bills but they go much further and do a much better job of providing for the needs of this country than they ever did.

On the floor last week, I took an opportunity to spend a few minutes debating the process with them. One of the things that I had an opportunity to engage in debate on was where was their outrage on the other side when they controlled this process? Where were the reformers, leaping to their feet, urging and pounding on their leadership to adopt transparency and to adopt a process in which they could have the maximum amount of input into earmark reform?

The answer is it was nonexistent because they didn't care about it. It didn't matter to them. They were very happy fat and happy to take all the earmarks they could get, bring them home, tied up with their lobbyists and their friends and their culture of corruption, all twisted up and intertwined, and that is what their process was like. And our process is clear and transparent and participatory and inclusive, and they can't stand it. So what they have to do is they have to try to muck up the perception of what we are doing here because if they acknowledge what is really going on, not only have we adopted a more inclusive, more transparent process when it comes to earmark reform, but the substance of our legislation they have to support because they know that we are going much further than they did.

I want to go beyond process, though, to President Bush's veto threat of the Homeland Security appropriations bill. He actually has threatened to veto this bill, which is just absolutely astonishing. And one of the things that I

have heard him articulate, Mr. MEEK and Mr. ALTMIRE, is that if the Congress proposes to spend \$1 over what he proposed in his administration's budget that he would veto any of that legislation. And that includes the Homeland Security bill, which provides for the homeland security needs for our border protection, for our first responders, for the 9/11 Commission recommendations that we passed in the first bill out of this Chamber during our 100-hour push for the Six in 06 agenda, and the President is actually proposing to veto a bill that would ensure that we spend more money on protecting our homeland domestically.

You know, you can argue process and earmarks and reform and all that. But at the end of the day, that is the stark contrast that people of this country have to choose from. When they go to the polls next November and when they evaluate how they think a Democratic Congress is doing versus how a Republican Congress did, at the end of the day, we are passing a Homeland Security appropriations bill that will really provide for the domestic homeland security needs, as opposed to continuing to twist us up and mire us in the war in Iraq with an endless, open-ended commitment that never proposes to get us out of there.

On top of that, we have a President who has been critical of a military construction bill that will provide for the largest single increase in veterans' health care in history. I mean this is how backwards their priorities are. Under the Republican control, their goal was to help lobbyists, was to make sure that they brought home as many earmarks that were pushed by lobbyists as they could. And, instead, what we are doing here is we have transparency, where people will know, anyone can know, who is sponsoring an earmark, where any Member can offer an amendment to strike an earmark, where any Member can offer to sponsor an earmark. Members will be able to participate in the conference process, which you would think that that would be a normal thing, but it wasn't normal under the Republicans because you couldn't even participate as the minority in the conference process.

□ 2330

But at the end of the day, all of that has been a deliberate distraction because they can't argue with the content of our appropriations bills because they are much stronger and go much further and do more for the country than they did. They don't win that debate. They don't win a head-to-head, toe-to-toe debate on the substance, so they have to try to distract people with the process. And that is what I am hopeful that we can get into in this 30-Something hour and future special order hours that we participate in, because what we need to make sure we focus on is the substance of our legislation, because they would like nothing better than to twist us up in debate on process.

Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, what they say and what we do are two different things. And the good thing about it is that right is on our side and the American people are on our side, be it Republican, Democrat, independent, those that are thinking about voting, those that may be voting for the first time in the 2008 elections. I think it is very important to lay the facts out, and that's what we are doing here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, we go through a great deal of work to make sure that we actually give facts, not fiction. And we know that there is a lot of fiction on this floor. That's what I would call it. And there is another word to call it, but I would just call it "fiction" to be honorable in this Chamber. But I think it is also important for us to just take the President's words for what they are. I am reading from his radio address, and this week, the President said the tax-and-spend approach is endangering the economic growth. And balanced budget efforts, mark "efforts," balanced budget efforts, that's what he's calling it, that's what the President is calling it, as it relates to the budget, saying they have passed a budget that would mean higher taxes; put another line under "higher taxes" because I want to come back to that; for American families and job creators, put a line under that.

