United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 19, 2007 No. 47

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 19, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CORRINE BROWN 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 Maryland, the majority leader, Mr. STENY HOYER.

AFTER FOUR YEARS, NO MORE BLANK CHECKS

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, 4 years ago tonight, our Commander in Chief, President Bush, gave the orders that instigated Operation Iraqi Freedom. Whether they supported the President's decision or not, all, and I emphasize ''all'' patriotic Americans prayed for our success as well as the safe return of our brave service men and women. And 4 years later, we still do. However, today our success in Iraq is as elusive as it ever was and has ever been over the past 1,460 days. More than 3,200 American soldiers have given the ultimate measure of sacrifice, and more than 24,000 have been injured. The American taxpayers have spent more than $400 billion on this war, and the President asked for an additional $245 billion, including a $100 billion wartime supplemental spending bill that will be considered on the floor later this week. And thousands of Iraqis have been killed, while literally millions have fled to neighboring countries, triggering a refugee crisis.

Yet despite the sacrifice and hardship, how much progress has been made? Just last week, the Department of Defense reported record levels of violence and hardening sectarian violence in the fourth quarter of 2006, stating, ''Some elements of the situation in Iraq are properly descriptive of a civil war.''

Administration officials themselves admitted last week that political goals that were to have been met by the Iraqi government this month will take significantly longer to achieve, said the administration. The National Intelligence Estimate tells us the war has increased the global terror threat rather than reduce it. And General Schoomaker, the Army Chief of Staff, has issued strong warnings about the effect of this war on America's overall military readiness and our ability to respond to emerging strategic threats. Indeed, IKE SKELTON of Missouri, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, said that the situation with respect to America's readiness of its Armed Forces is grave and troubling. Meanwhile, the American people have wearied of administration claims that are divorced from reality. ''Mission accomplished'' and ''the insurgency is in its last throes'' are just two of the assertions that have proved, sadly, very badly mistaken.

From the outset, the administration refused to commit a force commensurate with the threat it articulated, and now it asks for patience while a fourth troop escalation seeks to accomplish what three others could not. It profoundly miscalculated the cost of this war. It went to war without a plan for postwar stabilization and security. And perhaps most egregiously, the administration sent our troops into battle without proper equipment.

Madam Speaker, given the repeated miscalculations by the administration over the last 4 years, and given the situation on the ground in Iraq, today it is past time, way past time for the United States Congress, the people's representatives, to insist on accountability and a new direction in Iraq.

As one who supported the authority of the President of the United States to remove Saddam Hussein, and in listening to the President's State of the Union when he said not one of us who voted voted for failure, that was accurate. I certainly did not vote for failure. And I want success and seek success, but the administration's policies have not garnered success. Therefore, more blank checks and questioning obeisance by this Congress would constitute, in my opinion, a dereliction of our responsibility and our constitutional duty. Thus, this Congress, for the first time in 4 years, will have the opportunity this week to change America's course in Iraq and to insist that the Iraqis take control of their own destiny.

The U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act offers the best way forward in Iraq. I urge Members of both sides of the aisle to support it. And I would call the attention to many of our Members to a vote in June of 1997, where so many Members on the Republican side of the aisle voted to set a timetable, set a date certain for withdrawal or exit strategy in amendments sponsored by Mr. BUYER of Indiana in which all the present leaders of the Republican

Party who were in the Congress at that time voted for.

In short, the legislation that will come before us is saying much the same, but after 4 years of a lack of success, why do I say a lack of success? Secretary Gates in his confirmation hearing said that we are not winning in Iraq. That was just a few months ago, and he was right. Again, I would reiterate in my opinion because we have never, not at the outset, not over the last 4 years has this administration deployed assets sufficient to meet the challenge. This legislation is designed to protect our troops, requiring troop deployment to adhere to the Defense Department's current standards for training, not new standards, not new timelines, not new requirements, but the Department of Defense currently articulated standards to keep our troops safe, trained and well equipped, standards for equipment and armor, with the President required to certify if he believes the Nation's security requires DoD standards be waived. None of us want to stand in the way if a crisis is imminent and deployment must be accomplished. However, all of us want to see our troops safe, equipped and trained.

The bill also holds the Iraqi government accountable, measuring its performance by the benchmarks President Bush outlined in his January 10 speech, again, the President's benchmarks, not those imposed by Congress, but the administration's own benchmarks for the Iraqis.

In addition, the legislation provides a responsible strategy for a phased redeployment of U.S. forces, provides greater protections for our troops and veterans, and refocuses our efforts on fighting al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan.

There are those of course who will claim that this legislation attempts to micromanage the war. They are wrong. There is nothing in this legislation that will be considered this week that micromanages this war. Neither General Petraeus nor any of his commanders on the ground or at CENTCOM will in any way be constrained from the tactics or the strategies that they deem best to employ on the ground in Iraq. The only strings attached are those benchmarks and standards endorsed by the President himself, our Commander in Chief. And let me add, is there anyone who believes that Congress would be strongly asserting itself today if the President's policy was succeeding. The answer, I think, is clear.

This legislation is the justified response of the people's representatives to a policy that is failing and a President who insists that we must continue to stay the course. There is not a new policy here. As I said before, we have increased troops on three different occasions. Unfortunately, lamentably, it did not bring the stability and security that it was planned to bring.

There are others who will argue that this bill will compromise our position in the war on terror. To them I say that this legislation goes above and beyond the President's funding request, supporting our troops deployed at the tip of the spear, and reaffirming our commitment to fighting and defeating al Qaeda. And there certainly are those who will argue that this bill doesn't go far enough, that even one more day of fighting is one too many. To them I say respectfully that this legislation for the first time sets a date for the responsible redeployment of American troops from Iraq. It is not tomorrow, it is not the day after, but it is a date, a date that provides the Iraqis with the time they need to ready themselves for the responsibility they must assume.

Madam Speaker, the Iraq war is already longer than our participation in World War I, World War II and the Korean War. The specter of 5½ years in Iraq, if our troops remain deployed until August 31, 2008, can hardly be called a precipitous cut and run.

As we enter the fifth year of this war, let us insist on a policy designed to achieve success. As we enter the fifth year of this war, let us respond to the plea of the American people for a new direction in Iraq. And as we enter the fifth year of this war, let us demonstrate to the world that American strength and American wisdom are not set in opposition. I urge my colleagues, vote for a new direction in Iraq, support the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act.

Mr. President, I did not vote for failure. I pray for the safety of our troops and for their success, but I also strongly believe that the legislation we will bring to this floor on Thursday is a reasoned, thoughtful way forward, a way forward that was initially suggested by the Iraq Study Group, five Republicans and five Democrats, headed up by former Secretary of State and adviser to this administration and previous administrations, James Baker. It is time that the Congress of the United States does not simply rubber-stamp the President's request, but on behalf of the American people exercises its best judgment to make policy for a change, to make policy for success, and make policy to ensure victory against those who would terrorize Americans, terrorize our Nation, and terrorize the rest of the world through the employment of their terrorist acts.

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 45 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 (Ms. WATSON) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Lord of goodness and harbinger of peace, be with the Congress of the United States this week. Guide decisions that will resist evil, establish good order, and strengthen relationships between people of good will. May the impulse toward reconciliation empower Members that they may lead this Nation to transform unjust structures and restore respect for the dignity of all men and women created in Your likeness.

Lord, through rational argument, may our government and others across the globe reawaken the spiritual energy in people that is needed to become true promoters of peace and justice throughout the world. We pray, calling upon Your Holy Name, 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 her approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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.

HEAR YOUR GENERALS, MR. PRESIDENT, AND END THE WAR IN IRAQ

(Ms. SHEA-PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. We are at the anniversary of the beginning of the war in Iraq. Things are not going well. Our troops are strained. Our generals are speaking to the President of the United States, who does not seem to be listening. I would like to read this to the President of the United States on this day.

General Peter Pace, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was asked last month by a House panel whether he was comfortable with the preparedness of Army units in the United States, he stated simply: ''No, I am not comfortable.'' Mr. President, that is one of your generals. General Peter Schoomaker, Army Chief of Staff, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee on Thursday: ''We have a strategy right now that is outstripping the means to execute it.'' Mr. President, that is one of your generals.

The Army Vice Chief of Staff, General Richard Cody, described as

''stark'' the level of readiness of Army units in the United States which would be called on if another war breaks out. The readiness continues to decline of our next-to-deploy forces, Cody told the House Armed Services Committee Readiness Panel last week.

Mr. President, hear your generals and end this war now.

IN SUPPORT OF VICTORY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, as we stand here today, the Iraqi people enjoy a freedom and sense of self-government they were not afforded 4 years ago. Since the United States originally liberated the Iraqis, they have established a democracy, ratified a constitution, and elected a representative government. Such rights were denied under the totalitarian regime of Saddam Hussein.

General David Petraeus, the new commander of coalition forces in Iraq, is an expert in fighting insurgencies by murderers who defy laws of war. Our military officials have made necessary adjustments, and we are seeing signs of progress. Cutting funding, limiting reinforcements and setting artificial timetables only serve to undermine this end. Together, as Democrats and Republicans, we must achieve victory in Iraq to achieve victory in the global war on terrorism to protect American families. We must face the terrorists overseas, or we will face them again in the streets of America.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF HON. RICK LARSEN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Luke Loeffler, Community Representative, Office of the Honorable Rick Larsen, Member of Congress:

OFFICE OF RICK LARSEN,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 12, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the Municipal Court of the City of Bellingham, Whatcom County, Washington, for testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

LUKE LOEFFLER,
Community Representative.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. RICK LARSEN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable Rick Larsen, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 15, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a subpoena, issued in the Municipal Court of the City of Bellingham, Whatcom County, Washington, for testimony in a criminal cases.

I do not appear to have any relevant or material testimony to offer. Accordingly, after consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoenas is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

RICK LARSEN,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Don Kellaher, Assistant Sergeant at Arms, Office of the Sergeant at Arms, U.S. House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 19, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with an administrative subpoena for testimony issued by the Office of Compliance of the U.S. House of Representatives.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by House Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

DON KELLAHER,
Assistant Sergeant at Arms.

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.

RECOGNIZING IMPORTANCE OF HOT SPRINGS NATIONAL PARK ON ITS 175TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 138) recognizing the importance of Hot Springs National Park on its 175th anniversary.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 138

Whereas the concept in the United States of setting aside a nationally significant place for the future enjoyment of its citizens was first implemented 175 years ago in Hot Springs, Arkansas, with the creation of the Hot Springs Reservation, which protected 47 area hot springs;

Whereas the Act that created the Hot Springs Reservation, entitled ''An Act authorizing the governor of the territory of Arkansas to lease the salt springs, in said territory, and for other purposes'', approved April 20, 1832 (4 Stat. 505), required that ''the hot springs in said territory, together with four sections of land, including said springs, as near the centre thereof as may be, shall be reserved for the future disposal of the United States, and shall not be entered, located, or appropriated, for any other purpose whatever'';

Whereas the Hot Springs Reservation was the first protected area in the Nation;

Whereas the Act creating the Hot Springs Reservation preceded both the establishment of the Department of the Interior in 1849 and the establishment of Yellowstone National Park as the first national park in 1872;

Whereas the Hot Springs Reservation was renamed Hot Springs National Park in 1921 and became America's 18th national park; and

Whereas the tradition of preservation and conservation that developed into the National Park System, which now includes 390 units, began with the Act that created the Hot Springs Reservation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That on this 175th anniversary of the Act of Congress that created the Hot Springs Reservation, the House of Representatives recognizes the important contribution of the Hot Springs Reservation and Hot Springs National Park to the history of conservation in 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. Madam 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. House Resolution 138, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, Representative MIKE ROSS, would express a recognition by the House of Representatives of the importance of the Hot Springs National Park on its 175th anniversary.

Most people know that Yellowstone is our first national park, but more than 40 years before Yellowstone was established as a park, Congress set aside 2,529 acres in the Ouachita Mountains of Arkansas to preserve 47 hot springs located there.

The law was enacted at the request of the General Assembly of the Territory of Arkansas and signed by President Andrew Jackson on April 20, 1832. That made the Hot Springs Reservation the first nationally protected parkland.

The reservation was turned over to the Department of the Interior when

that Department was established in 1849. However, it took another quarter of a century, a ruling from the U.S. Supreme Court, and the protection of Federal troops to settle the bogus land claims and chase off overeager entrepreneurs seeking to make profit from the springs. Notably, the 1916 Organic Act which established the National Park Service mentioned only the Hot Springs Reservation by name, even though by that time several other national parks and monuments had been designated by Congress. The Organic Act placed all these units under the supervision, management, and control of the new agency.

On March 4, 1921, Congress elevated Hot Springs to a national park status, apparently with the personal interest of the first director of the National Park Service, Stephen Mather.

Bathhouse Row, the Hot Springs street lined with opulent bathhouses and hotels, was added to the National Register of Historic Places on November 13, 1974. The most elegant of these bathhouses, the Fordyce, has since been adapted to use as a visitor center and museum.

The park currently totals 5,550 acres and attracts over 1 million visitors a year. The park plans a 175th anniversary celebration on Friday, April 20; and this resolution will be a fitting commemoration of the role Hot Springs played in National Park history.

Madam Speaker, I want to commend and congratulate my colleague, Representative ROSS, for his commitment and leadership on this matter. We strongly support the passage of House Resolution 138 and urge its adoption by the House.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

House Resolution 138 was adequately explained by the majority, and we support this resolution and we urge its adoption.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield as much time as he may consume to my colleague from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Thank you, Chairman GRIJALVA.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 138, a resolution honoring and recognizing the importance of Hot Springs National Park on its 175th anniversary. I am pleased that the entire Arkansas congressional delegation is supporting and cosponsoring this bipartisan bill.

April 20, 2007, will mark the 175th anniversary of Hot Springs National Park in Hot Springs, Arkansas. This resolution will write into history the important role that Hot Springs National Park has played in the formation of the Department of the Interior and the National Park System.

The very idea of setting aside special places in the United States for the future enjoyment of its citizens originated in Hot Springs, Arkansas, when on April 20, 1832, President Andrew Jackson and the United States Congress established Hot Springs Reservation to protect the 47 hot springs in Garland County, Arkansas. That year, Hot Springs Reservation became the first protected area in the Nation and was the only Federal area mentioned by name in the act that established the National Park System.

The Hot Springs Reservation was then officially renamed Hot Springs National Park on March 4, 1921, becoming America's 18th national park, joining many other national landmarks.

For more than 200 years, Hot Springs National Park has remained an area of exceptional beauty and magnificence. People have used the hot spring water and therapeutic baths to treat a variety of ailments, and the reservation eventually developed into a well-known resort nicknamed ''the American Spa.'' Well, today Hot Springs National Park protects eight historic bathhouses, and the Bathhouse Row area in Hot Springs National Park is a national historic landmark district that contains the largest collection of bathhouses of its kind in North America. It provides visitors from around the country and the world with leisure activities such as hiking, picnicking, and scenic drives and remains a national treasure to be enjoyed by generations of Americans.

□ 1415

Hot Springs National Park has played a crucial role in the formation of the United States National Park System. I am proud to sponsor a resolution commemorating its 175th anniversary, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of House Resolution 138 today.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam 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 agree to the resolution, H. Res. 138.

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. Madam 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.

MORE WATER AND MORE ENERGY ACT OF 2007

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 902) to facilitate the use for irrigation and other purposes of water produced in connection with development of energy resources.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 902

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE, FINDINGS, AND PURPOSE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''More Water and More Energy Act of 2007''.

(b) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Development of energy resources, including oil, natural gas, coalbed methane, and geothermal resources, frequently results in bringing to the surface water extracted from underground sources.

(2) Some of this produced water is used for irrigation or other purposes, but most of it is returned to the subsurface.

(3) Reducing the amount of produced water returned to the subsurface, and increasing the amount that is made available for irrigation and other uses—

(A) would augment water supplies;

(B) could reduce the costs to energy developers for disposing of such water; and

(C) in some instances could increase the efficiency of energy development activities.

(4) It is in the national interest to remove or reduce obstacles to use of produced water for irrigation or other purposes in ways that will not adversely affect water quality or the environment.

(c) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to facilitate the use of produced water for irrigation and other purposes without adversely affecting water quality or the environment, and to demonstrate ways to accomplish that result.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) PRODUCED WATER.—The term ''produced water'' means water from an underground source, that is brought to the surface as part of the process of exploration for or development of oil, natural gas, coalbed methane, or any other substance to be used as an energy source.

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

(3) UPPER BASIN STATES.—The term ''Upper Basin States'' means the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

(4) LOWER BASIN STATES.—The term ''Lower Basin States'' means the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada.

SEC. 3. IDENTIFICATION OF PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Director of the United States Geological Survey, shall conduct a study to identify—

(1) the technical, economic, environmental, legal, and other obstacles to increasing the extent to which produced water can be used for irrigation and other purposes without adversely affecting water quality or the environment; and

(2) the legislative, administrative, and other actions that could reduce or eliminate such obstacles.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall report to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate regarding the results of the study required by this section.

SEC. 4. IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) GRANTS.—Within existing authorities and subject to the availability of funds appropriated for the purpose, the Secretary shall provide financial assistance for the development of facilities to demonstrate the feasibility, effectiveness, and safety of processes to increase the extent to which produced water may be recovered and made suitable for use for irrigation, municipal or industrial uses, or other purposes without adversely affecting water quality or the environment.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—Assistance under this section—

(1) shall be provided for—

(A) at least one project in one of the Upper Basin States other than New Mexico;

(B) at least one project in either New Mexico or one of the Lower Basin States other than California;

(C) at least one project in California; and

(D) at least one project in Texas;

(2) shall not exceed $1,000,000 for any project;

(3) shall be used to pay not more than 50 percent of the total cost of a project;

(4) shall not be used for operation or maintenance of any facility; and

(5) may be in addition to assistance provided by the United States pursuant to other provisions of law.

SEC. 5. CONSULTATION, ADVICE, AND COMMENTS.

In implementing this Act, including preparation of the report required by section 3 and the establishment of criteria to be used in connection with award of financial assistance pursuant to section 4, the Secretary shall—

(1) consult with the Secretary of Energy, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and appropriate Governors and local officials;

(2) review any relevant information developed in connection with research carried out by others, including research carried out pursuant to section 999 of Public Law 109–58, and to the extent the Secretary considers advisable include such information in the report required by section 3;

(3) seek the advice of individuals with relevant professional or academic expertise and of companies or individuals with industrial experience, particularly experience related to production of oil, natural gas, or other energy resources, including geothermal resources; and

(4) solicit comments and suggestions from the public.

SEC. 6. RELATION TO OTHER LAWS.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as superseding, modifying, abrogating, or limiting—

(1) the effect of any State law or any interstate authority or compact with regard to any use of water or the regulation of water quantity or quality; or

(2) the applicability or effect of any Federal law or regulation.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated—

(1) $1,000,000 to implement section 3; and

(2) $5,000,000 to implement section 4.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

Madam Speaker, I would like to commend our colleague, Representative MARK UDALL, for his hard work on this issue.

As many of us know, clean water is one of the most precious commodities in the West. The bill before us, H.R. 902, has a promise of providing more clean water to western communities.

In oil and gas fields with thousands of producing wells, millions of gallons of so-called produced water will be brought to the surface along with oil or gas. To those who operate oil and gas wells, produced water is a waste product. In some cases, the produced water can be injected into the wells to force more oil to the surface. If the water quality is good enough, a well operator might be allowed to discharge the water down the nearest stream, but there may also be opportunities to treat the water and make it useful for irrigation or even domestic purposes. H.R. 902 authorizes a study of the opportunities and the obstacles to beneficial and environmentally safe use of this produced water.

I again commend Mr. UDALL for his hard work on this legislation. In the 109th Congress, the Subcommittee on Water and Power held a hearing on similar legislation. This legislation was subsequently passed by the House. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am here to support H.R. 902 introduced by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL). I have cosponsored legislation authorizing the Department of the Interior to study the potential use of extracted water from oil and gas production for irrigation and other purposes.

It will not surprise anyone in this Chamber that water is the most important resource in the West. Water is the lifeblood of the American West and the foundation of its economy. Yet it is also the scarcest resource in some of the fastest-growing areas of the country. But we can go beyond that and declare that water is the most strategic asset in the entire world. It may surprise some in this Chamber that the potential source of good-quality water lies just beneath the surface and is being wasted every day.

During the process of oil and gas development, approximately 924 billion gallons of water is extracted throughout the year, with most of that water being pumped back underground. Some significant share of that water is already being used for irrigation and livestock watering, but converting just 1 percent more of that total to additional beneficial use would yield over 75 billion gallons of more usable water for irrigation, ranching, fish and wildlife enhancement, stream augmentation or drinking water. The produced water that contains the lowest concentration of total dissolved solids, or TDS, less than 10,000 parts per million, is found in the western United States where water is a critical resource.

Often the largest hurdle to beneficial use of water produced from oil and gas production is finding the technology to accomplish water treatment in a cost-effective manner. Water treatment must compete with the lower-cost option of deep well injection. And while deep well injection is the most environmentally sound method of disposal, it forgoes the opportunity to use millions of gallons as a resource.

Beneficial use of this water in these arid environments will be a win-win situation for the energy industry, water consumers, and oil and gas consumers. This legislation will facilitate the potential use of this abundant water for irrigation uses and other beneficial purposes. It could potentially help us find new water from what is now a virtually untapped water resource.

I thank the gentleman from Colorado for introducing this legislation, and urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, let me begin by first thanking the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) for his excellent explanation of what is in this bill. I will not repeat all of the details of this bill, but the bottom line of this legislation is that America needs energy, America needs clean energy, and America needs clean water.

My district in central and north Texas basically is in the heart of one of the largest natural gas fields in American history, the Barnett Shale, and we are blessed to be in that situation where we are producing natural gas for not only Texas citizens, but families and businesses throughout the country.