I think it's important, just in that paragraph alone, Mr. Speaker, for me to just dissect that for a moment. Let me just work on that paragraph just for a moment. It's just a paragraph within many, but it's at the beginning of the President's speech. I think it's important, as we start looking at fact versus fiction, I mean, we need to have a segment in the 30-Something group, fact versus fiction, because I think it's important that we do away with the fiction, because we have two wars going on. We have a country that's begging for health care. We have children that we were about to lose their health care if it wasn't for the action of the Democratic majority here to be able to push that effort along and put it on the President's desk for him to sign.

Now, let's just start with the whole piece of endangering and taxes. Listen, I'm on the Ways and Means Committee, and unless there is a meeting that I missed or several days that I missed from Congress, I haven't seen anything that dealt with a tax increase. And I would challenge anyone from the White House or from the minority side of this Chamber to point out somewhere, anywhere, where taxes are being increased. Okay. That's what I thought. I think it is very, very important that we pay very close attention to what's being said here on this floor.

I think it's also important for us to underline "budget balancing efforts." People, Mr. ALTMIRE, they don't want an effort; they want it to happen. Okay? One of the first things we did

without the President's approval, thank God we didn't need it, to say that we're going to move pay-as-you-go rules and that we are no longer going to borrow from foreign nations. As soon as I can get my chart over here, I will pull it over, of how much money we have borrowed from foreign nations, Mr. Speaker, more than ever before in the history of the republic. As a matter of fact, I have my old chart here. I will use this one, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. For folks here in the Chamber, you know that this is an old chart. And I am really fond of this chart. The rubber stamp is in my office under lock and key because somehow my velcro chart somehow grew legs and it went somewhere. And I don't know where it is, Mr. ALTMIRE, but I think it's important that we find that chart. I'm going to put pictures around the Capitol. Have you seen the out-of-control borrowing that the Bush Administration and Republican Congress were able to do in the past?

Remember this chart here? And it talked about, it went all the way through 2005? Well, I am going to draw a line through that right now. And I know that we are going to have a new chart here on the floor, because our good people that work with us here, the new number that comes at the end of the 109th Congress and the Republican Congress, this number is no longer 1.50; it is now \$1.0019 trillion that the President Bush and the old Republican Congress passed under the rubber stamp policy of the Congress of the past, but not now; \$1.01 trillion, 42 Presidents before this President and the past Republican Congress, and between the two, they were able to borrow from foreign nations, these are foreign nations who I have outlined on the next chart, \$1.0019 trillion. Historical. Never happened before. No one can point to World War I and World War II.

Who are we borrowing from that we are putting a stop to here in this Democratic Congress? Let's just start with Japan at \$644.3 billion. Let's look over at China, Red China of all places, at \$349.6 billion. These numbers are old. Many other countries are involved in this. And, you know, that is just one sentence.

Then we move on, "They have passed a budget that will mean higher taxes for American families and job creators." Now, I have already addressed the issue of higher taxes. Taxes have not been raised.

So for the President to say this means that it's fiction. That's the word I choose. Job creators. Who's he talking about? Must be talking about Big Oil. I guess they're creating all kinds of jobs. I know there are a lot of people that are trying to figure out how they are going to get to their job, paying the high prices.

And look at the profits. Wow. And it's funny, remember that little thing I talked about, the meeting at the White House, and Vice President CHENEY with the executives, and then all of a sudden

the energy bill was written? And it was almost like every oil executive, somehow they figured out the six numbers to the Lotto. That Lotto happened to be the payoff by the American people. And their stock went skyrocketing up. In 2002, the profits were \$6.5 billion in profits. And look, 2007, \$30.2 billion, and you're paying almost \$3 at the pump. I wonder who the job creators are. And we took some of these incentives and give-aways away, or so-called incentives, that were just tax give-aways of the taxpayers' money back into finding alternative fuels.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I will yield, yes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Let's zero in specifically on what we did compared to what they did. If you recall, that was the energy bill that they held open for 40 minutes longer than our normal time limit so they could twist enough arms to get the votes to ensure that they could give the oil companies \$14 billion in subsidies, give them those subsidies in the face of world record profits. Now, you know, we support profit. Profit is a good thing. Profit is not a bad word; it's a good thing. But when you are doing what they did, which was forgive the royalties that the oil industry would have been required to pay the Federal Government; they are supposed to pay the Federal Government to use the land that they drill on in exchange for the oil that they pull out and make a profit on. And the Republican majority gave away the \$14 billion and said, no, no, no, very profitable oil industry, that's okay, you don't have to pay us. Just put that in your pocket, no problem. And what we did, as part of our 100-hour agenda in the Six in '06 bills that we passed when we first became the majority is we passed a bill that repealed those \$14 billion in give-aways and said, what we are going to do with that money is we are going to use it to fund alternative energy research so that we can make sure that we truly make a commitment to wean ourselves off of our addiction to foreign oil, which were nice words that the President said in the State of the Union last year, but then promptly he signed that energy bill that gave \$14 billion in subsidies away to the oil industry. So I just wanted to jump off that poster because it really needed to be zeroed in on.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You know, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and thank you for yielding back.

Mr. ALTMIRE, this is why we come to work, this is why we, Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker, to be able to point out, and I love this whole fact versus fiction. You know, this is probably going to be my new top ten because I think it's important that we outline these issues. Because the American people, hopefully what we are sharing with them, it's fact. Now, folks start writing speeches and start saying, well,

what sounds better or using words like efforts, you know "efforts" is open-ended.

□ 2340

Well, you know, I make a great effort to do some things around the house. But eventually I will get around to them. Well, we are dealing with the Federal Treasury, and it is not some sort of slush fund. That is the way it has been treated. We are talking about accountability.

I also want to point out Mr. Bob Novak, I don't think I am on his Kwanzaa list and he is not on mine, but he is one of the most conservative writers here in this town and well-known, and I appreciate his work, and we see him moving around on Sunday talk shows.

This is interesting. "Bush veto strategy." This is in the Washington Post. Just in case, we like third-party validators. We want you to go on, we want Members to be able to go on WashingtonPost.com. And this was June 18. It was actually on A-17, if you have an old copy of the Washington Post.

I will go down to paragraph three, where it talks about Bush was the first President since John Quincy Adams not to exercise his veto power during the complete 4-year term, even though the Republican-controlled Congress was on a spending spree.

All right, we have heard of shopping sprees. You look in the dictionary, let's just do it. Let's do it because we can. Let's do it because we can borrow from foreign nations and put this country in a posture that it has never been in before.

He has two bills in his second term, rejecting only the Iraq war bill, since the Democrats took control.

Let me just say this. One of them was that. Let me just point that out, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ALTMIRE. It is important that we outline that, that we outline the fact that the President has had a rubber-stamp Congress, and that even the conservative writers are saying, wait a minute. All of a sudden now you want to be Mr. Veto. You want to send a letter to the Speaker of the House saying if you go \$1 over my projected budget and I am going to veto the bill, even if it means healthcare for children, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, even if it means better healthcare for our veterans that are coming back and that are here and that are waiting in line 8 or 9 weeks to see the ophthalmologist, which is not what they signed up for and not the promise that we gave them. Even if it means that school districts will not have the money that they deserve as it relates to the Federal dollar.

The bottom line is I wish the President and I wish the Republican side had the kind of courage to stand up to corporate America when they were giving away all of the taxpayers' money during their spending spree. This is now what I am saying. This is what Bob Novak is saying.

I think it is also important to note that one of our Republican colleagues took enough time to get 147 votes against the Homeland Security bill, an appropriations bill, and also it is important that we point this out, because this was done to be able to say that we can withstand a veto. I think it is 146 that is needed to make sure that we can override the President if we need to override him.