Natural gas is one of the cleanest forms of energy for this country to run our factories and to heat our homes. Because it is priced on a regional basis rather than on a world basis, every extra thousand cubic feet of natural gas we can produce is going to make America more competitive in the world market by bringing those prices down.

This legislation is going to help us continue utilizing great natural resources such as the Barnett Shale by establishing pilot projects whereby we can learn how to more efficiently recycle the massive amounts of water that are used to, in effect, crack the shale,

divide the shale where this Barnett Shale field exists.

It is estimated that one well alone can require 3½ to 5 million gallons of water to basically break up that shale so we can bring the natural gas to the surface and utilize it in our homes and businesses. Right now much of that water is either being injected back down into the earth or literally carted away at great expense to be disposed of at other sites.

What a great benefit to the natural gas industry and families and businesses and communities all across America if we can recycle that water in an environmentally friendly way for the benefit of our farmers and ranchers, for the benefit of local communities that could use that water.

Seldom do we see in this House and on this floor a bill that businesses, the oil and gas industry, and environmentalists can be behind. I commend the gentleman and his coauthor, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), for having developed this legislation. It is nice to see bipartisanship on the floor of the House.

This is good for America. It does what its title says, More Water, More Energy. That is what this bill is all about. That is why I enthusiastically support it.

I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for agreeing to my request to add Texas to the possible list of pilot sites for this project. Again, the home of the Barnett Shale in Texas is, I think, the largest producing gas field today. I think it is appropriate that Texas be included in this list of potential pilot projects. This is good legislation not just for Texans, it is good for America.

I thank the gentleman and all of those involved who put this legislation together.

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Speaker, many times people have asked exactly how does this work on the ground. For instance, in my home county of Lea County, New Mexico, we have the Ogallala Aquifer. We are right at the very edge of it. And in the 50 years we have been pumping out of the aquifer, we have used about 50 percent of the water that is available to us. There is no surface water available, only that aquifer water is available. We have used 50 percent of it, and it would take 1,900 years to recharge what has been used, and so we understand that we are on the downward slide for having water available to us.

In Lea County, New Mexico, we produce over 150,000 barrels of water yearly, and that water is reinjected. If that water were available to be cleaned up, that water would be available for development, industry and jobs. It is a very important thing.

The county right next is Eddy County. Water is produced there that is fresher than water in the Pecos River, and yet law and regulation requires the disposal of that water back down into salt zones. Everyone in the West understands that at some point we are going to go back and repump that water to the surface, this time for use as water. Right now it is free at the surface. It is a by-product of the oil and gas exploration, and yet we are required to put that water back down into wells, into the salt zones, where it is going to be very much harder to clean up the next time we use it.

So this bill represents a great opportunity for us to take a step forward to benefit the industry in the West, to benefit the residents of the West, and to help lower the cost of production of oil and gas. It seems to be a win-win situation every way that we look at it.

I compliment the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Colorado for introducing this legislation.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 902, the "More Water and More Energy Act, and to express my thanks to Chairman RAHALL and Ranking Member DON YOUNG of the Natural Resources Committee for making it possible for the House to consider it today.

The bill's purpose is to facilitate the use of water produced in connection with development of energy resources for irrigation and other uses in ways that will not adversely affect water quality or the environment.

It is similar to a bill I introduced in the 109th Congress that passed the House last year but on which the Senate did not complete legislative action. It is cosponsored by Representative PEARCE of New Mexico, who is the ranking Republican member on the Natural Resources Committee's Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources and also by Representative EDWARDS of Texas. I greatly appreciate their support.

I think the bill may help change an energy-industry problem into an opportunity, not just for oil and gas producers but for everyone else who would benefit from increased supplies of useable water.

Especially in the arid west, that covers everyone—not least our hard-pressed ranchers and farmers.

The focus of the bill is the underground water extracted in connection with development of energy sources like oil, natural gas or coalbed methane. It would do two things:

First, it would direct the Bureau of Reclamation and the USGS to identify the obstacles to greater use of produced water and the how those obstacles could be reduced or eliminated without adversely affecting water quality or the environment.

Second, it would provide for Federal help in building 3 pilot plants to demonstrate ways to treat produced water to make it suitable for irrigation or other uses, again without adversely affecting water quality or the environment.

At least one of these pilot plants would be in Colorado, Utah, or Wyoming. At least one would be in New Mexico, Arizona or Nevada. And there would be at least one each in California and Texas. This is to assure that, together, the plants would demonstrate techniques applicable to a variety of geologic and other conditions.

Under the bill, the federal government could pay up to half the cost of building each plant, but no more than $1 million for any one plant. No federal funds could be used for operating the plants.

The bill's goal is reflected in its title—the "More Water and More Energy Act of 2006."

The extent of its potential benefits was shown by the testimony of Mr. David Templet at a hearing on the similar bill of mine the House considered last year.

Mr. Templet testified in support of that bill on behalf of the Domestic Petroleum Council and several other groups, including the Colorado Oil & Gas Association. He noted that produced water is the most abundant byproduct associated with the production of oil and gas, with about 18 billion barrels being generated by onshore wells in 1995.

And he pointed out that if only an additional 1 percent of that total could be put to beneficial use, the result would be to make over 75 billion gallons annually available for use for irrigation or other agriculture, municipal purposes, or to benefit fish and wildlife.

Now, remember that in the west we usually measure water by the acre-foot—the amount that would cover an acre to the depth of one foot—and an acre-foot is about 32,8560 gallons, so an additional 75 billion gallons is more than 230,000 acre feet—more water, indeed.

And at the same time making produced water available for surface uses, instead of just reinjecting it into the subsurface, can help increase the production of oil and gas.

At last year's hearing, this was illustrated by the testimony of Dr. David Stewart, a registered professional engineer from Colorado. He cited the example of an oil field in California from which an estimated additional 150 million barrels of oil could be recovered if water were removed from the subsurface reservoir. And he pointed out that where oil recovery is thermally enhanced, a reduced amount of underground water means less steam—and so less cost—is needed to recover the oil.

The potential for having both more water and more energy is also illustrated by the example of a project near Wellington, Colorado, that treats produced water as a new water resource. I had the opportunity to visit it just last week, and found it very interesting.

An oil company is embarking on the project to increase oil production while a separate company will purchase the produced water to supplement existing supplies, eventually allowing the town of Wellington and other water users in the area to have increased water for drinking and other purposes.

In view of its potential for leading to both "more water" and "more energy" I was pleased but not surprised that last year the Administration, through the Interior Department, testified that it "agrees that the goals of the bill are commendable and the needs that could be addressed are real" and that the roles the bill would assign to the Bureau of Reclamation and the USGS are consistent with the missions and expertise of those agencies.

In view of all this, Madam Speaker, I submit that this bill—and its promise of helping provide our country with both more water and more energy—deserves the support of the House, and I urge its approval.

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam 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. 902.

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.

TAUNTON, MASSACHUSETTS, SPECIAL RESOURCES STUDY ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1021) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resources study regarding the suitability and feasibility of designating certain historic buildings and areas in Taunton, Massachusetts, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1021

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 ''Taunton, Massachusetts Special Resources Study Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The city of Taunton, Massachusetts, is home to 9 distinct historic districts, with more than 600 properties on the National Register of Historic Places. Included among these districts are the Church Green Historic District, the Courthouse Historic District, the Taunton Green Historic District, and the Reed and Barton Historic District.

(2) All of these districts include buildings and building facades of great historical, cultural, and architectural value.

(3) Taunton Green is the site where the Sons of Liberty first raised the Liberty and Union Flag in 1774, an event that helped to spark a popular movement, culminating in the American Revolution, and Taunton citizens have been among the first to volunteer for America's subsequent wars.

(4) Robert Treat Paine, a citizen of Taunton, and the first Attorney General of Massachusetts, was a signer of the Declaration of Independence.

(5) Taunton was a leading community in the Industrial Revolution, and its industrial area has been the site of many innovations in such industries as silver manufacture, paper manufacture, and ship building.

(6) The landscaping of the Courthouse Green was designed by Frederick Law Olmsted, who also left landscaping ideas and plans for other areas in the city which have great value and interest as historical archives and objects of future study.

(7) Main Street, which connects many of the historic districts, is home to the Taunton City Hall and the Leonard Block building, 2 outstanding examples of early 19th Century American architecture, as well as many other historically and architecturally significant structures.

(8) The city and people of Taunton have preserved many artifacts, gravesites, and important documents dating back to 1638 when Taunton was founded.

(9) Taunton was and continues to be an important destination for immigrants from Europe and other parts of the world who have helped to give Southeastern Massachusetts its unique ethnic character.

SEC. 3. STUDY.

The Secretary, in consultation with the appropriate State historic preservation officers, State historical societies, the city of Taunton, and other appropriate organizations, shall conduct a special resources study regarding the suitability and feasibility of designating certain historic buildings and areas in Taunton, Massachusetts, as a unit of the National Park System. The study shall be conducted and completed in accordance with section 8(c) of Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–5(c)) and shall include analysis, documentation, and determinations regarding whether the historic areas in Taunton—

(1) can be managed, curated, interpreted, restored, preserved, and presented as an organic whole under management by the National Park Service or under an alternative management structure;

(2) have an assemblage of natural, historic, and cultural resources that together represent distinctive aspects of American heritage worthy of recognition, conservation, interpretation, and continuing use;

(3) reflect traditions, customs, beliefs, and historical events that are valuable parts of the national story;

(4) provide outstanding opportunities to conserve natural, historic, cultural, architectural, or scenic features;

(5) provide outstanding recreational and educational opportunities; and

(6) can be managed by the National Park Service in partnership with residents, business interests, nonprofit organizations, and State and local governments to develop a unit of the National Park System consistent with State and local economic activity.

SEC. 4. REPORT.

Not later than 3 fiscal years after the date on which funds are first made available for this Act, 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 on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study required under section 3.

SEC. 5. PRIVATE PROPERTY.

The recommendations in the report submitted pursuant to section 4 shall include discussion and consideration of the concerns expressed by private landowners with respect to designating certain structures referred to in this Act as a unit of the National Park System.

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. Madam 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. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1021 directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resources study to determine if certain historic buildings and areas in Taunton, Massachusetts, are suitable and feasible for designation as a unit of the National Park System. The bill was introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. BARNEY FRANK.

Taunton is a city rich in cultural and historic resources. The city is home to nine historic districts, with more than 600 properties on the National Registry of Historic Places. A comprehensive study of these resources will help to determine if inclusion within the National Park System is appropriate. This study will be completed in consultation with the State historic preservation officer, State Historical Society, and the city of Taunton and other appropriate organizations.

Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate Representative FRANK for his efforts on behalf of this legislation and this community. I would note that identical legislation was approved by the House in the last Congress, and we urge our colleagues to support the measure today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1430

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

H.R. 1021 has been adequately explained by the majority, and we have no objection to this legislation. We also have no other speakers.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam 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. 1021.

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.

NATURAL RESOURCE PROTECTION COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 658) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements to protect natural resources of units of the National Park System through collaborative efforts on land inside and outside of units of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 658

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 ''Natural Resource Protection Cooperative Agreement Act''.

SEC. 2. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS FOR NATIONAL PARK NATURAL RESOURCE PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this Act as the ''Secretary'') may enter into cooperative agreements with State, local, or tribal governments, other Federal agencies, other public entities, educational institutions, private nonprofit organizations, or participating private landowners for the purpose of protecting natural resources of units of the National Park System through collaborative efforts on land inside and outside of National Park System units.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—A cooperative agreement entered into under subsection (a) shall provide clear and direct benefits to park natural resources and—

(1) provide for—

(A) the preservation, conservation, and restoration of coastal and riparian systems, watersheds, and wetlands;

(B) preventing, controlling, or eradicating invasive exotic species that are within a unit of the National Park System or adjacent to a unit of the National Park System; or

(C) restoration of natural resources, including native wildlife habitat or ecosystems;

(2) include a statement of purpose demonstrating how the agreement will—

(A) enhance science-based natural resource stewardship at the unit of the National Park System; and

(B) benefit the parties to the agreement;

(3) specify any staff required and technical assistance to be provided by the Secretary or other parties to the agreement in support of activities inside and outside the unit of the National Park System that will—

(A) protect natural resources of the unit of the National Park System; and

(B) benefit the parties to the agreement;

(4) identify any materials, supplies, or equipment and any other resources that will be contributed by the parties to the agreement or by other Federal agencies;

(5) describe any financial assistance to be provided by the Secretary or the partners to implement the agreement;

(6) ensure that any expenditure by the Secretary pursuant to the agreement is determined by the Secretary to support the purposes of natural resource stewardship at a unit of the National Park System; and

(7) include such other terms and conditions as are agreed to by the Secretary and the other parties to the agreement.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The Secretary shall not use any funds associated with an agreement entered into under subsection (a) for the purposes of land acquisition, regulatory activity, or the development, maintenance, or operation of infrastructure, except for ancillary support facilities that the Secretary determines to be necessary for the completion of projects or activities identified in the agreement.

(d) FUNDING.—Funds available to carry out the provisions of this Act shall be limited to programs and amounts specified in the statute for such use in the annual appropriation Act for the National Park Service.

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. Madam 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. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 658 is an administration proposal introduced by Representative JON PORTER of Nevada. The bill would authorize the National Park Service to enter into cooperative agreements to spend Park Service funds outside of existing Park boundaries.

According to a report from the Government Accountability Office, the National Park Service is the only Federal land management agency that does not currently have that authority.

While there are several areas in which such cooperative agreements would be useful, the ability to participate in coordinated plans to eradicate invasive species in and around national parks is the primary reason that the National Park Service is seeking this authority.

Under the terms of this legislation, the National Park Service could enter into such agreements with State, local or tribal governments, with other public entities, educational institutions, private nonprofit organizations, or participating private landowners. The legislation requires that any such cooperative agreements provide clear benefits to park resources.

Madam Speaker, I would note this legislation does not authorize any new funding.

I thank my colleague from Nevada for his effort, and we support passage of H.R. 658 by the House today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 658, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 658 was introduced by the very effective Congressman from Nevada, JON PORTER, and would authorize the National Park Service to enter into a cooperative agreement with willing partners to protect park natural resources through collaborative efforts on land inside and outside of units of the National Park System. This was recommended by the Government Accountability Office, as the Park Service is still the only land management agency without this particular authority. So we expect this will help control the spread of invasive species and increase the protection of parks and wildlife.

At this point, Madam Speaker, I would like to engage the majority bill manager, Mr. GRIJALVA, in a colloquy to clarify an issue related to this bill, if he would.

I understand that the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies has brought to the committee's attention their concern that H.R. 658 not be interpreted to give the National Park Service authority to manage fish and wildlife outside park boundaries.

Management authority for fish and wildlife resources within State boundaries has customarily been held in trust by the respective States. Congress has repeatedly affirmed this. This trust responsibility has been implemented primarily through State fish and wildlife agencies. In general, these principles are expressed in relevant fish and wildlife policies of the Department of the Interior found in volume 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 24.

Can the chairman of the subcommittee please clarify that the States' existing authority to manage fish and wildlife is not affected by H.R. 658?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I thank the gentleman, and I agree with the gentleman from Utah on his description of Federal and State authorities to manage fish and wildlife resources.

I also agree that we should promote better coordination and cooperation between the Federal Government and the States to enhance our fish and wildlife resources for future generations, especially for the control of invasive species. I assure my colleague that nothing in H.R. 658 diminishes or enlarges the authority of the Federal Government or any State for the conservation and management of fish and wildlife.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his assurances, and with that, I urge adoption of the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER), the author of this very good piece of legislation.

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, invasive animal and plant species know no boundaries. That is why I introduced H.R. 658, the Natural Resource Protection Cooperative Agreement Act.

The passage of this legislation today has significance to my district, given the recent infestation at Lake Mead of quagga mussels. These are a species capable of causing massive destruction and billions of dollars in damages. The quagga mussel is a resilient species that multiplies at exponential rates and can cause enormous ecological, recreational, and economic damage. In recent years, the mussel has caused an estimated $5 billion in damages to the Great Lakes region.

As the law currently exists, the National Park Service does not have the legal authority to enter into cooperative agreements with neighboring States and local governments or private entities. Rather, the Park Service

must wait until invasive species cross into their lands and waterways before they can be dealt with.

Part of responsible stewardship of our local environment is being proactive and not merely responsive to new ecological challenges. H.R. 658 enables the National Park Service to take preventative measures in order to preserve our lands and natural resources.

By entering into cooperative agreements with State and local experts, we will be able to eradicate invasive species before they encroach onto Federal lands. We have an obligation to our children and to our community to be responsible stewards of our local environment.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working in a bipartisan manner on this very important issue.

I also want to thank my constituent Ann Schreiber in Nevada who has worked so hard to eradicate invasive plant life in my district and recognizes the importance of meeting these challenges head-on.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of our 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. 658.

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. Madam 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.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT TO PARK CITY, UTAH

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 838) to provide for the conveyance of the Bureau of Land Management parcels known as the White Acre and Gambel Oak properties and related real property to Park City, Utah, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 838

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

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF LAND BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT TO PARK CITY, UTAH.

(a) LAND TRANSFER.—Notwithstanding the planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary of the Interior shall convey, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to Park City, Utah, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to two parcels of real property located in Park City, Utah, that are currently under the management jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and designated as parcel 8 (commonly known as the White Acre parcel) and parcel 16 (commonly known as the Gambel Oak parcel). The conveyance shall be subject to all valid existing rights.

(b) DEED RESTRICTION.—The conveyance of the lands under subsection (a) shall be made by a deed or deeds containing a restriction requiring that the lands be maintained as open space and used solely for public recreation purposes or other purposes consistent with their maintenance as open space. This restriction shall not be interpreted to prohibit the construction or maintenance of recreational facilities, utilities, or other structures that are consistent with the maintenance of the lands as open space or its use for public recreation purposes.

(c) CONSIDERATION.—In consideration for the transfer of the land under subsection (a), Park City shall pay to the Secretary of the Interior an amount consistent with conveyances to governmental entities for recreational purposes under the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the Recreation and Public Purposes Act; 43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.).

SEC. 2. SALE OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND IN PARK CITY, UTAH, AT AUCTION.

(a) SALE OF LAND.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall offer for sale any right, title, or interest of the United States in and to two parcels of real property located in Park City, Utah, that are currently under the management jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and are designated as parcels 17 and 18 in the Park City, Utah, area. The sale of the land shall be carried out in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701) and other applicable law, other than the planning provisions of sections 202 and 203 of such Act (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), and shall be subject to all valid existing rights.

(b) METHOD OF SALE.—The sale of the land under subsection (a) shall be consistent with subsections (d) and (f) of section 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1713) through a competitive bidding process and for not less than fair market value.

SEC. 3. DISPOSITION OF LAND SALES PROCEEDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—All proceeds derived from the sale of the lands described in this Act shall be deposited in a special account in the treasury of the United States and shall be available without further appropriation to the Secretary of the Interior until expended for—

(1) the reimbursement of costs incurred by the Bureau of Land Management in implementing the provisions of this Act, including surveys, appraisals, and compliance with applicable Federal laws; and

(2) environmental restoration projects on Bureau of Land Management administered public lands within the Salt Lake City Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management.

(b) INVESTMENT OF SPECIAL ACCOUNT.—Any amounts deposited in the special account shall earn interest in an amount determined by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities, and may be expended according to the provisions of this section.

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. Madam 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. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 838, sponsored by the ranking member of the National Parks, Forests and Public Lands Subcommittee, Representative Rob Bishop, is intended to preserve existing open space in Park City, Utah. The bill would transfer two parcels of land owned by the Bureau of Land Management to Park City, with a deed restriction that the land be maintained as open space. Park City will pay fair-market value for the land.

Two other parcels in the area owned by the BLM are encumbered with unpatented mining claims. The bill directs that these parcels, which the BLM had previously identified for disposal, be sold at auction, subject to any valid existing rights, to resolve these outstanding issues. Park City is expected to bid for these properties at the auction.

It is our understanding that Park City has undertaken an aggressive campaign to maintain open space and that the citizens of Park City have proven their commitment by approving a local bond initiative to fund this project.

We applaud Park City's efforts and congratulate Representative BISHOP for working hard to bring this legislation to the floor.

Madam Speaker, identical legislation was approved by the House in the 109th Congress. We support passage of H.R. 838 and urge its adoption by the House today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 838 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 838 conveys to Park City about 110 acres of Bureau of Land Management land that was previously marked for disposal. This land would be used by Park City as recreational open space. The residents of Park City have placed a premium on preserving this space for the character of their resort town; and as the chairman accurately said, they have approved a $20 million bond to purchase this environmentally sensitive land. The conveyance of this is consistent with Park City's long-range plan to protect its sensitive landscape.

Park City hosted many of the events of the 2002 Olympics, and visitors from around the world visit there to ski and

partake of the scenic vistas, which will be enhanced by this bill. As was stated, this bill, as passed by the 109th session of Congress and as considered today, enjoys the support of both Republicans and Democrats and does have a companion bill that has been introduced in the United States Senate.

I ask for your support of this particular bill.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, we have no additional speakers, and we yield back the balance of our 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. 838.

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.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS DAM ENLARGEMENT ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 839) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility of enlarging the Arthur V. Watkins Dam Weber Basin Project, Utah, to provide additional water for the Weber Basin Project to fulfill the purposes for which that project was authorized.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 839

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 ''Arthur V. Watkins Dam Enlargement Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Arthur V. Watkins Dam is a feature of the Weber Basin Project, which was authorized by law on August 29, 1949.

(2) Increasing the height of Arthur V. Watkins Dam and construction of pertinent facilities may provide additional storage capacity for the development of additional water supply for the Weber Basin Project for uses of municipal and industrial water supply, flood control, fish and wildlife, and recreation.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF FEASIBILITY STUDY.

The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, is authorized to conduct a feasibility study on raising the height of Arthur V. Watkins Dam for the development of additional storage to meet water supply needs within the Weber Basin Project area and the Wasatch Front. The feasibility study shall include such environmental evaluation as required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and a cost allocation as required under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485 et seq.).

SEC. 4. COST SHARES.

(a) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the costs of the study authorized in section 3 shall not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of the study.

(b) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Secretary shall accept, as appropriate, in-kind contributions of goods or services from the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District. Such goods and services accepted under this section shall be counted as part of the non-Federal cost share for the study.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $1,000,000 for the Federal cost share of the study authorized in section 3.

SEC. 6. SUNSET.

The authority of the Secretary to carry out any provisions of this Act shall terminate 10 years after the date of the enactment of 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. Madam 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. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 839, introduced by our colleague, Representative ROB BISHOP of Utah, would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility of enlarging the Arthur V. Watkins Dam. The dam is one of the main features of the Bureau of Reclamation's Weber Basin Project located along the shore of the Great Salt Lake near Ogden, Utah.

□ 1445

Recent drought and a growing population in Utah have highlighted water supply needs in the area. The feasibility study authorized by this legislation will help local water agencies and the Bureau of Reclamation to decide whether we should consider raising the dam to improve water storage capacity.

In the 109th Congress, the Subcommittee on Water and Power held hearings on similar legislation. That legislation was subsequently reported by the committee and passed by the House.

We have no objection to this legislation and urge its passage.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 839. The Bureau of Reclamation's Weber Basin Project, which is located in northern Utah only a short distance from the historic Brigham City, stores and delivers water from the Weber River into its tributaries.

The Arthur V. Watkins Dam, which is part of the Weber Basin Project, is part of an off-stream reservoir on the northeastern edge of the Great Salt Lake. It is formed by a roughly rectangular perimeter dam that is about 14.5 miles long. Water from the Weber River near its outlet to the Great Salt Lake is diverted into the reservoir by the Willard Canal and pumped from the reservoir by that same canal for multiple purposes. In addition to providing water supply, the reservoir is a popular recreation facility.

Recent drought and a growing population of Utah have highlighted the need for additional water storage. As a result, the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, a water user which manages the Arthur V. Watkins Dam and Reservoir, desires the Bureau of Reclamation's assistance in determining the feasibility of adding water storage capacity to the reservoir.

H.R. 839 authorizes such assistance. This bill passed in the 109th Congress by voice vote. I again ask for your support.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of our 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. 839.

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. Madam 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.

MARINE MAMMAL RESCUE ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 2007

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1006) to amend the provisions of law relating to the John H. Prescott Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Grant Program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1006

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 ''Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Amendments of 2007''.

SEC. 2. STRANDING AND ENTANGLEMENT RESPONSE.

(a) COLLECTION AND UPDATING OF INFORMATION.—Section 402(b)(1)(A) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1421a(b)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting ''or entangled'' after ''stranded''.

(b) ENTANGLEMENT RESPONSE AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 403 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1421b) is amended—

(A) by amending the section heading to read as follows:

"SEC. 403. STRANDING OR ENTANGLEMENT RESPONSE AGREEMENTS.";

and

(B) in subsection (a) by inserting ''or entanglement'' before the period.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents at the end of the first section is amended by striking the item relating to section 403 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 403. Stranding or entanglement response agreements.''.

(c) LIABILITY.—Section 406(a) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1421e(a)) is amended by inserting ''or entanglement'' after ''stranding''.

(d) ENTANGLEMENT DEFINED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 410 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1421h) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (6) in order as paragraphs (2) through (7); and

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(1) The term 'entanglement' means an event in the wild in which a living or dead marine mammal has gear, rope, line, net, or other material wrapped around or attached to it and is—

''(A) on a beach or shore of the United States; or

''(B) in waters under the jurisdiction of the United States.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 408(a)(2)(B)(i) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1421f–1(a)(2)(B)(i)) is amended by striking ''section 410(6)'' and inserting ''section 410(7)''.

(e) JOHN H. PRESCOTT MARINE MAMMAL RESCUE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 408(h) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1421f–1(h)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2003'' and inserting ''$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2010''; and

(B) in paragraph (1) by striking ''$4,000,000'' and inserting ''$6,000,000''.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS AND EXPENSES.—Section 408 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1421f–1) is amended—

(A) by adding at the end of subsection (a)(1) the following: ''All funds available to implement this section shall be distributed to eligible stranding network participants for the purposes set forth in this paragraph and paragraph (2), except as provided in subsection (f).''; and

(B) by amending subsection (f) to read as follows:

''(f) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS AND EXPENSES.—Of the amounts available each fiscal year to carry out this section, the Secretary may expend not more than 6 percent or $80,000, whichever is greater, to pay the administrative costs and administrative expenses to implement the grant program under subsection (a). Any such funds retained by the Secretary for a fiscal year for such costs and expenses that are not used for such costs and expenses before the end of the fiscal year shall be provided as grants under subsection (a).''.

(3) EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE.—Section 408 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1421f–1) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3), and by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary may also enter into cooperative agreements, contracts, or such other agreements or arrangements as the Secretary considers appropriate to address stranding events requiring emergency assistance.'';

(B) in subsection (d) by inserting ''(1)'' before the text, and by adding at the end the following:

''(2) Funding for emergency stranding projects shall not be subject to the funding limit established in paragraph (1).'';

(C) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1) by striking ''The non-Federal'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (2), the non-Federal'';

(ii) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(iii) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE.—No non-Federal contribution shall be required for funding for a response to an emergency stranding event.''; and

(D) in subsection (g) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3) and inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE.—The term 'emergency assistance' means assistance provided for a stranding event that—

''(A) is not an unusual mortality event as defined in section 409(6);

''(B) leads to an immediate increase in required costs for stranding response, recovery, or rehabilitation in excess of regularly scheduled costs;

''(C) may be cyclical or endemic; and

''(D) may involve out-of-habitat animals.''.

(4) CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 408 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1421f–1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) CONTRIBUTIONS.—For purposes of carrying out this section, the Secretary may solicit, accept, receive, hold, administer, and use gifts, devises, and bequests.''.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MARINE MAMMAL UNUSUAL MORTALITY EVENT FUND.—Section 409(3) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1421g(3)) is amended by striking ''fiscal year 1993'' and inserting ''each of fiscal years 2007 through 2010''.

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. Madam 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. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I commend the ranking Republican on the Committee on Natural Resources, Congressman DON YOUNG, for introducing H.R. 1006, the Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Amendments of 2007. The bill would extend through fiscal year 2010 the authorization of appropriations for the John H. Prescott Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Grant Fund and the Marine Mammal Unusual Mortality Event Fund.

H.R. 1006 would direct the relevant Secretary to collect and update procedures for rescuing and rehabilitating marine mammals entangled in fishing gear, rope, line, net or other material. The bill also authorizes the Secretary to enter into agreements for marine mammal stranding events requiring emergency assistance.

In the 109th Congress, the House passed a similar provision in H.R. 4075, by voice vote, on July 17, 2006. We support this bill and commend Congressman DON YOUNG for his leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1006, the Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Act amendments.

This legislation, introduced by the distinguished Ranking Republican on the Natural Resources Committee, DON YOUNG, and the ranking Republican on the Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans Subcommittee, HENRY BROWN, will extend the John H. Prescott Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Grant Program.

The Prescott Grant program was first authorized in 2000 to assist the National Marine Fisheries Service with recovery and rehabilitation of stranded marine mammals. The Prescott Grant program has been very successful in supporting facilities around the Nation which volunteer space and staff time to rehabilitate these sea creatures and return many of them to the wild.

The National Marine Fisheries Service has received $4 million in appropriations each year for the Prescott Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Grants. In 2006, the Service issued 42 grants to facilities in coastal States. While the Prescott Grant program has been successful in these areas, there are still areas of the country that do not have appropriate coverage; the Alaska region and the Southeast region are two examples.

This legislation will increase funding for the Department of Commerce to address this lack of coverage and will also increase the number of grants that can be issued each year. The legislation will also cap administrative costs and roll over any unused funds into the grant program. The administration will have the authority to enter into cooperative agreements with trained personnel to allow for removal of floating debris from marine mammals to prevent the stranding and/or the death of those animals.

This legislation also authorizes emergency assistance funding. In addition, it will reauthorize funding for the Marine Mammal Unusual Mortality Event Fund, which allows the agency to respond to mass stranding events and reimburse facilities that have assisted in the response activity.

This is an important conservation bill. I urge an ''aye'' vote on H.R. 1006.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of our 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. 1006.

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.

BOB HOPE MEMORIAL LIBRARY

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 759) to redesignate the Ellis Island Library on the third floor of the Ellis Island Immigration Museum, located on Ellis Island in New York Harbor, as the ''Bob Hope Memorial Library''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 759

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

SECTION 1. REDESIGNATION.

The Ellis Island Library on the third floor of the Ellis Island Immigration Museum, located on Ellis Island in New York Harbor, shall be known and redesignated as the ''Bob Hope Memorial Library''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Ellis Island Library on the third floor of the Ellis Island Immigration Museum referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Bob Hope Memorial Library''.

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. Madam 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. Madam Speaker, H.R. 759, introduced by my colleague from New York (Mr. ENGEL) redesignates the Ellis Island Library on the third floor of the Ellis Island Immigration Museum as the Bob Hope Memorial Library.

Bob Hope immigrated to the United States with his family in 1907. Like millions of other immigrants, he entered the United States through Ellis Island in New York Harbor. Bob Hope went on to have an illustrious career as a comedic entertainer and is remembered by many for his work over nearly six decades traveling the globe to entertain American servicemen and women.

Madam Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from New York, Representative ENGEL, for his work on this legislation. I would note that identical legislation passed the House in the 109th Congress. We support the passage of H.R. 759 and urge its adoption today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 759, which has been well explained by the subcommittee chairman. We support the designation of the Bob Hope Memorial Library. We urge the adoption of this particular bill.

In 1940, Bob Hope starred, with Paulette Goddard and Richard Carlson, in a remake of the movie ''The Ghost Breakers.'' In that picture, as they are talking about zombies that would be attacking the house that is owned by Paulette Goddard, she said, ''Zombies! That's horrible.'' Richard Carlson said, ''It's worse than horrible because a zombie has no will of his own. You see them sometimes walking around blindly with dead eyes, following orders, not knowing what they do, not caring.'' At which time Bob Hope said, ''Oh, you mean like Democrats.''

I am very grateful that the other side of the aisle has taken this opportunity to recognize and reward both the wit and the wisdom of Bob Hope with this piece of legislation. I firmly support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, at this point I extend as much time as he may consume to my colleague from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona in whose district my son Jonathan is enjoying himself as a sophomore at the University of Arizona. I would like to thank all concerned for the opportunity to speak about my bill, H.R. 759, a bill which will name the third floor library at Ellis Island in New York Harbor the Bob Hope Memorial Library.

I would also like to thank Representative GALLEGLY for his assistance with this bill, and I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the committee for their help in bringing this bill expeditiously to the floor.

Most Americans remember Bob Hope for his work in the entertainment business as a comedian, actor, dancer and singer, as well as his work with the American troops abroad. Perhaps his work with American troops abroad is the thing that he is most remembered for. But what few know is that Bob Hope was actually an immigrant from England, came here when he was very, very young. He is sometimes even referred to as America's most famous immigrant, whose life epitomizes the American Dream. Bob Hope embodies the American Dream, and the Ellis Island Restoration Commission even called naming the library a fitting tribute.

After a long period of restoration, Ellis Island, where my grandparents, all four of them, came through about 100 years ago, Ellis Island was turned into a museum in 1990 with the purpose of allowing people to come and remember the 16 million immigrants who passed through Ellis Island from 1892 through 1954 to pursue the American Dream.

Like many of the other 16 million immigrants who passed through Ellis Island, Bob Hope arrived in America in 1907, which is actually the same year that my grandmother, my mother's mother, came to this country, and Bob Hope arrived in 1907 with little in the way of worldly possessions. Bob Hope described himself upon arrival as, and I quote him, ''a 4 year-old boy in knickers who had no idea of the opportunities that lay ahead.''

He went on to become a household name in the United States and around the world. After arriving in the United States, the Hope family moved to Ohio, and he later studied and started his career in radio.

He moved on to appear in numerous movies and even Broadway plays, and is perhaps best known, as I mentioned before, for his unwavering commitment to entertaining our Nation's troops abroad. For nearly six decades, often during holidays in World War II, through Vietnam and until the Gulf War, Bob Hope traveled the globe, bringing a little bit of America to U.S. troops during times of peace and war.

Troops abroad even took calling him ''GI Bob.'' In 1997, Congress named him an honorary veteran. Bob Hope has been recognized in many ways for his work. He has been honored with over 1,500 awards, but this award or reward is perhaps the most fitting.

Some notable awards include several Academy Awards, a Congressional Gold Medal in 1962, an Emmy and a Golden Globe. Despite all the awards that Bob Hope received, he had a special place in his heart for Ellis Island. In 1990, when the Ellis Island Restoration Commission suggested naming the third floor library of the museum in his honor, he stated it would be, and I quote him, ''one of the single most important high points of my career.''

Sadly, Bob Hope passed away in 2003 at the age of 100 and did not see this project finished. But today I hope we would move, as the first step, in seeing this come to fruition.

The Bob Hope Memorial Library will serve as a daily reminder to Ellis Island's visitors of Bob Hope's great contributions to the American people, the American culture and the American Dream. After all, it is Bob Hope. It's Bob Hope.

Madam Speaker, I ask to insert into the RECORD two statements, a letter from Bob Hope back in 1990 expressing his support of the museum, as well as a letter from the Ellis Island Restoration Commission expressing their support for this project.

BOB HOPE,
October 24, 1990.

Mr. PHILIP LAX, President,
Mr. NORMAN LISS, Chairman of Development,
Ellis Island Restoration Commission,
New York, NY.

DEAR PHIL AND NORMAN, I was both thrilled and gratified to receive your letter announcing the establishment of ''the Bob Hope Family Heritage Center'' at Ellis Island. What a great honor for someone who just 83 years ago saw the first glimmer of this great nation of ours as a 4-year old boy in knickers and had no idea of the opportunities that lay ahead. Frankly, my only concern back then was running away as fast as

my little legs would carry me from the doctor who came to innoculate me before landing at Ellis!

A great many wonderful things have happened to me since that day. However, I assure you that the honor bestowed on me by you and your commission is one of the single most important highpoints in my life and career. That it will be cherished by the Hope Family for generations to come is a true understatement.

With deep appreciation and warm personal regards to each and every member of your commission who made this honor possible. I just want to add that I admire and respect all you've been doing to restore this great symbol of the American dream.

Regards,

BOB HOPE.

ELLIS ISLAND RESTORATION COMMISSION,
New York, NY, Nov. 27, 2003.

Mr. WARD GRANT,
Burbank, CA.

DEAR MR. GRANT: The Ellis Island Restoration Commission, together with the National Park Service, are desirous of naming the third floor of the National Museum at Ellis Island in New York Harbor, the Bob Hope Memorial Library in honor of that great American legend.

The ship's manifest. which we have in our possession, reflects that Bob Hope emigrated to America through Ellis Island with his mother and siblings on March 28, 1908, at the age of four. He is probably the most famous immigrant to come through Ellis Island of the sixteen million who so emigrated. Forty percent of the current United States population has roots in Ellis Island.

The Museum is owned and administered by the National Park Service on behalf of the Department of Interior. Ellis Island and the Statue of Liberty, to which it is connected, are the most sought after destinations for tourists visiting New York. The Library contains, among other rooms, the Oral History Room, in which the stories of immigrants who arrived through Ellis Island are recorded and computerized, and the Ellis Island Archives.

As reflected in the letters we have enclosed, Mr. Hope in 1990 and 1991, showed great interest in the Island and reflected sincere appreciation for the honor of having the Library named after him. Unfortunately, at that time, bureaucratic complications did not permit the project to move ahead.

It would be our intention, if the family approves, to seek a bill passed by Congress and have it signed into law by the President. We would not be seeking any funds from the Bob Hope Foundation or any family members, but this would simply be in recognition of the great contributions to America's life, culture and entertainment by Bob Hope.

Ironically, we were in London at the time of Mr. Hope's passing and took the opportunity to visit his childhood home and the Bob Hope Theatre in Eltham.

We were provided your contact information by WOR's Joe Franklin and his producer, Richard Orenstein, in New York, both of whom enthusiastically encouraged this idea.

We look forward to hearing from you after you have communicated with the family and if the response is in the affirmative, make appropriate arrangements for a formal announcement by the Commission, Congressional representatives. National Park Service, as well as family members.

We eagerly await your response.

Sincerely yours,

PHIL LAX,
President.

NORMAN LISS,
Chairman of Development.

□ 1500

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam 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. 759.

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. Madam 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 2 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. BRALEY of Iowa) 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. Res. 138, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 658, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 839, by the yeas and nays.

The vote on H.R. 759 will be taken tomorrow.

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

RECOGNIZING IMPORTANCE OF HOT SPRINGS NATIONAL PARK ON ITS 175TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 138, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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 agree to the resolution, H. Res. 138.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 0, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

YEAS—399

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
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
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
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
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer

Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
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.
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—34

Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Carson
Castor
Conaway
Cubin
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Fattah
Flake
Fossella
Gilchrest
Goode
Gutierrez
Johnson (IL)
Kanjorski
Kucinich
Lowey
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Mitchell
Napolitano
Pence
Pryce (OH)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Terry
Wamp
Weiner
Young (FL)

□ 1859

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF FALLEN HEROES IN IRAQ WAR

(Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today because today marks the 4-year anniversary of the war in Iraq. I would like to offer a moment of silence for the 19 members of my unit that did not make it home from Iraq, and for the thousands of brave Americans that have fallen.

On this somber occasion, we must commit ourselves to honoring the memories of the fallen, and continue to do right by our troops still fighting.

The SPEAKER. Members will rise and the House will observe a moment of silence.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

NATURAL RESOURCE PROTECTION COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 658, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. 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. 658.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 10, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

YEAS—390

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
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
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
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
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
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
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NAYS—10

Bartlett (MD)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Deal (GA)
Franks (AZ)
Gingrey
Kingston
Paul
Sali
Westmoreland

NOT VOTING—33

Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Carson
Castor
Cubin
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Fattah
Flake
Fossella
Gilchrest
Goode
Gutierrez
Johnson (IL)
Kanjorski
Kucinich
Lowey
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Mitchell
Napolitano
Pence
Pryce (OH)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Terry
Wamp
Weiner
Young (FL)

□ 1911

Mr. CAMPBELL of California and Mr. GINGREY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS DAM ENLARGEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRALEY of Iowa). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 839, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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. 839.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

YEAS—394

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
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
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
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
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
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.
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—38

Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Buchanan
Carson
Castor
Cleaver
Cubin
Cuellar
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Duncan
Fattah
Flake
Fossella
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Gutierrez
Johnson (IL)
Kanjorski
Kucinich
Lowey
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Mitchell
Napolitano
Pence
Pryce (OH)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Terry
Towns
Wamp
Weiner
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1920

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. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber today. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 157, 158, and 159.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I was regrettably absent from the Chamber on March 19 during rollcall votes 157, 158, and 159. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 157, "nay" on rollcall 158, and "nay" on rollcall 159.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 253) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 253

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.—Ms. Moore of Wisconsin.

Mr. HODES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I object. I ask the Clerk to read the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued reading the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMARKS ON FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF IRAQ WAR

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, as the war in Iraq enters its fifth year, we take time to reflect on those who have made the greatest sacrifices because of this war, our troops. We all salute them because of their courage, their patriotism and the sacrifices they are willing to make. They have done everything asked of them, and we are forever in their debt.

That debt extends to their families, who have also made sacrifices. The missed family events, births of children, deaths of loved ones, graduations, anniversaries, birthdays are losses which cannot be replaced. We owe to these families a renewed commitment

to support them in whatever way may be required and to make sure that our troops have everything they need to do their job and to come home safely and soon.

To those who have been wounded, our Nation has promised to care for you as you have protected us. This is a solemn promise, and it will be honored.

The debt which can never be repaid is to those whose lives have been lost in the war, and as a Nation we mourn them. Their absence is felt each day, each and every one of them; but on this day in particular, their sacrifice should be remembered in a special way. I therefore salute our colleague, Congressman PATRICK MURPHY, for leading us in a moment of silence in memory of his colleagues who were lost in the war and all others as well.

Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago today, our Nation launched a war of choice in Iraq. The war has claimed the lives of over 3,200 American troops and wounded tens of thousands more, some of them permanently.

Any U.S. military engagement has to be judged in three ways: does it make our country safer, our military stronger, and the region in which we are engaged in the conflict more stable. The war in Iraq has failed on all three counts.

In fact, the administration's policy in Iraq has diminished the safety of our country by reducing the strength of our military. The readiness has sunk now to levels lower than Vietnam, it has failed to hold the Iraqis accountable for the future of their own country, and it has dishonored our commitment to our veterans. It has cost billions of dollars and significantly damaged our reputation in the eyes of the world.

When our young men and women are placed in danger, we owe it to them to provide them with the best training and equipment possible and a strategy worthy of their sacrifice.

The generals have told us over and over again, across the board, generals on active duty, General Petraeus as recently as last week, and many retired generals: there is no military solution to the war in Iraq. It cannot be won solely militarily. Instead, we must leverage all of our political, economic, and diplomatic strengths.

Again and again Senator REID, the Democratic leader in the Senate, and I have urged President Bush to adopt a plan for Iraq that contains the following elements:

Change the mission. Transition the mission from combat to training. That will enable us to responsibly redeploy our troops.

Third, we must build consensus for political accommodation in Iraq. They must amend the constitution to be more inclusive to end the civil strife.

Fourth, we must encourage a robust diplomatic effort, primarily involving Iraq's neighbors. The first meeting of neighbors was held. That is a good step. It was at a low level, appropriately, and now it has to move to the ministerial level.

We then must reform and reinvigorate the reconstruction effort. $10 billion is unaccounted for. $10 billion in thin air of the reconstruction effort is unaccounted for. How do we answer to the American taxpayer, when this war is costing $2 billion a week on the military side, and on the reconstruction side we can't account for the money?