The last point I want to make on this topic, you know I always have a number of points, but after we passed the bill that the American people wanted, date on redeployment of when troops will be redeployed out of the field and letting the Iraqi government know we will not be in the middle of a civil war forever and ever and ever, and passed this House and it passed the Senate. And before the President could even get to it, Republicans marched down to the White House, had lunch, and came out and said, "We stand with the President in not overriding his veto. We say that we stand with the President."

That is what the Republicans said. Not one Democrat was at the White House. I want to know how many more times that Republicans are going to go down to the White House and stand with the President. Are they going to stand in front of VA Healthcare? Are they going to stand in front of universal healthcare for children? Are they going to stand in front of everything that we came to Congress to do? And I talking about Democrats and Republicans?

And I am just going to say it, not every Republican went to the White House, but enough to be able to stop us from doing the business of the people of this country. And I think it is important that we outline these issues. Go to WashingtonPost.com.

There is an old saying out there, if I am lying, I am flying. The bottom line is this: It is right here. I didn't write it. Mr. Novak wrote it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. If the gentleman will yield, I am so pleased. We are all pleased that we have been joined by Mr. ALTMIRE and the 40 other Democratic freshmen in his class who are majority makers who came to Congress to help us move this country in a new direction and make it possible to move this country in a new direction.

The stark contrast you are talking about, where you have tired old, same old, do business as shall Republicans standing with the Republican standing with the President, supporting his veto, his suggestion that he would veto the Homeland Security appropriations bill.

Now, I sit on the Appropriation Committee so I know what is in that bill and had an opportunity to comment on it and participate in it, and I am proud to have supported it.

But I would like Mr. ALTMIRE, given that he is part of the new direction Democrats and our freshmen class who brought us to this point, to outline for us, let's talk just exactly what the

President is talking about vetoing. Let's outline that for folks.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I appreciate the gentleman and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

I did want to make clear, just for anyone who is watching this debate, that all of these bills that the President is threatening to veto over spending are compliant with pay-as-you-go policy. That is critical.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You are not borrowing and you are not taxing, am I correct?

Mr. ALTMIRE. It means we as the Congress are doing the same thing the American people have to do in their own home. Checkbooks, you have to have money on one side of the ledger if you want to spend it on another. That is something this Congress has not done.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Were PAYGO rules, in other words, not spending more than you are taking in, were those in place before Democrats took over the Congress?

Mr. ALTMIRE. They came into place in the 1990 budget agreement.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I mean just a few months ago, before November 7, in the 109th Congress.

Mr. ALTMIRE. They were allowed to expire, and that led to the record deficits of the past 6 years that I talked about earlier.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And who reinstated the PAYGO rules to make sure that we didn't spend more money than we took in?

Mr. ALTMIRE. On our very first day in Congress, it was this Congress that reinstated the pay-as-you-go. As a result, all of these appropriations bills that the President is threatening to veto, for the first time in 6 years, these appropriations bills are compliant with PAYGO. They say simply, as I said, you have to have money on one side to pay for it on the other. If you want to increase spending, or decrease revenue, for that matter, you have to find an offset to pay for it on the other side of the ledger. That is what the President is talking about vetoing.

Specific to the Homeland Security appropriations bill, which we passed last week, I just wanted to talk a little bit about immigration. Boy, we hear a lot about immigration, around the country on talk radio. I am sure each of you in your Florida districts hear about it. I can promise you in my Western Pennsylvania district, I hear more about immigration than I hear about any other issue, and there is not even a close second.

It is an important issue. It is an issue for a lot of people that we have illegal immigrants coming across the border. And for anyone who is talking about this Homeland Security bill that is concerned about that issue, I want to tell you that in this bill we have money for fencing.

The speaker before us had his prop out where he was showing about building a fence along the border. This bill has money to build the fence.

This bill has money for new technologies for detection of immigrants, illegal immigrants coming across the borders.

This bill has increased border agents and security agents that are able to enforce our laws, 3,000 new border agents along our southern border with Mexico.

It has new detention beds. We have a catch-and-release program where we don't have the capacity to hold on to folks that we are catching on the southern border, so we simply release them. This bill has money to stop that practice with new border agents and new detention beds.