When we do this, when we transition, when we change the mission, redeploy the troops, build political consensus, engage in diplomatic efforts and reform and reinvigorate the reconstruction effort, then we can turn our attention to the real war on terror, in Afghanistan.

I hear the voice of the future in the Chamber. What a beautiful sound. What a beautiful sound.

Later this week, Mr. Speaker, we will debate a plan to bring the war to an end. The U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act will rebuild our military, protect our troops, provide for our veterans and hold the Iraqi Government accountable.

The benchmarks for the Iraqi Government set forth in this bill are the benchmarks endorsed by President Bush on January 10. They are: improvement in the performance of the Iraqi security forces; a greater commitment by the Iraqi Government to national reconciliation; and reductions in the level of sectarian violence in Iraq.

After 4 years of war, it is reasonable to expect these benchmarks to be met this year. Four years. We are in this war longer than World War II. There is no end in sight. There is no end in sight. There is an unlimited commitment, with no strategy to match the sacrifice of our troops.

Democrats will be offering later in the week, and hopefully with Republican support, we will pass a supplemental that will, that will, place a time frame. And I am really pleased that so many retired generals have come out in support of a time certain that relates to the performance that the President himself established, that the Iraqi Government themselves agreed to.

This isn't anything we created. It is the President's benchmarks. The Iraqis agreed to it. We want to see progress. But if we don't, we will begin the redeployment of our troops out of Iraq in 6 months from that date. Then we will leave troops there for training, for protecting our diplomats, for fighting terrorism, for force protection, but only for those purposes.

I welcome the debate over this bill and the opportunity it provides for Members of Congress to express themselves in what I consider is the greatest ethical challenge to our country, how we send our young men and women into battle; how we send them without the training, without the equipment, without the rest time at home, and overextend them when they are there.

□ 1930

How we send them into battle without plans to honor our commitment to them.

In the military they say: On the battlefield, we will leave no soldier behind. We say: And when they come home, we will leave no veteran behind.

Apparently our country, our great country, has to make a decision for greatness on how we are viewed in the world, on how we project our power and our ideals to make the world a more peaceful place, to honor our commitment to our troops, to honor our commitment to the future, and to honor the sacrifice and the vision of our Founding Fathers.

This is a very important decision for our caucus, for our Congress, for our country, and I hope that the debate will be in the spirit as it was a few weeks ago. It was a great commitment to our troops with knowledge of substance, based on values and respecting the patriotism of each and every person who serves in the Congress.

I know for certain as Speaker of the House that every single person who serves here is patriotic and wants to honor our veterans. I know for certain because I have seen every single person here take an oath of office to protect and defend our Constitution and our country. It is in that spirit that we offer this supplemental that makes America safer, that strengthens our military, and brings stability to the world.

OIG PROTESTS ITS INNOCENCE TOO MUCH

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, today 6 months after meeting with Members of Congress and with the staff of OIG of Homeland Security about Ramos and Compean, Richard Skinner of the Office of the Inspector General is now saying his staff did not lie to Members of Congress, but his staff was just mistaken about certain facts when it briefed us.

He also is saying the meeting was confidential. I am sure the OIG staff wishes it had been since the staff misled Congress on what occurred at the border.

Is Skinner saying it is okay to mislead Congress in a confidential meeting? Sounds like it to me. The meeting was only confidential in the fantasy world of OIG. And how would Skinner know; he wasn't even there.

His staff not only told Congress inaccurate things about the case, they said they have the documents to prove their assertions. Even after repeatedly asking for such documents, they were never produced. Why? Because they don't exist.

Now that the transcript of the trial is completed, we find out about the inaccurate statements of OIG to Congress.

OIG would do well to simply tell the truth and get accurate information in public and private rather than use slick Madison Avenue press releases to justify their misstatements to Congress.

And that's just the way it is.

BRING OUR TROOPS HOME WITH DIGNITY

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, some semblance of security in Baghdad, but chlorine bombs in Anbar province and other parts of Iraq, the fourth-year anniversary of this country's offensive on the nation state of Iraq.

It is interesting that as we continue to watch our young people fall in battle, heroes that they are, and veterans come home, that the executive in this body, this Congress, this House and the other body cannot come to grips with a forward path for solving and reconciling the war in Iraq.

It is interesting that our Commander in Chief desires to tell us that we must stay the course, a refrain that we have heard over and over again.

My plea would be let us sit down at the table of reconciliation. Let us not suggest that people who stand for conscience are unpatriotic, and let us resolve to bring our troops home together in dignity and with success.

HONORING REV. RAYMOND MOSS

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recall the exceptional life of Reverend Raymond Moss of Marietta, Georgia. Reverend Moss passed away this month at the age of 79, leaving behind a long legacy as an advocate of social justice and civil rights.

Reverend Moss was a fixture in Cobb County. After a brief stint in Minor League Baseball and a job as draftsman at Lockheed Martin, Moss found his true calling, and in 1959 he started Back to the Bible Holiness Church, the first homegrown Black church in Cobb County.

He went on to build 14 more churches in Georgia and Alabama, and helped lead the Cobb community during the turbulent civil rights era.

Reverend Moss was a compassionate father not only to his own 14 children, but to any member of the Marietta community in need of a mentor.

In fact, I first came to know the Reverend 30 years ago while practicing medicine with one of his dear friends, Dr. Douglas Glover. Indeed, many of Reverend Moss' faithful came to my office for care, and all had been deeply touched by the Reverend's compassion.

I know these members of our community will carry on his dedication to compassionate service.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in honoring the life of Reverend Raymond Moss.

APPLAUDING TENNESSEE BASKETBALL

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, as a Tennessean, I am proud of the success of my three schools that have reached the Sweet Sixteen.

In America, there is nothing going on with greater import on the local scene than March Madness; and there is no place more happy about the madness than the State of Tennessee, the Volunteer State.

Three of our schools have teams in the Sweet Sixteen: Our land grant university, the University of Tennessee; and my two alma maters, Vanderbilt University and the University of Memphis.

On Thursday, the University of Tennessee and the University of Memphis will both be playing in the Sweet Sixteen in San Antonio, Texas. Everybody in Texas knows if it weren't for Tennessee, there wouldn't be a Texas. So we bring basketball to Texas, and we brought liberty and independence to Texas. We have a lot of pride in our basketball teams and our universities.

SUPPORTING COLEMAN CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to commend the men and women serving in the Federal Correction Complex in Coleman, Florida, in my district. This Federal complex serves our Nation by housing prisoners in low-, medium- and high-security facilities. It has provided countless jobs in my district and helped our growing economy.

The people who fill those jobs truly are a testament to the array of wonderful people in my district. Even with the struggles in funding and thinly stretched staff, the officers at Coleman are cheerful, positive, and professional people. Staffing a prison complex is no easy job, and many of the officers there literally have scars to prove it. Yet they know their job is to keep our families safe.

I have had the opportunity to tour this facility several times and meet with the staff, and I am proud to serve alongside such honorable public servants. I want to take this opportunity to give them all my heartfelt thanks.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRALEY of Iowa). 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.

HEARING REQUESTED ON RAMOS AND COMPEAN PROSECUTION

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 I had the pleasure of meeting with Congressman JOHN CONYERS, chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I shared with him information from myself and other Members of Congress who are requesting a hearing on the case of Border Patrol Agents Ramos and Compean.

Many of us in Congress are concerned about the Federal prosecutor in this case and his decision to bring criminal charges against these agents. Agents Ramos and Compean were convicted last spring for shooting a Mexican drug smuggler who brought 743 pounds of marijuana across our border into Texas.

These agents never should have been sent to prison, yet today is their 62nd day behind bars. There are legitimate legal questions about how this prosecution was initiated, and how the U.S. Attorney's Office proceeded in this case. Members of Congress and the American people want to know why the Federal prosecutor is on the wrong side in this case.

To prosecute the agents, the U.S. Attorney's Office granted immunity to a known drug smuggler. He is not an American citizen, he is a criminal. Drug enforcement reports have confirmed that the Mexican drug smuggler brought a second load of marijuana, 752 pounds, into the United States after he was granted immunity to testify against our border agents, but this information was kept from the jury and the public.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that Chairman CONYERS will review the information that I and other Members of Congress have brought to his attention concerning the prosecution of these two heroes.

Before closing, I ask the President to use his authority and pardon these two Hispanic Americans who were doing their job to protect the American people; and, more importantly, I call on the President to listen to the American people and to the thousands of citizens who have asked for a pardon for these two men.

IRAQ IN CIVIL WAR

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise with deep concern that on this very day 4 years ago, our Nation inaugurated a conflict, an unnecessary war, a war of choice, not a necessity.

The most comprehensive intelligence we have, the National Intelligence Estimate and the latest Pentagon report, tells us that Iraq had descended into a state of civil war. Over 3,000 Americans have died, and hundreds of thousands, some even say up to 1 million citizens of Iraq, have lost their lives in this unnecessary conflict.

And while we are telling our veterans of this war, the elderly, the poor, and the sick that there is no room in the budget for them, the American people have spent over $400 billion on a failed policy. We cannot do more of the same. Mr. Speaker, violence begets violence. It does not lead to peace.

President John F. Kennedy once said, ''Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable.'' My greatest fear is that the young people of Iraq and of the Middle East will never forget this war. My greatest fear is they will grow up hating our children and our children's children for what we have done. Mr. Speaker, the Bible is right. Even a great nation can reap what it sows.

Nothing troubles me more than to see the young faces of these soldiers who have been led to their death.

□ 1945

Some are only 18, 19, 21, 22, 23. It is painful; it is so painful to watch. Sometimes I feel like crying and crying out loud at what we are doing as a Nation and what this administration is doing in our name. Our children do not deserve to die as pawns in a civil war.

They do not deserve to pay with their lives for the mistakes of this administration. They never had a chance.

When I was their age, when I was 23 years old, I was leading the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, soon to speak in Washington on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, but then we were involved in a nonviolent revolution to transform the soul of America, to create a beloved community.

Forty years ago, I was there in New York City in Riverside Church when Martin Luther King, Jr., gave one of the most powerful speeches he ever made against the war in Vietnam. If he could speak today, he would say this Nation needs a revolution of values that exposes the truth that war does not work. If he could speak today, he would say that war is obsolete as a tool of our foreign policy.

He would say there is nothing keeping us from changing our national priority so that the pursuit of peace can take precedence over the pursuit of war.

He would say we must remove the causes of chaos, injustice, poverty and insecurity that are breeding grounds for terrorism. This is the way towards peace.

As a Nation, can we hear the words of Gandhi, so simple, so true, that it is either nonviolence or nonexistence? Can we hear the words of Martin Luther King, Jr., saying that we must learn to live together as brothers and sisters or perish as fools?

Tonight I must make it plain and clear that as a human being, as a citizen of the world, as a citizen of America, as a Member of Congress, as an individual committed to a world at peace with itself, I will not and I cannot in good conscience vote for another dollar or another dime to support this war.

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.)

A FAILED STRATEGY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, Vice President CHENEY, on the looming war in Iraq, of which he was a principal architect, he and his staff are responsible for the manipulation and manufacturing of intelligence that misled people into believing there was a threat of weapons of mass destruction or there was some ties to 9/11. Neither of those things was true. Vice President CHENEY said we will, in fact, be greeted as liberators. I think it will go relatively quickly. Weeks, rather than months, said Vice President CHENEY, and he still does not believe that he was wrong.

He is still a principal architect of the surge, of an escalation of the war in Iraq, of continuing a war without end, a war that President Bush said last November it will be up to the next President to determine when U.S. troops might come home.

A failed strategy, a strategy that fails our troops. Our troops have done all that we have asked and more under difficult conditions. They started with inadequate equipment, and Congress had to push the administration to give them the equipment they needed. They have been put on brutal rotations, stop/loss orders, and they have done more than was asked.

But the leadership has failed. Donald Rumsfeld is gone. He should have gone a very long time ago. Vice President CHENEY is still there pulling the strings. We will be greeted as liberators, he said.

Then the President two months later said major combat operations have ended, 1st of May. Nearly 3,000 American troops have died since the President gave that speech. Over 12,000 have been seriously wounded, very seriously wounded; and yet their answer is more of the same, stay the course, to escalate the conflict. They will not engage in meaningful diplomacy, and they will not change direction in Iraq. Their strategy will not bring a successful end to this war.

They are now again trying to tie it to 9/11 and al Qaeda. Yet they are contradicted, in fact, by the Director of National Intelligence, a Bush appointee. When he was asked, Mike McConnell, if al Qaeda would establish itself in Iraq and they would launch attacks from there, I would not go so far as to say al Qaeda would necessarily believe that. They want to reestablish their base and their objective would be in Afghanistan.

Remember Afghanistan? Remember Osama bin Laden? Remember 9/11? Remember the Taliban? They are still out there. They are planning and plotting. Afghanistan is going in a bad direction because the President diverted our attention, our troops, our resources away from a battle that was supported by all the major nations in the world to eradicate those who had attacked us so grievously on 9/11 into a discretionary war in Iraq, and still, the President would put the emphasis on Iraq.

His National Security Adviser says this is a charade what they would do in the House of Representatives, a charade. If it is a charade, why are they fighting so hard? For the first time, Congress is going to exert its constitutional responsibility as a third and coequal branch to say enough failed leadership is enough and we want a new direction.

The Speaker came to the well earlier and laid that out in detail, what that new direction would be, and this bill that we will vote on later this week would move us in that new direction. That is not a charade. That is the first meaningful challenge to the failure of leadership by Vice President CHENEY and George Bush that have put that region at risk, that has put American troops in the middle of a civil war, which is now admitted by the Pentagon.

We did not go there to be referees in the middle of a 1,400-year-old sectarian conflict in a civil war. The Iraqis are going to have to resolve those issues themselves.

I wrote to the President 2 years ago February and said you need to set meaningful timelines to force the Iraqis to come together and begin to resolve their differences. They still do not want to do that.

Americans should not be the surrogates. We should not be in the middle. Our troops should not be in the middle.

This bill is extraordinarily important. Yes, the President might veto it, but we are going to challenge him again and again and again until we get a new direction that better serves our country, our troops, that region and the world.

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.)

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

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, as you have heard our colleagues coming down to the well and talking passionately on the anniversary of the Iraq war and the debate that will go later on in this week and a vote that will come on to the floor of the House, I think that this is what certainly the American people want to see; but tonight, Mr. Speaker, I also want to talk about something else.

We in Congress must keep our eyes and ears open on all things that are happening around us; and today I want to talk about the tens of thousands of Federal Aviation Administration employees that are working without a contract.

Most of these workers are represented by the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, Professional Airways System Specialist, and the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees.

The FAA under the Bush administration has attacked the collective bargaining process. The FAA has not implemented a single negotiated and ratified contract with any of its contract unions. FAA employees need a fair collective bargaining process restored.

Just as this House gave collective bargaining rights to TSA employees in the 9/11 bill, which was the right thing to do, we must do no less for the employees of the FAA. Let me be very clear on this point. Our air traffic controllers do not have a contract with the FAA.

The FAA imposed work and pay rules on these individuals last September. There is no Federal law that recognizes imposed work and pay rules as a contract. Morale among FAA employees is extremely low. Retirements are far exceeding FAA's planning. Fatigue among those employees who remain is a major concern, and these are all direct effects of the unilaterally imposed work rules.

In 2003, there were over 15,000 air traffic controllers. At the end of 2006, there were barely 14,000. Of the 14,000 working today, almost 2,000 of them are trainees and not fully certified. At the same time, and by no means by coincidence, operational errors are on the rise at the FAA's busiest facilities, including Atlanta-Hartsfield and the Southern California TRAY–CON.

Current FAA projections are that by the year 2010, which is only a few years away, 40 percent of the air traffic control workforce will have 4 years or less on the job.

This House has a duty to these individuals to a fair process. That is all they are asking for, nothing more, nothing less.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of people do not understand the job that air traffic controllers have, yet they have the control of the thousands and thousand of lives on a daily basis. Every single day that people fly, it is the air traffic controllers that are basically controlling the skies to make us safe.

And being that we are talking about 9/11, think about what our air traffic controllers did on that day. They brought down thousands and thousands of planes without one incident. They saved so many lives, and yet here the administration is taking away the right for them to earn a decent pay.

The pressure that is up in those towers is unbelievable. I have spent time there just to see what that job was like. They are not asking for more or less. All they are asking for is a contract.

This House has a duty to make sure that those workers have what is due them.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1227, GULF COAST HURRICANE HOUSING RECOVERY ACT OF 2007

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110–53) on the resolution (H. Res. 254) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1227) to assist in the provision of affordable housing to low-income families affected by Hurricane Katrina, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution calling on the Government of the United Kingdom to immediately establish a full, independent, and public judicial inquiry into the murder of Northern Ireland defense attorney Patrick Finucane, as recommended by Judge Peter Cory as part of the Weston Park Agreement, in order to move forward on the Northern Ireland peace process.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 5. Joint resolution proclaiming Casimir Pulaski to be an honorary citizen of the United States posthumously.

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 85th anniversary of the founding of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, a leading association for the 1,300,000 United States citizens of Greek ancestry and Philhellenes in the United States.

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

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

LACK OF POLITICAL PROGRESS IN IRAQ

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, last week the New York Times reported that Iraq is falling well short of the political progress they were supposed to have made by now. Still no constitutional reform. Still no local elections. Still no final action on a law governing distribution of oil revenues. Still no reversal of the de-Baathification laws.

The Bush administration is now saying that their military escalation needs time to work and that these political goals will not be met until the end of the year.

I think it is clear what is going on here. What we have is another tactic by the White House in an attempt to run out the clock until January of 2009 when they can hand over the reins and make Iraq look like someone else's problem.

The President has said that the military commitment to Iraq is not open-ended; yet all evidence is to the contrary.

□ 2000

The supporters of this war, a group whose numbers are dwindling by the day, tell us the next 6 months are critical. This really is the last chance for success. Time and time again, deadlines are established and not met, but there are no consequences, nor is there accountability. I am of the belief that the Iraqi Government won't get its act together until it is forced to govern on its own, until it is no longer propped up by the presence of more than 150,000 American soldiers.

As it is now, as long as we continue with this military occupation, Iraqis have absolutely no incentive to push for democratic reform. As the Times article indicated, the President has waved off these concerns, accusing those of us who want to apply deadlines, pressure of being part of a culture of instant results.

Instant results? I am sorry, the President has had 4 years and more than $400 billion to make this work. Besides, it is this administration that assured us we would be greeted as liberators, that democratizing Iraq would be a cinch, that there would be hardly any sacrifice at all. Now that they have turned out to be monumentally wrong, they are wanting to know why we are demanding answers 4 years later.

I, for one, am tired of being told to be patient, especially when this body is asked to write another enormous check for this war, especially when my country is becoming a global pariah, especially when we learn that our Iraq policy has increased the threat of terrorism, especially when Americans are dying by the thousands, and those lucky enough to make it home alive

face a mountain of red tape, substandard care, rodent-infested living quarters at Walter Reed.

I believe we must move toward a fully funded military withdrawal now, not in August of 2008, not at some future date to be determined by the President. End the occupation and start bringing the troops home so that every last one of them can be out of Iraq and with their families in time for the holidays.

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.)

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION, 110TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(3) of Rule XI, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I submit the rules of the Committee for the 110th Congress for publication at an appropriate place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

RULE NO. 1

General provisions

(a) The Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a privileged motion in the Committee. Each subcommittee of the committee is a part of the committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the chair and to its rules as far as applicable.

(b) The Committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under House Rule X and, subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by House Rule X, clause 6, to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) The Committee is authorized to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the Committee, and to make such information available to the public. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with any meeting or hearing of the Committee shall be paid from the appropriate House account.

(d) The Committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year, a report on the activities of the committee under House Rules X and XI during the Congress ending at noon on January 3 of such year.

(e) The Committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

RULE NO. 2

Regular and special meetings

(a) The regular meeting date of the Committee on House Administration shall be the second Wednesday of every month when the House is in session in accordance with Clause 2(b) of House Rule XI. Additional meetings may be called by the Chair of the Committee as she or he may deem necessary or at the request of a majority of the members of the Committee in accordance with Clause 2(c) of House Rule XI. The determination of the business to be considered at each meeting shall be made by the Chair subject to Clause 2(c) of House Rule XI. A regularly scheduled meeting may be dispensed with if, in the judgment of the Chair, there is no need for the meeting.

(b) If the Chair is not present at any meeting of the Committee, or at the discretion of the Chair, the Vice Chair of the Committee shall preside at the meeting. If the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee are not present at any meeting of the Committee, the ranking member of the majority party who is present shall preside at the meeting.

RULE NO. 3

Open meetings

As required by Clause 2(g), of House Rule XI, each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation of the Committee shall be open to the public except when the Committee in open session and with a quorum present determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person, or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House: Provided, however, that no person other than members of the Committee, and such congressional staff and such other persons as the Committee may authorize, shall be present in any business or markup session which has been closed to the public.

RULE NO. 4

Records and rollcalls

(a)(1) A record vote shall be held if requested by any member of the Committee.

(2) The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee shall be made available for inspection by the public at reasonable times at the Committee offices, including a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition; the name of each member voting for and against; and the members present but not voting.

(b)(1) Subject to subparagraph (2), the Chair may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment. The Chair may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time.

(2) In exercising postponement authority under subparagraph (1), the Chair shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote.

(3) When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(c) All Committee and subcommittee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the member serving as Chair; and such records shall be the property of the House and all members of the House shall have access thereto.

(d) House records of the Committee which are at the National Archives shall be made available pursuant to House Rule VII. The Chair shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision to withhold a record pursuant to the rule, and shall present the matter to the Committee upon written request of any Committee member.

(e) To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

RULE NO. 5

Proxies

No vote by any member in the Committee may be cast by proxy.

RULE NO. 6

Power to sit and act subpoena power

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under House Rules X and XI, the Committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized (subject to subparagraph (b)(1) of this paragraph)—

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings; and

(2) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, documents and other materials as it deems necessary, including materials in electronic form. The Chair, or any member designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b)(1) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or subcommittee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present. The power to authorize and issue subpoenas under subparagraph (a)(2) may be delegated to the Chair pursuant to such rules and under such limitations as the Committee may prescribe. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chair or by any member designated by the Committee, and may be served by any person designated by the Chair or such member.

(2) Compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or a subcommittee may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

RULE NO. 7

Quorums

No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House unless a majority of the Committee is actually present. For the purposes of taking any action other than reporting any measure, issuance of a subpoena, closing meetings, promulgating Committee orders, or changing the rules of the Committee, one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum. For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members shall constitute a quorum.

RULE NO. 8

Amendments

Any amendment offered to any pending legislation before the Committee or a subcommittee must be made available in written form when requested by any member of the Committee. If such amendment is not available in written form when requested, the Chair will allow an appropriate period of time for the provision thereof.

RULE NO. 9

Hearing procedures

(a) The Chair, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the Committee, and the appropriate subcommittee chair, in the case of hearings to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one (1) week before the commencement of that hearing. If the Chair, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member,

determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present, the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) Unless excused by the Chair, each witness who is to appear before the Committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the Committee, at least 48 hours in advance of his or her appearance, a written statement of his or her proposed testimony and shall limit his or her oral presentation to a summary of his or her statement.

(c) When any hearing is conducted by the Committee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chair by a majority of those minority members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearings thereon.

(d) All other members of the Committee may have the privilege of sitting with any subcommittee during its hearings or deliberations and may participate in such hearings or deliberations, but no member who is not a member of the subcommittee shall count for a quorum or offer any motion or amendment or vote on any matter before the subcommittee.

(e) Committee or subcommittee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chair for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The 5-minute period for questioning a witness by any one member can be extended as provided by House Rules. The questioning of a witness in Committee or subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the Chair, followed by the ranking minority member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chair shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority. The Chair may accomplish this by recognizing two majority members for each minority member recognized.

(f) The following additional rules shall apply to hearings of the Committee or a subcommittee, as applicable:

(1) The Chair at a hearing shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the investigation.

(2) A copy of the Committee rules and this clause shall be made available to each witness as provided by clause 2(k)(2) of Rule XI.

(3) Witnesses at hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

(4) The Chair may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the Committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(5) If the Committee determines that evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, it shall—

(A) afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness;

(B) receive such evidence or testimony in executive session; and

(C) receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.

(6) Except as provided in subparagraph (f)(5), the Chair shall receive and the Committee shall dispose of requests to subpoena additional witnesses.

(7) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the Committee.

(8) In the discretion of the Committee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The Committee is the sole judge of the pertinence of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearing.

(9) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the Committee.

RULE NO. 10

Procedures for reporting measures or matters

(a)(1) It shall be the duty of the Chair to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by the Committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(2) In any event, the report of the Committee on a measure which has been approved by the Committee shall be filed within 7 calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the Committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the Committee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the clerk of the Committee shall transmit immediately to the Chair notice of the filing of that request.

(b)(1) No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

(2) With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter of a public character, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those members voting for and against, shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter.

(c) The report of the Committee on a measure or matter which has been approved by the Committee shall include the matters required by Clause 3(c) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House.

(d) Each report of the Committee on each bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by the Committee shall include a statement citing the specific powers granted to the Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution.

(e) If, at the time any measure or matter is ordered reported by the Committee, any member of the Committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than two additional calendar days after the day of such notice, commencing on the day on which the measure or matter(s) was approved, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays, in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that member, with the clerk of the Committee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the Committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter. The report of the Committee upon that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume which—

(1) shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views, in the form submitted, by the time of the filing of the report, and

(2) shall bear upon its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views (and any material submitted under subparagraph (c)) are included as part of the report. This subparagraph does not preclude —

(A) the immediate filing or printing of a Committee report unless timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided by paragraph (c); or

(B) the filing of any supplemental report upon any measure or matter which may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by the Committee upon that measure or matter.

(3) shall, when appropriate, contain the documents required by Clause 3(e) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House.

(f) The Chair, following consultation with the ranking minority member, is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House, relating to going to conference with the Senate, whenever the Chair considers it appropriate.

(g) If hearings have been held on any such measure or matter so reported, the Committee shall make every reasonable effort to have such hearings published and available to the members of the House prior to the consideration of such measure or matter in the House.

(h) The Chair may designate any majority member of the Committee to act as ''floor manager'' of a bill or resolution during its consideration in the House.

RULE NO. 11

Committee oversight

The Committee shall conduct oversight of matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee in accordance with House Rule X, clause 2 and clause 4. Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the Committee shall, in a meeting that is open to the public and with a quorum present, adopt its oversight plan for that Congress in accordance with House Rule X, clause 2(d).

RULE NO. 12

Review of continuing programs; budget act provisions

(a) The Committee shall, in its consideration of all bills and joint resolutions of a public character within its jurisdiction, ensure that appropriation for continuing programs and activities of the Federal Government will be made annually to the maximum extent feasible and consistent with the nature, requirement, and objectives of the programs and activities involved. For the purposes of this paragraph a Government agency includes the organizational units of government listed in Clause 4(e) of Rule X of House Rules.

(b) The Committee shall review, from time to time, each continuing program within its jurisdiction for which appropriations are not made annually in order to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations therefor would be made annually.

(c) The Committee shall, on or before February 25 of each year, submit to the Committee on the Budget (1) its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year which are within its jurisdiction or functions, and (2) an estimate of the total amounts of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction which it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

(d) As soon as practicable after a concurrent resolution on the budget for any fiscal year is agreed to, the Committee (after consulting with the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate) shall subdivide any allocation made to it in the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on such resolution, and

promptly report such subdivisions to the House, in the manner provided by section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) Whenever the Committee is directed in a concurrent resolution on the budget to determine and recommend changes in laws, bills, or resolutions under the reconciliation process it shall promptly make such determination and recommendations, and report a reconciliation bill or resolution (or both) to the House or submit such recommendations to the Committee on the Budget, in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

RULE NO. 13

Broadcasting of committee hearings and meetings

Whenever any hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee is open to the public, those proceedings shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography, as provided in Clause 4 of House Rule XI, subject to the limitations therein. Operation and use of any Committee Internet broadcast system shall be fair and nonpartisan and in accordance with Clause 4(b) of rule XI and all other applicable rules of the Committee and the House.

RULE NO. 14

Committee and subcommittee staff

The staff of the Committee on House Administration shall be appointed as follows:

A. The staff shall be appointed by the Chair or her or his designee except as provided in paragraph (B), and may be removed by the Chair and shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Chair;

B. All staff provided to the minority party members of the Committee shall be appointed by the ranking member or her or his designee, and may be removed, by the ranking minority member of the Committee, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of such member;

C. The Chair shall fix the compensation of all staff of the Committee, after consultation with the ranking minority member regarding any minority party staff, within the budget approved for such purposes for the Committee.

RULE NO. 15

Travel of members and staff

(a) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern travel of Committee members and staff. Travel for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chair or her or his designee. Travel may be authorized by the Chair for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance at hearings conducted by the Committee and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chair in writing the following:

(1) The purpose of the travel;

(2) The dates during which the travel will occur;

(3) The locations to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each; and

(4) The names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b)(1) In the case of travel outside the United States of members and staff of the Committee for the purpose of conducting hearings, investigations, studies, or attending meetings and conferences involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of the committee, prior authorization must be obtained from the Chair. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chair, in writing, a request for such authorization. Each request, which shall be filed in a manner that allows for a reasonable period of time for review before such travel is scheduled to begin, shall include the following:

(A) the purpose of the travel;

(B) the dates during which the travel will occur;

(C) the names of the countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each;

(D) an agenda of anticipated activities for each country for which travel is authorized together with a description of the purpose to be served and the areas of committee jurisdiction involved; and

(E) the names of members and staff for whom authorization is sought.

(2) At the conclusion of any hearing, investigation, study, meeting or conference for which travel outside the United States has been authorized pursuant to this rule, members and staff attending meetings or conferences shall submit a written report to the Chair covering the activities and other pertinent observations or information gained as a result of such travel.

(c) Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, or regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel.

RULE NO. 16

Number and jurisdiction of subcommittees

(a) There shall be two standing subcommittees, with party ratios of members as indicated. Subcommittees shall have jurisdictions as stated by these rules, may conduct oversight over such subject matter, and may consider such legislation as may be referred to them by the Chair. The names and jurisdiction of the subcommittees shall be:

(1) Subcommittee on Capitol Security—(2/1). Matters pertaining to operations and security of the Congress, and of the Capitol complex including the House wing of the Capitol, the House Office Buildings, the Library of Congress, and other policies and facilities supporting congressional operations; the U.S. Capitol Police.

(2) Subcommittee on Elections—(4/2). Matters pertaining to the Federal Election Campaign Act, the Federal Contested Elections Act, the Help America Vote Act, the National Voter Registration Act, the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act, the Federal Voting Assistance Program, the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act (accessibility for voters with disabilities), the Federal Elections Commission (FEC), the Elections Assistance Commission (EAC), and other election related issues.

(b) The Chair may establish and appoint members to serve on task forces of the Committee, to perform specific functions for limited periods of time, as she or he deems appropriate.

RULE NO. 17

Referral of legislation to subcommittees

The Chair may refer legislation or other matters to a subcommittee, or subcommittees, as she or he considers appropriate. The Chair may discharge any subcommittee of any matter referred to it.

RULE NO. 18

Powers and duties of subcommittees

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence and report to the full committee on all matters referred to it. No subcommittee shall meet during any Committee meeting.

RULE NO. 19

Other procedures and regulations

The Chair may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the committee.

RULE NO. 20

Designation of clerk of the committee

For the purposes of these rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives, the staff director of the Committee shall act as the clerk of the Committee.

THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today is the fourth anniversary of our invasion of Iraq. We still don't necessarily know why we went to war in Iraq; I certainly don't. This is my first year in Congress, and we have a very serious and important matter coming up this week which we have to vote on. I haven't decided exactly how I am going to vote. I know I want us out of Iraq. I want our troops to be safe, but be protected, and I want our veterans to be looked after.

There is a proposal to come up to suggest we should have a definite date, September 1 of 2008, to have our troops out of Iraq, and to have certain benchmarks which the Iraqi Government has to meet, and have our President certify they have met them at different times in the summer and next fall.

There are certain restrictions on the troops that says that the military can't send folks in if they haven't had a year off, they are not properly trained and don't have proper equipment, which is kind of hard for me to fathom, that after 4 years of war, we are only now getting around to saying our troops should have proper equipment, proper training and proper rest. It's hard for me to imagine what's gone on the last 4 years, what type of oversight or undersight has taken place in this Congress, and what type of concern that the administration has had for our troops, sending them into Iraq without proper training and without proper equipment.

It borders on malfeasance, and it makes me wonder, in voting for $100 billion in the supplemental budget, if it's not negligence, and Mr. Speaker knows as a lawyer it may be beyond that. It may be gross negligence of this administration, which has shown it doesn't know how to handle money, particularly in sending it to Iraq, where $10 billion is totally missing, other monies have just disappeared, to give them $100 billion and to give them the care and custody of American men and women, great patriots who have volunteered for military duty.

We have had 3,200 Americans die in Iraq, over 3,200 now, and casualties in the area of 20,000. For every day we stay there longer, there will be more and more casualties and more and more deaths.

I understand the proposal being put forth is an advancement, and it's more than the Senate will do, and it's more

than the administration will permit, because they have said they will veto anything with a date, anything with conditions, anything that is reasonable, that reflects what the American people want to have, which is the same policy in Iraq to get our troops home and to find a way to end America's nightmare, which has, indeed, been a nightmare.

We were told the mission was accomplished. I don't know what has been accomplished. I have read newspapers today, and everybody, people in Iraq, have no medical care, they have very little electricity, they are living in squalor, and they say life was better with Saddam Hussein than it is now. We have not improved the lives of the Iraqi people. We have pretty much destroyed their country, and we claim we did it for freedom.

But one of the conditions upon which we will measure the benchmarks is if they give us their oil and give it to some of our multinational companies, which makes you wonder if they hate us because of our love for freedom, or if they hate us because we want to take their oil. Maybe that is what it was all about was oil, blood for oil.

It's hard for me not to support a progressive measure, which I know Speaker PELOSI and I know my party's leadership is going to advance, to try to bring some end to this nightmare. But at the same time it's difficult for me to give another dollar and another life to the care and custody of this administration. I do think it's gross negligence probably to do so when you look at what they have done over the last 4 years.

I read about death this weekend in Iraq, soldiers who died who were 20 years old, 19 years old, 21 years old, and I thought about how young they were. They are children basically, children with guns, going over to Iraq, and they are dying because they fall, they have an IED blow them up. It's not mano a mano, it is not being shot by Iraqis. It's IEDs. Every day we stay, there will be more and more American men and women being blown up, being sent to inadequate facilities such as Walter Reed because we haven't gotten out.

I don't know that the situation there will get any better. The President today called a press conference and spoke and said we need to keep going forward; we won't know in weeks, we won't know in months, we won't know until longer if this surge or escalation will work.

It's not going to work. You learn from history. If you don't learn from history, you are a fool. The fact is you look at the past, you can look at the Sunnis and the Shi'a and the situation over there and the insurgents, and our being there has not made a difference. It just means that American men and women have died, and the dollars that should have been spent in cities in America to help children with education and health care hasn't been spent.

I am conflicted. I hope the people in my district will let me know what they think. Should we spend another dollar and sacrifice another life, or should we get out as soon as possible?

PETRODOLLARS AND THE IRAQ WAR

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal reported last week what most Americans may not realize, that for the first time in history, our U.S. military is now guarding the major Iraqi oil pipeline that leads to its major refinery in Bayji. Yes, our brave soldiers from the 82nd Airborne are now maintaining around-the-clock presence at Iraq's largest oil pipeline and refinery to fight the corruption, smuggling and sabotage that characterize Iraq's oil industry, its premier industry.

The article talks about the flourishing market in stolen Iraqi oil. It says U.S. military officials estimate that as much as 70 percent of the fuel processed at the plant is lost to the black market, an amount valued at more than $2 billion. Iraq's oil reserves may be the largest in the world. Future access to them is now being determined by a group of people we generally don't see on the evening news.

Do you know them? It's important to figure out who those people are and who exactly is now involved in writing Iraq's hydrocarbon law. How transparent are these oil deliberations?

Indeed, it is amazing how little we hear about them, as trillions of dollars are at stake. Meanwhile, oil smuggling has earned lots of shady characters hundreds of millions of dollars since the beginning of the war. Why did we let this go on? Until now, we can catch Saddam Hussein in the spider hole, and yet somehow we could not figure out who is smuggling Iraqi oil?

Americans deserve answers to so many questions. Who has been earning the money from the oil smuggling? Which global oil companies will benefit once the U.S. leaves Iraq? What percent of oil resources in Iraq will be left for the Iraqi people?

Traveling to Iraq and Kuwait a few weeks ago, I had the chance to witness how technology and power systems transformed endless deserts into oil supply lines. It is an awesome sight. Yet I couldn't help but ask, what is America doing in these deserts? Who does our oil addiction benefit? How have we let ourselves become tied to oil dictatorships? Why do we pay nearly $400 billion a year to import petroleum rather than become energy-independent ourselves here at home?

Our able colleague, Congressman BILL DELAHUNT of Massachusetts, gave me a book last week, and I looked on page 96. This is called ''The Price of Loyalty,'' by Ron Suskind. It explains how Donald Rumsfeld used our Defense Intelligence Agency to map Iraq's oil fields and lists companies that might be interested in leveraging the precious asset long before the Iraqi war was declared.

Judicial Watch obtained Mr. Rumsfeld's map through a Freedom of Information request because Mr. Rumsfeld and Paul Wolfowitz would not share it voluntarily. Imagine that. Our taxpayers footed the bill for this map to benefit private firms.

The book attests Rumsfeld and his cohorts in the Bush administration were not concerned with legitimate reasons to go to war; they only concerned themselves with how and how quickly to penetrate Iraq's oil fields. Mr. Wolfowitz had written as early as 1999 that the United States should be committed, should be prepared to commit ground forces to protect a sanctuary in southern Iraq where the opposition could safely mobilize. As we pay dearly for this violent war, and our soldiers die in Iraq, just coincidentally we have to remember the world's largest untapped oil reserves are in Iraq.

Most other nations in the Middle East have guarded their oil reserves as national treasures, but I will tell you what: Halliburton, ExxonMobil, ConocoPhillips, ChevronTexaco and foreign companies like Total, Royal Dutch Shell and British Petroleum have been identified by reporters like Antonia Juhasz, who said last week in the New York Times, these oil companies would not have to invest their earnings in the Iraqi economy, partner with Iraqi companies, hire Iraqi workers or share their new technologies. In fact, she says, only 13 of the 80 oil wells, oil fields in Iraq would be for the Iraqi people. The other ones are being bargained away as the hydrocarbon law is written. Why do we hear so little about this on our evening news?

John Perkins, in his book ''Confessions of an Economic Hit Man,'' talks about how Saudi oil money through petrodollars has been reinvested in our economy, holding up so many of our equities and certainly our U.S. Treasury securities. Why can't America become energy-independent at home? Why do we have to be dependent to the 20th century view of dependency on foreign oil?

"Almost immediately after the [1973 oil] embargo ended," Perkins writes, "Washington began negotiating with the Saudis, offering them technical support, military hardware and training and an opportunity to bring their nation into the twentieth century, in exchange for petrodollars and, most importantly, assurances that there would never be another oil embargo." Congress did not negotiate this—the overall management and fiscal responsibility lay with the Department of the Treasury, and according to the book, the ensuing agreement, which was negotiated in intense secrecy, "fortif[ied] the concept of mutual interdependence." The very goal of this agreement was to "find ways that would assure that a large portion of petrodollars found their way back to the United States" so that "Saudi Arabia would be

drawn in, its economy would become increasingly intertwined with and dependent upon ours'' and, of course, we on them. It is a ridden economy.

Is this the America you want? Do you want U.S. soldiers risking their lives guarding Iraqi oil? I want an America free of counterproductive foreign entanglements. I want an America free of support for dictatorships, no matter how tempting their treasures. I want an America free of foreign oil. I want to invest our dollars here at home in energy independence—in solar, wind, hydrogen, clean coal, new turbine systems, fuel cells and so much more.

I think most Americans, if they understood the extent to which we are hurting ourselves, would want the same. Some global interests are getting so filthy rich year after year, that they would risk a free America for the sake of their bloodied oil profits. It's worth changing how we do business in order to regain our freedom.

[From the Wall Street Journal Europe, Mar. 15, 2007]

IRAQ'S OIL SMUGGLERS ARE TARGETED

(By Yochi J. Dreazen)

BAYJI, IRAQ—Adding another facet to Washington's new pacification plan for Iraq, U.S. and Iraqi forces have launched an aggressive campaign to curb the oil smuggling that is destabilizing the fragile Baghdad government and helping to fund insurgents.

In concert with stepped-up military and reconstruction initiatives across Iraq, U.S. troops for the first time are maintaining a round-the-clock presence at the sprawling oil refinery here, Iraq's largest. Soldiers from the Army's 82nd Airborne Division are cracking down on illegal gas stations, arresting refinery workers suspected of corruption and using sophisticated data-sifting methods to identify which senior Iraqi officials might have ties to black-market oil rings.

The Iraqi government, meanwhile, has begun what it calls Operation Honest Hands, which puts the entire refinery under Iraqi military control. Iraqi Army soldiers are physically monitoring each of the facility's pumps and entrances, assuming many of the responsibilities previously held by a paramilitary security force employed by the Oil Ministry that was widely considered corrupt and ineffectual. Iraqi troops are also escorting many convoys of fuel trucks from the refinery to destinations around the country.

The move represents another course change for the administration of U.S. President George W. Bush as it struggles to craft a new approach for stabilizing Iraq. U.S. and Iraqi officials have long been aware of the flourishing market in stolen Iraqi oil but largely turned a blind eye because Washington feared that stationing American soldiers in major refineries would spark a nationalist backlash and renew accusations that the U.S. invaded Iraq for its oil. The Iraqi government, meanwhile, felt its modest security resources were better used directly fighting insurgents.

But officials from both governments have concluded recently that oil smuggling had become too big a problem to ignore any longer. The loss of so much output to the black market is sharply reducing the Iraqi government's main source of revenue: About 94% of Iraq's $32 billion budget last year came from oil revenue. The stolen oil also gives Iraq's insurgent groups a ready source of income, helping to perpetuate the country's civil war.

''Disrupting the insurgent funding is our main job,'' said 30-year-old Capt. Kwenton Kuhlman, who is leading the antismuggling operation at the Bayji refinery. ''I'm under no illusions—we can't stop it. It's too big. But we can try to disrupt it.''

Iraq produces some 2 million barrels of oil a day, but U.S. and Iraqi officials believe the figure could rise as high as 5 million barrels a day with improved security and new infrastructure.

Former Iraqi President Saddam Hussein helped create the black market in oil in response to economic sanctions imposed in the wake of the 1990–91 Persian Gulf War. Mr. Hussein used smuggling, as well as kickbacks on oil sold legitimately through the United Nations' oil-for-food program, to generate cash for his regime and to reward allies at home and abroad.

The stepped-up fight against smuggling has no guarantee of success—and risks triggering more political and economic turmoil. Senior Iraqi officials regularly pressure the Americans to call off specific investigations or release individuals detained for suspected involvement in the black market, feeding Washington's suspicions that oil-related corruption extends deep into the government.

The enormity of the task facing the soldiers from the 82nd Airborne was evident on recent visits, and underscores the broader challenge Americans face in turning more security over to their Iraqi counterparts. Several tanker drivers said Iraqi soldiers at the plant had already begun asking for bribes. The drivers also said they don't want to be escorted by Iraqi troops for fear of attracting insurgent attacks. ''I want coalition forces to guard this place, not the Iraqi Army,'' driver Suhaib Adil Kareem said. ''The Iraqis don't care about the law.''