So for anyone that is watching this debate that is concerned about immigration and thinks we need to secure the borders, we agree, and we passed a bill to make that happen. That is the bill the President is threatening to veto.

We also have port and aviation security measures. We have a situation where as a result of 9/11 we have to be very concerned about our aviation security, certainly, and our port security. We have money in this bill to increase our security on both of those. That is what the President is threatening to veto.

We have increased the money available for first responders. The President cut by 55 percent firefighter funding. So anyone who is concerned about firefighters, can you think of a more worthy commitment for our Federal spending priorities than the brave men and women who put their lives on the line every single day here at home to keep us safe and are doing it on a voluntary basis through the fire department?

The President cut that funding by 55 percent in his budget. Well, we restored that, because our priorities say that we should find that money, and through pay-as-you-go we did find the money to pay for that. But we put that money back in for our firefighters and our police, our first responders.

Lastly, before I turn it over to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, who can speak as a member of the Appropriations Committee, this is so important. This bill ensures our tax dollars are spent wisely with the requirement for competitive bidding on contracts.

Now, anyone who has followed what happened in the Homeland Security arena over the past several years, and certainly that includes Katrina and the fiasco that took place with the no-bid contracts thereafter along the Gulf Coast, knows how important it is to ensure that our tax dollars are spent in a responsible and fiscally rational way.

□ 2350

We do that through the requirement that we do competitive bidding on contracts which has been in very short supply over the past 6 years.

So that is what is in this bill. We secure our borders. We put money into detection and prevention and detention of illegal immigrants. We secure our aviation, our airplanes and our air-

ports. We secure our ports. We put money in for first responders. That is what the Homeland Security bill does, and that is what the President is threatening to veto.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman outlining what the President has been threatening to veto.

I want to take it a step beyond the Homeland Security appropriations bill and outline a few of the other bills all related to homeland security that the President has also threatened to veto. Tonight what we aim to show, fact versus fiction, is basically who is for homeland security and who is just kidding, who is just talk, who is just a lot of hot air, versus who is supportive of putting forward substance.

The only thing I can think of in terms of a reason that you have these veto threats and suddenly the President discovers ink in his pen, never having threatened a veto in his first 6 years, instead of an "R" next to the idea there is a "D" next to the idea. Now this is from a person who has talked a really nice story about being bipartisan and working with the Democratic Congress. This is how he has been proposing to work with the Democratic Congress: proposing to veto the Homeland Security appropriations bill which has a lot of very important issues that went unaddressed by the Republican Congress.

Also, threatening to veto the 9/11 Commission recommendations which was his own 9/11 Commission. We just passed that bill in our Six in 06 agenda with a vote of 299-128. And that would fully implement the 9/11 Commission recommendations.

The Homeland Security authorization bill which is the statutory provisions in Homeland Security that go with the appropriations bill, he has threatened to veto that. That authorizes \$40 billion for the activities of the Department of Homeland Security and includes strong accountability measures which were nonexistent under the Republican majority.

He has threatened to veto the rail and transit security bill, H.R. 1401, which requires the Department of Homeland Security to develop plans to protect rail and mass transit and authorizes \$6 billion over 4 years in grants to protect those systems. We don't have a system in place to protect rail and mass transit.

In south Florida, we don't have a really strong mass transit system. You do in the major populations across the country. How many times have you been on a train and been checked or gone through security? There are no security measures around our rail system. We proposed legislation to do that, and the President is threatening to veto that.

The Dubai Ports bill, maybe people have forgotten about the proposal that the administration was completely supportive of and allowed to sail through their FISA process that would

have allowed essentially a state foreign-owned company to own port terminals in America. I mean, that just sailed through the administration's process. They basically ignored Federal law and allowed it to happen. We passed a law to tighten that. That passed 423-0. No threat to veto there. We weren't going to allow that situation to continue. We need to ensure foreign countries do not own our port terminals and further undermining our security in America.