Widespread oil smuggling siphons off as much as $5 billion per year. At the Bayji refinery—one of three in the country [U.S. military officials estimate that as much as 70% of the fuel processed at the plant is lost to the black market, an amount valued at more than $2 billion per year.]

Iraq's parliament will soon debate a landmark petroleum law that would clear the way for direct foreign investment in the battered oil sector and set out rough guidelines for distributing oil revenue among Iraq's 18 provinces. But U.S. and Iraqi officials warn the new law will have little substantive impact unless the smuggling is brought under control.

The endemic oil-sector corruption is a financial boon to insurgent operations. A classified U.S. government report in November estimated Iraqi militants earn $25 million to $100 million every year by stealing tankers full of fuel, smuggling oil to other countries, carrying out kidnappings for ransom, and charging protection money from truckers and gas station owners.

''The fuel that is stolen comes back as bombs, mortar shells and Katyusha rockets,'' said Hamad Hamoud al-Shakti, the governor of the Salahaddin province, home to the Bayji refinery.

The black market is fueled by three factors. Baghdad heavily subsidizes gasoline and other oil products, and the resulting low prices mean they can be resold at enormous profit in neighboring countries. The government also doesn't verify that gas-station owners—who are entitled to receive 100,000 liters of fuel per week—sell to retail customers instead of on the black market.

The biggest issue, though, is pervasive corruption. U.S. and Iraqi officials say refinery workers routinely allow tankers to pick up fuel without any paperwork, which makes it easy to sell off the books. Police officers demand bribes of as much as $1,000 to let tankers pass through checkpoints or for ''protection'' along routes, the officials say. And some government officials work directly with smugglers or secretly own gas stations and fuel trucks, giving them a share of money earned through illicit sales, U.S. officials say.

''You're talking about corruption at basically every level,'' says Maj. Curtis Buzzard, the Harvard-educated executive officer of the brigade conducting the interdiction push. ''And it's deeply entrenched.''

As part of the campaign, the U.S. in coming months will spend more than $12 million to install video cameras to monitor the refinery's pumps and new digital scales to weigh trucks, making it easier to see if truckers are carrying more fuel than they were meant to receive. The money will also be used to build parking lots designed to protect drivers from extortion and insurgent attack.

Over the past few months, U.S. and Iraqi forces already have quietly begun arresting officials suspected of playing central roles in black-market rings. As far back as September, Iraqi forces arrested Ibrahim Muslit, who ran the Bayji refinery's oil-distribution operation, after he allegedly allowed 33 tankers in a single day to receive fuel without any paperwork. In January, U.S. troops arrested Ahmed Ibrahim Hamad, a senior transportation official at the refinery, after he allegedly tried to help smuggle out seven tankers of heavy-fuel oil. Both men are in custody and unavailable for comment.

Now, U.S. commanders say they are conducting investigations of senior officials from the Bayji city council, the local police force and the provincial and national governments. The American officers say they have made about 40 arrests since the crackdown began in earnest in early February, when the Iraqis formally joined the campaign, and they hope to make additional arrests in coming weeks.

During a surprise inspection of the refinery's gasoline and diesel pumps one afternoon, Sgt. Stephen Truesdale noticed that the analog display on one of the machines showed it had pumped 4,000 liters more than the facility's handwritten records indicated.

''He helped steal 4,000 liters of gas,'' Sgt. Truesdale, a former North Carolina police officer, said of the heavy-set Iraqi man who had been manning the pump. ''The pumps don't lie.''

The refinery worker insisted he was innocent, but Capt. Kuhlman, the brigade leader, told his men they had enough evidence to arrest him.

On the way back to their base, the U.S. forces saw a large fuel truck parked on the side of the road, surrounded by pickup trucks carrying overflowing oil barrels. The 18 Iraqis at the site freely admitted they had purchased the fuel from a tanker driver who had left the refinery a short time earlier. The men said they made such purchases several times a week and resold the oil to factory owners and other small businesses in neighboring towns.

The American forces ordered the Iraqis to drive their pickups back to the refinery, where the men were searched, photographed and escorted onto a pair of open-backed military vehicles for transport to holding cells at the U.S. installation.

The following day, Capt. Kuhlman told a room full of refinery officials and trucking-company executives about the arrests. Shakir Hamid, a businessman who said his partner had been kidnapped from the refinery months earlier, shook his head.

''In Saddam's time, oil smugglers were hung,'' he said.

''And I release them after two days,'' Capt. Kuhlman replied, shrugging his shoulders. ''But it's a start.''

Beneath the surface was a battle O'Neill had seen brewing since the NSC meeting on

January 30. It was Powell and his moderates at the State Department versus hard-liners like Rumsfeld, Cheney, and Wolfowitz, who were already planning the next war in Iraq and the shape of a post-Saddam country.

Documents were being prepared by the Defense Intelligence Agency, Rumsfeld's intelligence arm, mapping Iraq's oil fields and exploration areas and listing companies that might be interested in leveraging the precious asset.

One document, headed ''Foreign Suitors for Iraqi Oilfield Contracts,'' lists companies from thirty countries—including France, Germany, Russia, and the United Kingdom—their specialties, bidding histories, and in some cases their particular areas of interest. An attached document maps Iraq with markings for ''supergiant oilfield,'' and ''other oilfield,'' and ''earmarked for production sharing,'' while demarking the largely undeveloped southwest of the country into nine ''blocks'' to designate areas for future exploration. The desire to ''dissuade'' countries from engaging in ''asymmetrical challenges'' to the United States—as Rumsfeld said in his January articulation of the demonstrative value of a preemptive attack—matched with plans for how the world's second largest oil reserve might be divided among the world's contractors made for an irresistible combination, O'Neill later said.

Already by February, the talk was mostly about logistics. Not the why, but the how and how quickly. Rumsfeld, O'Neill recalled, was focused on how an incident might cause escalated tensions—like the shooting down of an American plane in the regular engagements between U.S. fighters and Iraqi antiaircraft batteries—and what U.S. responses to such an occurrence might be. Wolfowitz was pushing for the arming of Iraqi opposition groups and sending in U.S. troops to support and defend their insurgency. He had written in Foreign Affairs magazine in 1999 that ''the United States should be prepared to commit ground forces to protect a sanctuary in southern Iraq where the opposition could safely mobilize.''

[From the New York Times, Mar. 13, 2007]

WHOSE OIL IS IT, ANYWAY?

(By Antonia Judasz)

Today more than three-quarters of the world's oil is owned and controlled by governments. It wasn't always this way.

Until about 35 years ago, the world's oil was largely in the hands of seven corporations based in the United States and Europe. Those seven have since merged into four: ExxonMobil, Chevron, Shell and BP. They are among the world's largest and most powerful financial empires. But ever since they lost their exclusive control of the oil to the governments, the companies have been trying to get it back.

Iraq's oil reserves—thought to be the second largest in the world—have always been high on the corporate wish list. In 1998, Kenneth Derr, then chief executive of Chevron, told a San Francisco audience, ''Iraq possesses huge reserves of oil and gas—reserves I'd love Chevron to have access to.''

A new oil law set to go before the Iraqi Parliament this month would, if passed, go a long way toward helping the oil companies achieve their goal. The Iraq hydrocarbon law would take the majority of Iraq's oil out of the exclusive hands of the Iraqi government and open it to international oil companies for a generation or more.

In March 2001, the National Energy Policy Development Group (better known as Vice President Dick Cheney's energy task force), which included executives of America's largest energy companies, recommended that the United States government support initiatives by Middle Eastern countries ''to open up areas of their energy sectors to foreign investment.'' One invasion and a great deal of political engineering by the Bush administration later, this is exactly what the proposed Iraq oil law would achieve. It does so to the benefit of the companies, but to the great detriment of Iraq's economy, democracy and sovereignty.

Since the invasion of Iraq, the Bush administration has been aggressive in shepherding the oil law toward passage. It is one of the president's benchmarks for the government of Prime Minister Nuri Kamal al-Maliki, a fact that Mr. Bush, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, Gen. William Casey, Ambassador Zalmay Khalilzad and other administration officials are publicly emphasizing with increasing urgency.

The administration has highlighted the law's revenue sharing plan, under which the central government would distribute oil revenues throughout the nation on a per capita basis. But the benefits of this excellent proposal are radically undercut by the law's many other provisions—these allow much (if not most) of Iraq's oil revenues to flow out of the country and into the pockets of international oil companies.

The law would transform Iraq's oil industry from a nationalized model closed to American oil companies except for limited (although highly lucrative) marketing contracts, into a commercial industry, all-but-privatized, that is fully open to all international oil companies.

The Iraq National Oil Company would have exclusive control of just 17 of Iraq's 80 known oil fields, leaving two-thirds of known—and all of its as yet undiscovered—fields open to foreign control.

The foreign companies would not have to invest their earnings in the Iraqi economy, partner with Iraqi companies, hire Iraqi workers or share new technologies. They could even ride out Iraq's current ''instability'' by signing contracts now, while the Iraqi government is at its weakest, and then wait at least two years before even setting foot in the country. The vast majority of Iraq's oil would then be left underground for at least two years rather than being used for the country's economic development.

The international oil companies could also be offered some of the most corporate-friendly contracts in the world, including what are called production sharing agreements. These agreements are the oil industry's preferred model, but are roundly rejected by all the top oil producing countries in the Middle East because they grant long-term contracts (20 to 35 years in the case of Iraq's draft law) and greater control, ownership and profits to the companies than other models. In fact, they are used for only approximately 12 percent of the world's oil.

Iraq's neighbors Iran, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia maintain nationalized oil systems and have outlawed foreign control over oil development. They all hire international oil companies as contractors to provide specific services as needed, for a limited duration, and without giving the foreign company any direct interest in the oil produced.

Iraqis may very well choose to use the expertise and experience of international oil companies. They are most likely to do so in a manner that best serves their own needs if they are freed from the tremendous external pressure being exercised by the Bush administration, the oil corporations—and the presence of 140,000 members of the American military.

Iraq's five trade union federations, representing hundreds of thousands of workers, released a statement opposing the law and rejecting ''the handing of control over oil to foreign companies, which would undermine the sovereignty of the state and the dignity of the Iraqi people.'' They ask for more time, less pressure and a chance at the democracy they have been promised.

VIEW FROM AN O'BRIEN COUNTY, IOWA, SOLDIER

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to read into the RECORD an editorial that was published in the O'Brien County Newsletter, O'Brien County, Iowa. It is from Sean P. O'Brien, First Lieutenant, Field Artillery, United States Army and Purple Heart recipient.

It reads like this: ''There are few things that a professional military officer can attribute to editorial statements. However, I would like to share some of the ideas that more than represent what our tour of duty in Afghanistan meant to me. This ethos is to help put these personal feelings, which all soldiers have, into a tangible rallying point.

''I am an American soldier. I am a warrior and a member of a team. I serve the people of the United States and live the Army values. I will always place the mission first, I will never accept defeat, I will never quit, I will never leave a fallen comrade.

□ 2015

''I am a disciplined, physically and mentally tough trained and proficient warrior in my tasks and drills. I always maintain my arms, my equipment, and myself. I am an expert and I am a professional. I stand ready to deploy, engage, and destroy the enemies of the United States of America in close combat. I am a guardian of freedom and the American way of life. I am an American soldier.

''This is called the Warrior Ethos. Every soldier can recite it. It means everything. I cringe when I say this aloud. These words have such weight. As far as service, I understand now. When I shake hands with a veteran, there is a silent conversation that takes place that transcends all words. You can never understand this without experiencing it.

''I cannot deny the power of facing the enemies of truth with truth. The population was the center of gravity, and we systemically engaged in separating these bullies from the population, usually by simply not leaving. The stability created by our presence allowed civil leadership to stop focusing on being brutalized and start focusing on fostering a better way of life for the people, education, medical aid, and commerce. When the population realized that these ideas were worth having, they would generally take on the responsibility of denying safe havens for the bad guys.

''These people, the Afghans, are just like you and me. They want their children to have a safe place to grow. They

are extremely thankful that we are making the sacrifice we are for their nation. It is very humbling to be told that by a common villager. These people have known war as a way of life for 2,000 years. That being said, it is important to know that in every town there is an elder that stated, 'The U.S. was just different. You are respectful and you want to help us.'

''If you have ever held the ideal of compassion for your neighbor, then it is easy to understand that Afghanistan and her people are well worth the sacrifice. I am thankful to have been a part of a stronger future for Afghanistan.''

And here he says some complimentary things about me which I will leave from my presentation but leave in the printed RECORD and conclude with:

''As I said before, our efforts in this region are worth it. I encourage all to take a longer view. The compassion and the patience of the American servicemember make up a large part of their sense of duty. This is a fight between good and evil.'' Sean P. O'Brien, First Lieutenant, Field Artillery, United States Army, Purple Heart Recipient.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully enter this into the RECORD.

For: O'Brien County Republican Newsletter, Iowa

There are few things that a professional military officer can attribute to editorial statements; however, I would like to share some of the ideas that more than represent what my tour of duty in Afghanistan meant to me. This ''ethos'' is to help put these personal feelings—which all soldiers have—into a tangible rallying point.

I am an American Soldier.

I am a Warrior and a member of a team. I serve the people of the United States and live the Army Values.

I will always place the mission first.

I will never accept defeat.

I will never quit.

I will never leave a fallen comrade.

I am disciplined, physically and mentally tough, trained and proficient in my warrior tasks and drills. I always maintain my arms, my equipment and myself.

I am an expert and I am a professional.

I stand ready to deploy, engage, and destroy the enemies of the United States of America in close combat.

I am a guardian of freedom and the American way of life.

I am an American Soldier.

This is called the Warrior Ethos. Every soldier can recite it. It means everything.

I cringe when I say this aloud. Those words have such weight. As far as service, I understand now. When I shake hands with a veteran, there is a silent conversation that takes place that transcends all words. You can never understand this without experiencing it.

I cannot deny the power of facing the enemies of truth with truth. The population was the center of gravity, and we systematically engaged in separating these bullies from the population; usually by simply not leaving.

The stability created by our presence allowed civil leadership to stop focusing on being brutalized and start focusing on fostering a better way of life for the people; education, medical aid, commerce. When the population realized that these ideas were worth having, they would generally take on the responsibility of denying safe-havens for the bad guys.

Those people (the Afghans) are just like you and me. They want their children to have a safe place to grow. They are extremely thankful that we are making the sacrifice we are for their nation. It is very humbling to be told that by a common villager.

These people have known war as a way of life for 2,000 years. That being said, it is important to know that in every town, there was an elder that stated:

''The U.S. was just different, you are respectful and you want to help us''. If you have ever held the ideal of compassion for your neighbor, then it is easy to understand that Afghanistan and her people are well worth the sacrifice. I am thankful to have been a part of a stronger future for Afghanistan.

I was honored by the personal efforts of 5th District Congressman Steve King. He actively followed our efforts and through personal correspondence offered his support. I enjoy the fact that there is adequate moral ''top cover'' that actively engages in seeking the truth. Thank you Steve, you are as much a patriot as I ever hope to be.

As I said before, our efforts in this region are worth it. I encourage all to take a longer view. The compassion and the patience of the American Service Member make up a large part of their sense of Duty. This is a fight between good and evil.

Sean P. O'Brien, 1st Lieutenant, Field Artillery, U.S. Army, Purple Heart Recipient.

THE COUNTDOWN CREW

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, for the past 2 months, myself and others have been coming to the floor to talk about the impending tax increase that we face in this country if the majority doesn't act in something just under 1,400 days, and we will see this huge tax increase and all the majority has to do is run out the clock. They have to do nothing to see this tax increase be put back in place when the tax cuts that we passed in early 2001, 2002, 2003 will expire.

But tonight we are coming to the floor, and we think it is fitting to talk about the fourth anniversary of Iraq and what is happening in Iraq and, most importantly, what is going to happen on this House floor we think this week but maybe not until next week.

It was fitting tonight that we had a moment of silence for our men and women in harm's way. It was very fitting. But it is also fitting that the United States Congress is very clear to the men and women in harm's way that we support them. And we don't just support them in standing up on the House floor talking about it, but we support them in a concrete way, and that is making sure that they are getting the funds that they need, making sure that the United States Congress is sending a message to our enemies around the world that we are behind them; that we are not going to shortchange them; that we are not going to pull the rug out from under them; that we are not going to put a time line in place that is going to allow our enemies to know when and what we are going to do, we let our enemies know that they just have to run out the clock.

And if they run out the clock, that we are going to be gone and they are going to be able to be back in Iraq, they are going to be back in other places around this world doing harm to many people, including Americans. So it is absolutely important that our men and women know, and this supplemental is going to be the key. It is going to be the key for our men and women to know that we are behind them. And what the majority party is putting forth, at least we think what the majority party is putting forward, has created a confusing and inflexible timetable for the Americans' withdrawal from Iraq.

From what they have said, and we only know in press accounts and I will read many of those press accounts, and I would encourage you to go to www.gop.gov and see last week's press conference with the leadership of the majority party, the Democratic leadership talk about their plan, and just watch it for about a minute and you will see just how confusing it was to not only the American people but to the leadership of the majority party.

As I said, they have put in place timetables for withdrawal, with forces leaving as early as July 1 and concluding their removal no later than August 2008. Now, we can talk and talk and talk, but our enemies see that, and they will just go back into the shadows and they will just wait until we are gone to be able to wreak havoc on Iraq and the Iraqi people.

An example of what is in the supplemental, at least that is what we have heard, we are not sure but this is what we have heard: that none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other act may be used to deploy any unit of the Armed Forces to Iraq unless the chief of the military department concerned has certified in writing to the Committees on Appropriations and on Armed Services at least 15 days in advance of deployment that this unit is fully mission capable.

Now, if that is not micromanagement, I don't know what is. I think the lessons of Vietnam have been lost on the majority party. That is micromanaging the war. That is what caused us great detriment in Vietnam.

The next thing is: the President certifies in writing to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services that the deployment to Iraq of a unit that is not assessed fully mission capable, he is required to fill a report detailing the particular reason or reasons why that unit's deployment is necessary. If that is not micromanagement, I don't know what is.

We have one Commander in Chief, clearly stated in the Constitution, not 535 commanders looking to micromanage a war. This requirement ties the hands of the President in committing more troops to fighting required by red tape and lengthy explanations, cost of time, and the risk of lives. That is micromanaging the war. I think it is very, very clear. And, again, I would urge anybody that is interested to go to the Web site and see the Democratic House leadership's press conference last week, and you will see just how clearly they are confused.

So how can the American people not be confused? How can our men and women in harm's way not be confused about what this Congress, what this House is about to do?

Just a couple of press accounts talking about the supplemental. The Washington Post, The Washington Post described the Democrat plan as: an attempt to impose detailed management on a war without regard to the war itself. Micromanagement. The Los Angeles Times. The Los Angeles Times called for the bill to be vetoed. Imagine that. And I quote the Los Angeles Times saying this, not me: It is absurd for the House Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, Democrat, San Francisco, to try to micromanage the conflict and the evolution of Iraqi society with arbitrary timetables and benchmarks. The Los Angeles Times is saying that; it is not the Washington Times. If it were the Washington Times, my friends on the other side of the aisle would say that is a conservative paper. But it is the Los Angeles Times and The Washington Post saying this.

Now, my friends on the other side like to talk about the Iraqi Study Group, and the bipartisan Iraqi Study Group did not advocate, I repeat, did not advocate a firm timetable for withdrawal in its December 2006 report, because those folks knew that it was a bad idea to give our enemies a time certain as to when we would be out of Iraq.

The National Intelligence Estimate released in January warned of the perils of an early troop withdrawal. And it said: If Coalition forces were withdrawn rapidly during the term of this estimate, we judge that this almost certainly would lead to a significant increase in the scale and scope of sectarian conflict in Iraq. More death, more destruction.

Now, you can't have it both ways. You can't stand up and quote the Iraqi Study Group and the National Intelligence Estimate and pick out bits and pieces of it. There are certainly things in there that they said that we all need to pay attention to, but these are extremely important statements that were made.

I am sure I can go on and on quoting newspapers around this country that say similar things that The Washington Post and the Los Angeles Times are saying. And, again, I want to remind people what the Los Angeles Times said: It is absurd for the House Speaker to try to micromanage the conflict and the evolution of Iraqi society with arbitrary timetables and benchmarks. It is absurd for us to give our enemies a timetable for them to know when to lay back so they can regroup and wait until we leave, so that they can go back into the country of Iraq, set up bases, and wreak havoc on the people of Iraq.

The other thing about this supplemental that is distasteful to me and I believe others on the other side is that they have loaded this supplemental with spending. They have used our troops as a bargaining chip to increase domestic spending. Now, our troops deserve better than that, not to be used as a bargaining chip. This is a supplemental. This is for emergency spending, this is for the war, this is for something that our troops need. And I hope that those on the other side that have talked on the this floor night after night about irresponsible domestic spending, that they won't stand for it to be put in a supplemental that is to be used for emergency spending on this war.

Republicans rejected last year $14 billion of domestic spending not related to the war. We had a clean supplemental. And I hope my friends on the other side will reassess what they are about to do and use this supplemental, use our men and women in harm's way as a bargain chip.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Would the gentleman yield for one second?

Mr. SHUSTER. I most certainly will.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I just want to share, those who are joining us tonight have joined the Countdown Crew. We meet the first night of votes each legislative week. We can be reached by e-mail at CountdownCrew@mail.house.gov.

And the one thing that I would like to share from my perspective, we hear a lot of statements about a desire to support the troops. And I have said for the last 2½ years that, if we say we support the troops, it is important that we listen to what they have to say. As a former member of the 82nd Airborne Division and other military units with comrades serving in all the major line Army units, commanding brigades, serving on the senior staffs, receiving e-mail reports on a weekly basis, even from a platoon leader who is in Sadr City right now, we get a somewhat different perspective on the politics and debates that are going on back here in the House Chamber. And I would say this from a perspective of looking at the fiscal implications of decisions.