Now we have passed the military construction appropriations bill that would ensure that we have the largest single increase in veterans health care in American history, in addition to the Wounded Warrior Assistance Act which responds to the Walter Reed scandal, also ignored by the Republicans. That passed 426-0, but it took Democrats to pass that legislation.

Really what this is about is who is for homeland security and who is just talk; who is for homeland security and who is just kidding. At the end of the day, actions are what speak louder than words. It is what you learned in kindergarten: Follow what people do, don't just listen to them talk, talk, talk. We have to show the American people what the Democrats are trying to accomplish that Republicans and this President is trying to block.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I just want to remind our colleagues who are with us tonight and watching us tonight that this is about preventing the Democrats from a legislative victory. It is not about the budget because this is compliant with pay-as-you-go rules.

I was amused in listening to the gentlewoman from Florida when I thought about what one of the major Republican Presidential candidates said recently, "The Democrats don't understand terrorism." The gentlewoman went through a very lengthy list of things that we have done here in the first 6 months on homeland security and on terrorism, and the fact that the President is threatening to veto many of those initiatives.

I would ask the question rhetorically, who among us, the Democrats or Republicans, don't understand terrorism? I think we are the ones putting forward initiative after initiative after initiative compliant with PAYGO rules to prevent terrorist attacks, as much as it is possible to do that, and to address these issues in a way that has not been done. It has languished for years.

The 9/11 Commission recommendations were put forward in 2003. Here we are 4 years later. September 11 took place nearly 6 years ago. We still have not implemented the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, and that is indefensible.

I would just say to anyone who says it is the Democrats who don't understand terrorism to take a look at the list that the gentlewoman has put forward that we have done in only 6 months after these initiatives have languished year after year.

Mr. Speaker, I tell my colleagues, for more information, if they would like to learn, of course you can go to Speaker.gov/30something, or there is now a link on the Speaker's Web site to the 30-something Working Group of which the three of us are members as well as Mr. MURPHY and Mr. RYAN and others. So that site is www.speaker.gov, click on the 30-something icon and you can learn more about the issues and see the charts, even the gentleman's Velcro chart which is now missing.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And you can e-mail us as well.

Mr. ALTMIRE. That is 30somethingDems@mail.house.gov.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I would like to thank Mr. ALTMIRE and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Mr. Speaker, we have to remember that \$2 billion-plus a week are being spent in Iraq as we are here trying to resolve issues that we don't have money to resolve them.

Also I think it is important, at the top of the hour I meant to give this report, but as of this morning, June 18, 2007, at 10 a.m. the death total in Iraq is 3,517. Wounded in action and returned to duty is 14,283. Wounded in action and not returning to duty is 11,667. I think it is important that we share that with the Members constantly.

Mr. Speaker, I am also asking Members, I am trying to find a picture and I have been looking high and low for somebody to e-mail us a picture of this great White House meeting that the President had with the Republicans standing behind him saying they won't participate in overriding his veto of accountability in Iraq. I need that picture because we need that to be a chart so that we can discourage our friends on the other side of the aisle from going down and standing in the schoolhouse door on behalf of the majority of Americans' priorities.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and June 19 until 6:00 p.m.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Ms. ESHOO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for June 7 after 3 p.m. and June 15 after 4 p.m.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of travel delays due to weather.

Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of travel delays.

Mr. SULLIVAN (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of long-standing family obligations.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, June 25.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 25.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, June 19 and 20.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, June 19, 20, 21 and 22.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KUHL of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 19, 2007, at 9 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:

2236. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on a transaction involving U.S. exports to Israel pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2237. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the Nevada State Implementation Plan, Washoe County District Health Department [EPA-R09-OAR-2006-0619; FRL-8327-3] received June 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2238. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Allocation of Essential Use Allowances for Calendar Year 2007. [EPA-HQ-OAR-2006-0159; FRL-8325-5] (RIN: 2060-AN81) received June 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2239. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Revisions to the Nevada State Implementation Plan; Request for Rescission [EPA-R09-OAR-2006-0590; FRL-