When we talk about the supplemental spending, the vast majority of money, and the original clean bill before politics got involved was designed for one thing, it was designed for troop support, it was designed for equipment reset, it was designed to provide support for provincial reconstruction teams for the transition of Iraqi security forces to be effective in their mission on the ground.

Unfortunately, due to the Hatch Act, the troops themselves don't have a voice where they can come into this Chamber and debate, and so as we have seen on numerous occasions, opinion is often substituted for fact. And it is an honest opinion; it is an honest viewpoint. I think we have honest disagreements. I think one thing that both sides can agree on is that there were strategic mistakes that were made early in the campaign due to institutional infrastructure and process issues that are endemic in the United States Government and need to be reformed.

But the truth of the matter, at the moment, is we have people in harm's way that are deployed forward who actually watch C–SPAN, who watch these debates. Many of them are friends of mine that I have known for well over 30 years and we have served together, a number of us served together in the Middle East. And the perspective that I would bring is this when we talk about emergency supplemental spending, and it comes back to an aspect of fiscal responsibility, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania's point earlier: a supplemental spending bill is designed specifically to augment needs that were not covered in regularly budgeted, authorized, or appropriated lines.

□ 2030

And to put this into context, there are many divisions in the Congress, particularly in the Democratic Caucus, regarding the war. We are all well aware of them. I have many friends on both sides of the aisle. There are honest disagreements and disputes. But the one thing, to quote my friend, HAL ROGERS from Kentucky, where he said, ''Attention K-Mart shoppers,'' at the end of the appropriations hearing last week. ''A variety of spending provisions have been placed in a military supplemental bill that have nothing to do with national security in order to encourage those to vote for it.''

And I want to put this into context, that over $20 billion in nonmilitary, nonnational security spending has been included. They include $283 million in milk subsidies that are already funded in other programs. It includes $74 million for peanut storage.

Now, when I went to flight school at Fort Rucker, Alabama, at the U.S. Army Aviation Center, there were two great economic engines in the area. One was the United States Army Aviation Center that trained the pilots for the U.S. Army, the rotary wing force that provides our air assault and attack helicopter capability worldwide today, and also the peanut industry. The last time I checked, the peanut industry was not directly related to American national security.

Twenty-five million dollars are in payments to spinach producers on a national security supplemental bill. And this also rescinds $89 million in homeland security funding that allegedly would have lapsed in fiscal year 2006.

The reason that I bring these up, and the billions of dollars in spending, is

not to highlight honest disagreements about policy issues which have a rightful place in this Chamber.

And my friends on the other side are certainly entitled to their views, the basis of their perception. I certainly have my views on the subject which are different from many in the administration and on my side of the aisle as well. But the one thing that I will share is let's translate these dollars into reality from a fiscal perspective.

When Secretary Gates came over to testify before the Armed Services Committee in his first hearing in January of 2007, the first major request, and I was very heartened by this, was a request to increase the end strength of the United States Army by 96,000 soldiers. Now, why that number is important, I have advocated for nearly 5 years for a 100,000 soldier increase to the end strength to deal with and augment the operations tempo that our troops have experienced since the draw-downs in the mid-1990s. The rate and the pace of that transition is very significant upon our soldiers. And as a matter of fiscal responsibility for the investment that we have made in them and the commitment that we have made to them, I think it is important that we see that increase. And I was very heartened to see an acceptance of that need in the civilian appointed leadership of the Defense Department.

But here is the fiscal issue. When we talk about $20 billion in nonmilitary spending that were put on that supplemental bill, here is what $1 billion means. Regardless of your views on national security, $1 billion roughly translates into 10,000 fully equipped light infantry soldiers and fully trained and accessed into the military.

The reason that that number is important to keep in mind, at the end of the day, as we talk about force structure and staffing, I would ask my friends, would it have not been a more prudent use of our national security dollars and emergency supplemental, rather than going for programs or peanuts and spinach and the milk program, which I think would be more appropriately addressed jurisdictionally in the farm bill, to use that money, if there was a need, to assess it for troop training, to augment the needs for the conflicts that we are going to be facing in the 21st century, which are going to be significant. And I think that those conflicts would have come regardless of our policies there.

But nonetheless, this approach, I believe, is a poor use of fiscal stewardship and begs the real question at the end of the day of what we actually have voted for from a policy change, a world view change when we changed Speakers in January. As I have shared with many when we get asked about how is this going to be paid for, every working family in America making between $30- and $50,000 will have a $2,098 tax increase if those tax cuts are not extended and made permanent by 2010.

And with that I will yield back to the gentleman, but I just wanted to clarify that point from a national security perspective. Understand that it would be helpful for, I think, the American people to understand there are many nongermane issues and spending lines that have been added on this bill that have nothing to do with our current national security situation.

Mr. SHUSTER. I appreciate the gentleman pointing that out. And with your background, you are most qualified to do that, point out some of the things you pointed out.

I would now like to yield my friend from Texas, Mr. CONAWAY.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for hosting this hour tonight. It is particularly important, given it is the first of these hours for the week in which rumor has it that the war supplemental will be on the House floor this week up for debate. We don't even have really good rumors as to whether or not the other side will recognize the normal order of business with appropriations bills and bring it to the floor as an open rule, as has been the tradition certainly under the 12 years of Republican leadership. And so we are anxious to see the arrival of this first spending bill, if the other side brings it with a modified closed rule or a closed rule.

Mr. SHUSTER. May I interrupt the gentleman for a second? Did you say we are not going to have an open rule? Because I was under the impression that the Speaker and the leadership of the Democratic Party campaigned that they were going to have open rule after open rule, and they weren't going to put bills on the floor that didn't give the minority their rights. Are you telling me that it is not going to be an open rule on this supplemental?

Mr. CONAWAY. If the gentleman will yield back. We don't know for sure. I know that, during the debate last week, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee could not confirm his instructions from his leadership as to what he should be doing. In other words, were we going to have an open rule, as has been the tradition. Well beyond the 12 years' takeover that the Republican's experienced, it has just been a tradition on each floor that we bring an appropriations bill to the floor with open rules. And as late as last week, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, a guy that you would think would be in the know, would be in the inner circle, in the inside skinny with respect to the Democrat leadership, even he didn't know what the Speaker had decided in this arena.

So the caveats placed in there, the restrictions on our ability to fight this fight, the instructions to the President, I want to speak at from a little different angle. You yourself talked about the advantages that gives our enemies if we have a date certain that we have to be out of Iraq. That is pretty obvious. It doesn't take a lot of common sense, it doesn't take a lot of warfighting experience to understand that if you give your enemy that kind of an advance notice, that that is a clear advantage to the enemy.

I want to look at it from the other side. I want to look at it from the side of our troops. How do we ask good men and women who defend this country with their lives to fight under those considerations?

One of the great lines that the other side has used to argue about the war is, well, if we would have just known in 2002 what we know today, we would have voted differently. Well, yeah. Right. Well, let me maybe take a bit of a twist on that. How do we face that mom and dad in March of 2008 whose son or daughter has been maimed or killed? How do we look them in the eye and say, yeah, you know, if we had known in March of 2007, when we were setting the arbitrary and artificial dates, that your son was going to get killed in March of 2008, gee, we would have set the date at March 28 or January 31.

And so what we are doing to our troops is that we are undermining their morale, their strength of purpose by asking them to do things that are just unbelievably untenable. Night after night after night we listen to these floor speeches and we hear people build a case that in their mind we need to get out. We have had a couple earlier tonight, in fact, Mr. Speaker, that went through a litany of information they have used, they have gleaned to make their decision that we have lost this fight and that we need to get out.

Well, this body, from time to time, like daily, has its integrity challenged. Each one of us has a challenge to our integrity all the time; whether it is from a campaign contribution that we got and they are trying to link it to some sort of official act, all those integrity issues play out in the media constantly, and we rarely get our day in court. We rarely have an opportunity to stand tall and vote our conscience. I am going to argue, Mr. Speaker, that the Out of Iraq Caucus and all those other Members who have come in here night after night after night saying we have got to get out of Iraq have got an opportunity to vote their conscience this week.

I will argue, Mr. Speaker, that there are only two legitimate positions with respect to what we are doing in Iraq. The first, that I agree with, is to fight this fight and win it. The other legitimate circumstance is to get out today. There is no half ground. There is no half-stepping it. There is no run up the white flag and retreat the way that this supplemental would argue. There are no other choices but to fight the fight or get out.

And so all of these colleagues of ours that have night after night after night preached about getting out of Iraq have got an opportunity to demonstrate their integrity to their convictions. We will see how they vote. Will they vote the party line, come down here, 233 of them strong, vote in favor of this supplemental with these restrictions on

them that are unworkable in the extreme, but that put our men and women in harm, that make it very difficult for our combat leaders?

Our good colleague tonight is an experienced pilot in the Airborne. How do you ask a sergeant, how do you ask a first lieutenant to go do a dangerous mission in the last half of March of 2008, knowing that by the end of the month we are getting out of there? And how do you ask people to do that? You simply can't. You can't ask people to do that. You can't ask people to put their lives on the line under that kind of a restriction.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I think, to the gentleman's point, I received some correspondence from a colonel who came back from Iraq recently, and he shared this perspective. He shared that he had worked for General Abizaid, and he just made the comment, General Abizaid, the Central Command Commander, made the comment that dealing with Islamic radicalism is something that you want to do as an away game. And unlike different times in our history that, again, regardless of perceptions of the decisions that were made before you and I came here to be engaged in this conflict, there are second- and third-order effects that will be inherited by a precipitous withdrawal.

And when I go back, I listen to so many different voices with so many different perspectives, but the one unity of purpose that they say is that there would be profound consequences. In fact, one of the ones most recently was a friend who was in Task Force Ranger in Mogadishu, which I believe President Clinton reinforced an operation in 1993 to capture a tribal leader, a warlord, Mohammed Farah Aideed. This friend and Task Force Ranger shared that at the end of the Blackhawk Down incident, where America, frankly, lost the information war despite completely removing this militia, he shared with me over coffee recently and said, you know, little did we know that there were al Qaeda technical advisers who had served in Afghanistan fighting the mujahedin and were sent by Osama bin Laden to assist these groups because they were dealing with Americans and the consequences of leaving, when, in fact, he said if we had simply been able to stay, it would have sent a very different message. We could have accomplished the mission of apprehending the foe.

And to your point, again, the troops, I think, oftentimes inadvertently are used as human shields in debate, but we don't get down to the issues of what they really see on the ground and the perspective that they bring to this discussion.

Mr. CONAWAY. I appreciate my colleague's comment. This war, this fight has been compared with Vietnam. I think it is a lousy comparison. I think it is flawed on every level. But if we look at what happened when America withdrew, under Democratic leadership, withdrew, Democratic House, withdrew from Vietnam, look what happened to the people of Vietnam, the boat people exodus, the death inside Vietnam, and then the spillover into Cambodia with Pol Pot, 2 million lives lost under that ripple effect.

But the one thing that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have yet to answer, in addition to how do you face that mom and dad as a part of this artificial deadline, how do you manage the disaster in Iraq if we did pull out tonight, if we did get our guys out of there? The regional fight, the spillover into other countries, the humanitarian suffering on an incredible scale, how do, in fact, we manage that disaster if your answer is that we have to get out of Iraq tonight?

Mr. SHUSTER. And the gentleman, the point he just made is they try to compare Iraq to Vietnam, and it is not a good comparison at all. But, when the United States Congress is going to make an attempt to micromanage a war, that is going to be a comparison to Vietnam, and the same outcome is going to be not a good outcome. And like you said, the disaster that occurred, what happens after we leave and there is a disaster, human disaster of people, mass exodus from the country? So I just wanted to make that point.

Mr. CONAWAY. Let me finish off, and I will yield back for a little bit. We are talking about young men and women's lives who have volunteered to do a fight for us on our behalf, to fight an enemy that is really bad individuals, to stand between us and those bad individuals.

I even hesitate to bring this point up, but you look at this supplemental that has been proposed, an additional $21.8 billion added to it, and I would argue, and I am, on an individual basis, were it not in this bill, I would be for it. I think we have got some disaster relief and some other kinds of things that we could be for, but it appears to be an attempt to circumvent the PAYGO rules, that this, the other side beat our heads about, beat us about the head and shoulders with all during the campaign. In other words, if you declare the milk thing a disaster, then it doesn't have to be held up to PAYGO.

All of this emergency spending is outside the PAYGO rules under the Democrat leadership. So they have spoken with forked tongue, so to speak, that they would cling to the PAYGO rules, and yet on this first big appropriations bill, they come whistling in here with an additional $21.8 billion.

I would even question part of the $103 billion that the President proposed. I am not sure that Katrina is still an emergency. Yeah, we have issues in Katrina. Yeah, we have issues with what is going on in New Orleans, and we have a got a lot of money in the pipeline backed up. I think we ought to figure that out first before we throw additional moneys at it.

So the $99 billion that is for the war fight, for the reset, for the troops that are in harm's way, we would, I think most all of us would agree on. But beyond that we have got some real challenges from a spending standpoint. Those issues pale in comparison to putting a hard deadline on getting out of Iraq and the serious consequences that that leaves our military commanders on the ground.

□ 2045

Mr. SHUSTER. I think it is absolutely right, and I think the gentleman is right to point out that is really going to be a defining moment for many Members of this body, especially our colleagues on the other side, who, as you quite eloquently pointed out, that the choice is either stay and fight and have a strategy work to help the people of Iraq or get out.

So I hope the folks that come down here, and there were some here tonight that have come down night after night and for the last several months have talked about the need, the desire to get out immediately, we are going to see. Are they going to stand up and be true to what they have been talking about to the Nation on this House floor for the past several months, or are they going to bend to the will of their leadership?

As well there are other Members on the other side of the aisle that have said they will not stand for micromanagement of the war, they will not stand for putting timelines in to give our enemy the ability to fight a different kind of war and hurt and kill our soldiers. So this is going to be a defining moment.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I think your point on that too, if I might interject, the Members of the other party, for whom I have great personal respect though I disagree in execution of the policy, are those that have been very staunch and very consistent in their opposition to the use of our troops in offensive operations overseas.

And the reason that I bring that up is that some of the statements that have been made, and I am not referring to provocative statements, simply positions that were taken, had been controversial in their own caucus as well as in the Congress in general. But the reason that I bring it up is that those convictions, I think, echo at one point where we have mutual agreement, and on a variety of issues. And the point I called for during the debate a few weeks ago on the resolution regarding whether one accepted the ability of the Commander in Chief to authorize the combatant commander to reinforce troops on the ground was this: that if we are going to have a real vote that affects real people in the field, then we need to use the power of the purse of the United States Congress to vote to cut or sequester funding related to that.

And I think that is a noble cause regardless of which side one is on in that from the standpoint of the Republic. I know where I am. I am with my former

comrades who are in a country right now to make sure they have the resources they need. But one of my friends, one of our colleagues, made a comment last Thursday night that there was a bit of a fishing expedition going on for votes, and the irony wasn't lost on me when I actually saw the list of appropriations he was talking about: $120 million for the shrimp and Manhattan fishing industries, that would equip over 1,000 of our light infantry soldiers with what they need to do their job; $5 million for those engaged in the breeding, rearing, or transporting of live fish, think what $5 million can do from an operational standpoint.

We start going through this in detail, and we see $16 million for additional office space for the House of Representatives.

Mr. CONAWAY. Here, here. All under the emergency basis. We are totally out of office space and it is an emergency that we don't have that office space sooner.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I wanted to talk a little bit more about the politics of this. And, again, I want to read something that The Washington Post wrote on March 13. I took bits and pieces out of there, but I think it is pretty consistent throughout the whole editorial. And again to remind my colleagues if they have forgotten, The Washington Post is no friend of the Bush administration, and it is no supporter of Republican causes. But I will give The Washington Post credit that it takes a position, thinks about it, and comes down many times on the different side of the issue, or at least they are thoughtful about it.

And this Washington Post editorial, ''The Pelosi Plan for Iraq, it makes perfect sense if the goal is winning votes in the United States.

''The only constituency House Speaker NANCY PELOSI ignored in her plan for amending President Bush's supplemental war funding bill are the people of the country that the U.S. troops are fighting to stabilize. The Democratic proposal doesn't attempt to answer the question of why August 2008 is the right moment for the Iraqi Government to lose all support from U.S. combat units. It doesn't hint at what might happen if American forces were to leave at the end of this year, a development that would be triggered by the Iraqi Government's weakness. It doesn't explain how continued U.S. interests in Iraq, which holds the world's second largest oil reserves and a substantial cadre of al Qaeda militants, would be protected after 2008. In fact,'' The Washington Post says, ''it may prohibit U.S. forces from returning once they leave.

''In short, the Democratic proposal . . . is an attempt to impose detailed management on a war without regard for the war itself.

''Will Iraq collapse into unrestrained civil conflict with 'massive civilian casualties,' as the U.S. intelligence community predicts in the event of a rapid withdrawal? Will al Qaeda establish a powerful new base for launching attacks on the United States and its allies? Will there be regional war that sucks in Iraq's neighbors such as Saudi Arabia and Turkey? The House legislation is indifferent. Whether or not any those events happened, U.S. forces would be gone.

''Ms. PELOSI's strategy leads not toward a responsible withdrawal from Iraq but to a constitutional power struggle with Mr. Bush, who has already said he will veto the legislation. Such a struggle would serve the interests of neither the Democrats nor the country.''

And, again, that is coming from The Washington Post. So don't listen to a Republican Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, a conservative Republican from Pennsylvania. Listen to what The Washington Post has to say. And they are pointing it out over and over again: this is a bad plan; this is a bad war supplemental. And, again, I believe that it uses our men and women in harm's way as bargaining chips and it makes it more dangerous for those men and women in Iraq.

And it also is going to destroy their morale. If they find out they are going to be pulled out in 2 months or 6 months or 18 months or whatever the Democratic proposal is, which we are not quite sure, what is going to give a young marine or ranger the will to go kick in a door where the bad guys are when he sits back in his quarters and says, Well, I could be out of this place in 3 months or 6 months. I mean, it is going to destroy the morale of our men and women.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONAWAY. I would like to add one aspect that hasn't been discussed. We hate to engage in too much speculation, but let us assume that this thing passes and the President vetoes it or let us assume that cooler heads prevail and this thing fails this week on the floor. What next? What is this Congress going to do to actually continue to provide the funds needed, this $99 billion that is needed right now, this year, this fiscal year to fight this fight? What will be the next step? How will we, in effect, bring this about? What kind of a scramble will go on that is totally unnecessary?

Instead of dealing with the problem now in a rational, thoughtful manner, this Democratic majority sees fit to play a giant game of chicken, it seems like, to run at this thing in what I believe is an irresponsible manner with loading another $21.8 billion of funding on it, getting away from what the true nature of it is, trying to incite a veto by the President, trying to flex muscle and see who is the strongest as opposed to what do we need to do to deal with the troops' needs and then separate that from the broader discussion of where we should be.

So I think we are on a collision course that has the potential for being very disruptive and very harmful to the men and women who fight this fight on our behalf.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to welcome here tonight and yield to one of our newest Members of the House from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and appreciate the chance to say a few words. I was over making phone calls in my office and clicked on C–SPAN and saw what you guys were talking about and thought I would come over and maybe just share a few things.

For those who are advocating that we just up and leave, that our military come home, that concept scares me to death because of the message. And I know you have talked about this some here on the floor this evening. The message that sends to the people who want to do us harm and want to do people harm all over the planet is a dangerous message and it scares me to death.

And I am reminded of, if folks will remember, shortly after the 9/11 attacks, that terrible day, where the President gave several speeches, where he talked about the fact that if you are a country that harbors terrorists, finances terrorists, trains terrorists, and are looking to produce weapons that are going to cause great harm to a great number of people, if you are doing those things, we, the United States of America, are putting you on notice that we are not going to tolerate that. And it was amazing that shortly after those speeches that Moamar Kadafi, a guy who hadn't necessarily been a great leader around the world and not necessarily a good guy, how quickly after those speeches Mr. Kadafi suddenly found the Lord and saw the light and said, wait a minute, I want to cooperate with the United States of America now in their fight against terrorism around the world. He saw the message. He got the message. Now, if we do what some are advocating in the Out of Iraq Caucus, some are advocating that we just up and leave and not win in Iraq, not succeed in our mission, for those who are advocating that, think about the message that sends to the Kadafis of the world and how dangerous that message is for the credibility of the greatest Nation in history, the United States of America.

That is what scares me to death about those on the other side and what they are pushing not only in this supplemental but what they have been talking about for several months now. That is a scary, scary message when it comes to our foreign policy and the success of our mission and the safety of our men and women in uniform who have been fighting the good fight, defending those principles and values that make this country great. That scares me to death.

And that is a simple point I want to make, but I think it never hurts to reinforce that point, which is so fundamental and why we are still engaged in

this struggle and why I think it is so important that we win and we continue to do what the Commander in Chief and General Petraeus want us to do over there in Iraq today.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

And I think you are right. I think it is important. I think that one of the things that we learn as citizens, we learn here in Congress, is your word. Your word is what matters, and if your word is good, then people trust you and people know they can count on you. And I think that is exactly your point. If we pull out in Iraq, our word to not only our enemy, our enemy knows that if we pull out that our word is no good to stay there and fight them, but our friends around the world are going to say you can't count on America. And I think that is an extremely important point, and that is maybe the core of this. We need to stay and make sure the Iraqi people have control of the security on the ground. And I think that while it is too early to tell if the new strategy in Iraq will succeed, there are tangible indications that it is working.

The joint U.S.-Iraqi security crackdown is fulfilling its primary objective to reduce violence in Baghdad. Bomb deaths have gone down 30 percent. Execution-style deaths have decreased by nearly half in the last month. Iraqis are taking on an increased role in security of their country. Nine of the Iraqis' 10 army divisions are taking the lead in areas of operation. And today almost 329,000 Iraq security force members are working to secure their country. And the political benchmarks are being met. Last month the Iraqi Government approved a budget, approved a national hydrocarbon law, and just last week they convened a regional conference of 13 nations to discuss these concerns. So things are moving forward. There was a poll out, the largest poll done in Iraq in the last couple of years, the London polling firm Opinion Research Business found that in a survey of over 5,000 Iraqis that by a 2–1 margin, Iraqis prefer living under the current system than they did under Saddam. So there are positive signs there.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. And the gentleman is exactly right. Of course we wish things had progressed quicker and faster. We wish all our men and women were home. But there is good news to talk about. And one fact that I think gets lost sometimes, every single life that is lost is a tragedy. We wish it didn't happen, whether it is our service men and women in uniform or whether it is an Iraqi civilian in that country, but the truth is there have been fewer American service men and women killed in 2006 than there were in 2005. There were fewer American service men and women killed in 2005 than there were in 2004. Of course, you would never know that fact if you just listened to the national news every night.

There are good things happening, as the gentleman pointed out. The other thing I would just say is this: to get the kind of country that we need there and the kind of things happening that we need to happen, it is going to take a little time. I am reminded that in 1776 we declared independence. We made our quest for liberty and freedom here in the United States. It took us 13 years to get a Constitution that works and is still serving us well today. And we came from a culture that appreciated liberty and appreciated freedom.

It is going to take some time for this nation, which has never really known freedom or liberty, to get to that point where they can value those principles that make our country so great. So good things are happening, and we should talk about those more in our quest to make this country work.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman for coming down.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I want to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that as we talk tonight about an incredibly serious matter that those listening don't have a sense that we have a callous disregard for the men and women who are fighting this fight. We stand up here night after night and talk about the sacrifices made and the dedication of this all-volunteer force, and the phrase kind of rolls off our tongue very easily.

□ 2100

I want to make sure that those listening understand that each one of those lives lost is incredibly precious.

When I am out and about in the district in Texas talking to folks, I typically ask the question, how many folks have someone they know serving in Iraq or Afghanistan, and a lot of times a lot of hands will go up.

I will then ask, no, I need to know how many people out here have somebody in harm's way that when they hear about a death in Iraq, their stomach gets in a knot until they know it is not their loved one, and most of the hands go down. So we are fighting a fight there that while it has a dramatic impact on an awful lot of lives, broadly across this country, day in and day out, most Americans aren't really affected by this sacrifice, by this magnificent fighting force that we have in place.

I typically challenge that audience to say, look, anytime you hear about sacrifice for this country, dying for this country, fighting for this country, make sure you think about it in the terms of some specific person. Not the global group, because that defuses the impact. That lessens the tugs at our hearts and helps us deal with it. I want you to think about some specific person that has given their life on behalf of this country.

For me, it is a high school buddy of mine that died in Vietnam, a Medal of Honor winner. I look at all that I have done since he and I graduated from high school. He gave up all of that so that we could live in freedom today.

We have got the exact kind of men and women fighting in Iraq today and in Afghanistan today and in other places around this world that we don't get to talk about that are laying their lives on the line, laying their futures on the line, laying their ability to walk a daughter down the aisle at her wedding, the ability to hold a grandchild, and all those kinds of things that those of us who make it into this stage of life have gotten to do. Yet our men and women volunteer to take on these responsibilities, take these risks, and put themselves between you and I and some really, really bad people.

So as we come to this Chamber night after night to talk about this fight, we need to make sure we understand exactly who it is we are talking about, who we are talking to.

We got an e-mail 2 weeks ago, 3 weeks ago, when we were debating that nonsense on the meaningless, toothless House resolution from a buck sergeant in Mosul who made the comment, he said, you know, the professional veneer we keep in place that says that debate, that conversation going on back in America, has no impact on our ability total fight, our moral, he said that veneer is very thin. Underneath, we are angry, we are mad. We think we are being sold out.

So the things that we say in this Chamber and in front of newspapers and televisions have a deep impact on the men and women who fight this fight. It is almost as if we taunt them when we talk about, well, we are going to support you, but we don't believe in what you do. We want to support you, but we think you are screwing things up. We want to support you, but we are not going to pay for it.

All of those kinds of things are a mixed message that has deep impact, and while I would defend my colleagues' rights to continue to say those things and have those opinions and debate those things, I would also challenge them to understand the deep impact they have as they make those statements, as they talk about their positions, as they put forth their ideas on what we should and should not be doing in Iraq. It comes with a great responsibility that each one of us brings to this Chamber when we talk.

Mr. SHUSTER. I think the gentleman makes an excellent point. This country, there are people in this country, the political discourse, we agree, we disagree, we debate, but the wonderful thing about it is we can do it, and people aren't tortured and drug off to prison and killed.

As a matter of fact, I was on the Mall last week in the morning with another colleague of ours, and we went up to the war protestors. They had their tents up and their signs up. It was really quite a magnificent picture of the war protestors, and behind it was the United States Capitol.

I started to talk. We were talking about why they were opposed to the

war and why I wanted to continue to support our troops there. I said, you know, in some countries of the world, Iraq, Iran, many of those countries, almost all of those countries in the Middle East, you cannot be doing this. They wouldn't allow you to do this. In fact, they would kill you. They would take you off and kill you possibly. And you would be lucky if you were killed because most of the time they would torture you before they would kill you.

So this country is a great country, and what we are doing over there is we are trying to help a nation stabilize, trying to help a nation build a democracy, and that is not easy. That is difficult. As our colleague from Ohio pointed out, the Revolutionary War in 1776, it took 13 years for the Constitution.

A story I like to tell, because it happened in my district, during the first year of George Washington's second term, we had already got a Constitution, we elected a President, George Washington, not once, but the second time. In that first year, the Whiskey Rebellion occurred in western Pennsylvania. The farmers in western Pennsylvania didn't like the tax, so they revolted. So George Washington, it was the only time that a Commander in Chief mounted up on a horse and took the soldiers into the field, had to ride up into western Pennsylvania and put down that rebellion.

We as Americans sometimes forget that it took us a long time until we were able to establish democracy. So it is not easy. We need to remember our history, that it takes time. It takes time especially when you are a nation that has never known democracy; never known democracy, but certainly has that feeling, has that sense of wanting freedom.

I think that there is no doubt that the Iraqi people, as well as any person, any people in the world, or every people in the world, want freedom. They have a desire for freedom.

Mr. CONAWAY. If you look at our history, if you look at the year 1776 and you study George Washington that year, he got up every day thinking that was the last day of the revolution. His army in many cases was in tatters, it was unpaid, it was underequipped. He could not have made the certification that the Democrats are demanding that this President make in order to send a single unit into combat; Washington could not have made that certification and he would have had to give up.

He got up every day thinking, This is the last day of the deal. I am sure there were critics all over the place saying we are done, it is over, this grand experiment that turned into America, turned into 230 years of a beacon for liberty and democracy around the world, would have failed had he not stuck to this plan and stuck to the understanding that we could win this fight. And it was hard. Good men lost their lives every day, and it was hard.

We are there at the same place today in Iraq. It is hard and good men and women risk their lives and some lose their lives every single day. I mourn with the families and I cry with them, just as you do, when somebody from the district is killed or maimed or injured. This has serious consequences to what we do. But failure in Iraq, a disaster that would be an immediate pullout, is simply unacceptable on every level.

Let me switch gears for a minute, and then I will let my good colleague close, with some good news, totally unrelated to the supplemental except that it does have to do with this year's financial results.

As you know, I am a CPA and I like to look at numbers and all those kinds of things. If you look at the first 5 months of fiscal 2007, our revenue collections into this Federal Government are up $81 billion over the equivalent 5-month period in fiscal 2006. An additional $81 billion has been collected, not because we raised taxes, not because we had any changes to the Tax Code, because we haven't implemented any of those, but it is because this economy is ginning along. Expenses are also up almost $26 billion. So the net of those two is that we have got a deficit for the first 5 months of fiscal 2007 that is $55.5 billion less than the equivalent 5-month deficit for fiscal 2006.

I just wanted to inject a little great news into the conversation and get that into the record. These numbers come directly from the Treasury Department's monthly financial reports that are available on the Web for anybody to look at. I wanted to highlight those numbers tonight as we finish up this Countdown hour that we spent tonight talking about Iraq.

These are grave times, tough times, hard times, and I think our resolve is firm. We will see this week the integrity of our colleagues in this Chamber as to how they vote, how they have talked in this Chamber versus how they vote on this deal.

There are only two positions: stay and fight, win this thing and be successful; or get out, get our folks out now. There is no half step in between that you can orchestrate any kind of a justification that makes any sense. It will be interesting to watch our colleagues as they struggle with this vote this week, with their own integrity and their own ideas of what is right and wrong.

With that, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I will yield back. Thank you for having this Special Order tonight.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman for joining me and appreciate that report on the revenues to the government. Once again it proves that tax cuts do work. It increases the economic activity in this country, which generates more revenue not only for the government, but for the good people of America that are out there working hard every day. They are able to put more of that money into their pockets instead of sending it to the bureaucrats in Washington to spend it.

I think it is important on this fourth anniversary that we did speak about what is happening in Iraq, and most importantly what is going to happen on this House floor.

The American people, I was told by Colonel Walt Piatt in Afghanistan when I visited there a couple years ago, and I was talking to Colonel Piatt, who is from my district, and we were talking about the effort and the needs of the troops and the military equipment, and he said to me, you know, America's power is not its soldier, it is not its weaponry, it is not the bombs we create. The strength in America is the will of the American people, because if the soldiers know that the people are behind what they are doing, in support of what they are doing, they can accomplish anything.

I think what is going to be said here on this House floor, because the House, we are the people elected, we are the leaders elected from our districts, 435 districts, and what we say here is going to go a long way in whether we are going to be successful in helping the Iraqis building a democracy, in stabilizing that country and helping long term what is going to happen in the Middle East.

So it is going to be very critical what is said here on the floor in this war supplemental. Are we going to use it as a political ploy, use it as a bargaining chip, use our men and women as bargaining chips to get spending to things that don't belong in this war supplemental, or are we going to do the right thing, and that is you support our men and women with the funding that they need? Are we going to support them?

That is going to be a large step in proving to them that we are with them, that we are behind them and that we are not going to put in arbitrary deadlines that are going to give our adversaries and our enemies a leg up on us.

So this is going to be an absolutely critical week for America. It is going to be a critical week and a defining moment I believe for the majority party, because I don't believe, and I think it is pretty clear, the American people don't like conflict, don't like war, don't like death, don't like destruction. Nobody likes that. But the American people do not want to lose in Iraq. I think that is very clear. And this war supplemental, putting in these arbitrary timetables, is a prescription for that.

It is micromanaging this war by the politicians in Washington, just like many on the other side of the aisle say is what happened in Vietnam. That was wrong in Vietnam, and yet they are standing up on the House floor this week and the past couple weeks proposing that we do just that, micromanage this war. 435 Members of the House, 100 Senators, they are not the Commander in Chief.

The Constitution is clear. When you are fighting a war, you need one leader. When you are fighting a war, you leave it to the professionals, you leave it to the generals, you leave it to the colonels, you leave it to the men and women that are trained to do this, not bring it on the House floor. And as I said and as The Washington Post has said, trying to micromanage this war is the wrong thing to do for the Iraqi people, it is the wrong thing to do for the American people, and it is the wrong thing to do for the men and women that are in harm's way.

So I hope we are able to come together on this House floor and strip out many of those things that are in here that just make it unworkable and bad for the American people and the military.

MARKING THE END OF THE 4TH YEAR OF THE OCCUPATION OF IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my coming to the floor this evening, along with a number of my friends and colleagues on this side of the aisle, is to mark the fact that tomorrow will be the 4th year that our military forces instigated by the administration have attacked Iraq and engaged in what the administration has called a war in that country. Most people now have come to realize that we are not engaged in a war in Iraq, but we are engaged now in an occupation, the consequences of which are proving to be increasingly disastrous.

At 10:15 p.m. on March 19, 2003, in a televised address to the Nation, President Bush announced the start of what he refers to as ''the war in Iraq.''

□ 2115

The way in which the administration attempted to justify that attack has been a grave consequence for the United States, both internally and around the world. The President, of course, and others in his administration contended that there was a connection between Iraq and the attack that took place in New York and at the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, that Iraq was somehow involved in that attack, when all of the evidence and information indicated that that was not the case.

In spite of that, the administration continued to make that allegation. They then went on to say that it was important that the United States invade Iraq for the safety of our country and for the safety of others because Iraq was a country that possessed what they referred to as ''weapons of mass destruction,'' alleging that there was substantial amounts of chemical and biological weapons in Iraq.

They then went on to assert that Iraq had a nuclear weapons program, and the President of the United States in a 2003 State of the Union Address to a joint session of Congress and to the Nation here in this House asserted that the British Government had learned that Iraq had imported enriched uranium from Niger. When he included that sentence in his State of the Union Address, he was very much aware that the intelligence agencies in our country had said that there was no proof that that was the case. In fact, they had examined the documents upon which those assertions were being made, and they found those documents which had been stolen from the Nigerian Embassy in Rome were, in fact, forged.

So what we have here is an unnecessary and unjustified and consequently illegal attack on another country and a subsequent disastrous occupation which has gone on now for 4 years, and we will be beginning the fifth year starting tomorrow.

As a result of this occupation, over 3,200 American servicemen and women have been killed in Iraq since our invasion over 4 years ago. Over 24,000 troops have been wounded in action in Iraq, and the number of Iraqis killed is unknown, but the estimates range as high as 200,000 Iraqi civilians, mostly women and children, who have been killed in that country as a result of the military action.

We are spending now about $275 million per day in Iraq. More than $8 billion every month is being spent in that country. And as the Speaker of the House noted earlier this evening in her speech on the floor, at least $10 billion of that money is completely unaccounted for, and much of the rest has been spent in ways that have not been productive, but have been extraordinarily wasteful.

The President in January called for what he referred to as a surge of nearly 30,000 additional soldiers into Iraq. So far that has amounted to 21,500 additional troops that have gone to Iraq in January, and 4,400 more just two weekends ago.

The circumstances there continue to deteriorate as a result of the corrupt and incompetent way in which this illegal invasion and subsequent occupation have been carried out by this administration.

Roughly half of all of the ground equipment that the U.S. Army owns is now located in Iraq and Afghanistan. Since the invasion, the Army has lost nearly 2,000 wheeled vehicles and more than 1,000 armed vehicles. To make matters worse, according to the GAO, the Army has not been keeping accurate track of what they have and what they need to reset the force, and they cannot provide sufficient detail for Congress to provide effective oversight.

Between 75,000 and 100,000 pieces of National Guard equipment worth nearly $2 billion are now located in Iraq and Afghanistan. This is equipment that is needed by the National Guard here in our country to carry out the obligations and responsibilities of the National Guard around the United States. And they are now increasingly being deprived of their ability to carry out their responsibilities and obligations because of the loss of their equipment.

The Regular Army has lost so much equipment which has not been replaced that they are now using the equipment of the National Guard to replace the equipment that they have lost and which this administration has failed to provide replacements for.

We have a situation that is confronting us now in Iraq which is increasingly damaging, dangerous, and on the verge of being disastrous for our country as well as for others in the Middle East.

We need this Congress to assert its obligations and responsibilities to oversee the activities of this administration, and that is clearly necessary because all through the 4 years during which this illegal invasion took place followed by this occupation, there has not been any significant oversight by this Congress, which, of course, was controlled by the Republican majority for all of that period of time.

Now that we have a Democratic majority in Congress, that oversight is beginning. Appropriate hearings are being conducted both in this House and in the Senate, and more and more information concerning the way in which this operation has been carried out is being made available to the American people, and as a result of that, more and more people across the country are realizing what a disaster this has been. More and more Americans are understanding how they were intentionally and purposefully misled and deceived by this administration in order to carry out this invasion which had absolutely nothing to do with the attack of September 11, and which cannot be justified in any way whatsoever.

This action is unlawful, and appropriate oversight and supervision based upon detailed and focused hearings by this Congress is now absolutely necessary.

We have with us this evening several of my colleagues who are interested in speaking about this issue, and I would now like to recognize my very good friend from Ohio, who will address the House at this time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) for his superb remarks and for his organizing this Special Order in order to express our opinions on behalf of our troops and for a course correction in Iraq and the Middle East in general.

When you think about it, we are being asked this week to vote an additional $100 billion in what is called a supplemental, mainly to escalate the war in Iraq, and the money we are voting on will be just for today until the end of September of this year. This $100 billion is put on top of what has already been appropriated to be spent on

the war, and it is typical of this administration's mishandling the war and its accounting, always underestimating every year what it will really cost to carry out the activities.

If you look at the chart that shows what we are spending in Iraq, it is absolutely escalating every single year.

The best advice we were given on a recent trip to Iraq, Afghanistan and the region was from our generals, who said: What does victory mean? Victory means one-third military, two-thirds diplomacy and good governance. The two-thirds is missing. So, therefore, we are asking our soldiers to bear all of the burden of a flawed strategy for Iraq and the surrounding regions that is ripening terrorism in every single country, and we are losing respect. The coalition of the willing has dried up. The neighbors of Iraq have not been convened in a constructive way, and we watch other nations in the region border on destabilization because of what we are doing in Iraq.

My deep concern is that the violence could spill over into Jordan, Turkey, Bahrain, Kuwait, Pakistan, Lebanon, even Saudi Arabia. And so America has to face a strategic challenge much larger than Iraq, and the administration is not leading us there.

This evening I wanted to say a word about the theater in which Iraq is operating. She is not alone. So many of our soldiers, our patriotic brave soldiers, are in Iraq, and they are the finest military in the world, but they exist in a sea of discontent. And I would like to say that the face of terrorism that we see springs from a view, fair or not, that the United States allies with the rich but not the poor across the undemocratic Islamic world. And how can America stand for democracy in Iraq, but not in all of the oil kingdoms and theocracies to which our Nation has been tethered for most of the last century and now into this century?

Why would I say that? I would say that because recent polls in the region show exactly that. It shows that America is viewed as not on the side of rising popular expectations for a more democratic way of life. Rather, we are seen as tethered to an old power structure where the poor remain poor, and the rich, outlandishly rich, and becoming more so; and where religion has become the metaphor for political change of those excluded economically and politically.

Unfortunately, the Gallup poll shows how harshly the United States is viewed across the region. Right or not, the people there view us as a promiscuous culture in moral decay, and Abu Ghraib affirmed their views.

If we look at our closest ally, Turkey, a valued ally of ours for over 50 years in NATO, the disapproval rating of our country has risen from 48 percent in 2000, and we weren't doing so well back then, to 88 percent this year. So 88 percent of the citizens of Turkey disagree and disapprove of what we are doing.

The ruling secular party of Turkey has lost control of its Parliament, and now at the local level who is winning elections in Turkey? Parties that are tending more and more religious. And I am not saying that the religious parties of Turkey are like those of Pakistan or Saudi Arabia, but we have to recognize what is happening across the region as America falls into disrepute.

In Pakistan, home to tens of thousands of madrassas, schools funded by Wahabi donors from Saudi Arabia, young boys are being turned out by the thousands to revenge against America.

America's favorability ratings in Pakistan have fallen to 27 percent. When we were visiting Pakistan a few weeks ago, a female Parliamentarian was assassinated on the western side of the country, people who are trying to relate to the broader world outside of Pakistan.

In Egypt, which signed a peace treaty with Israel three decades ago, 70 percent of the public unfavorably views the United States. And more than 90 members of the anti-American Muslim Brotherhood were elected to Parliament recently, and that Parliament has about as many members as we do. So 90-plus members is a significant number in the Egyptian Parliament.

I could go down the list. King Abdullah of Jordan was here a couple of weeks ago. What did he ask us for? Peace now, time is short; peace now, time is short. The U.S. favorability rating in Jordan dropped to 15 percent. Are we paying attention to what is going on?

My dear colleague Mr. HINCHEY talked about Saudi Arabia, where the majority of 9/11 terrorists had come from. The United States is disliked by three-quarters of the people in Saudi Arabia. So we look at our troops inside of Iraq because the Commander in Chief of this country sent them there, but if we look at what is happening in the region, America is not winning.

One of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle just said, just measure the body count. Measure the American losses as a sign of how well we are doing.

It is taking us twice as much money every year just to keep the body count where it is now. Look at the casualties. Look at the Iraqi casualties that no one wants to talk about. Look at what is happening in the region. We are not being successful in the war on terrorism, as hard as our soldiers try, because they cannot do it alone.

□ 2130

Why are we asking the military to bear the full burden when the diplomatic channels of this government have crashed?

Can you believe that the neighbors of Iraq have not been assembled by our Secretary of State in any constructive way now going on 4 years? Unbelievable.

Can you believe that we have allowed nations with which we have been friends for 50 years just to fester at the end of a failed diplomatic pipeline?

The President's job is not just to be Commander in Chief. It is to be Diplomat in Chief for this country, and yet across that region we see ties that have been forged by this country for generations just ripped into shreds. What a tragedy.

I was thinking yesterday, I grew up in an era when John Kennedy talked about the Peace Corps and the great alliance for progress across Latin America. Look at the Latin Americans demonstrating against the United States.

We cannot ask our soldiers to fill a gap, a failed diplomacy and failed politics across the region. The world wants change. The world is begging us for change. The world is demonstrating for change. It just is not America that is demonstrating for change.

So this evening, Mr. Speaker, I would thank my colleague so very much for allowing me some time to talk about regaining America's standing in the world by correcting what has gone wrong in Iraq.

I just might end by saying today in USA Today there was a major story of Poland, people risking their lives going to Iraq, asking the Iraqi people what they think. What it shows is compared to 2005, just a couple years ago, when 71 percent of people in Iraq said their life was fairly good, today it has dropped to 39 percent.

In Baghdad, where so many of our soldiers are being sent, what percentage of the people rate their basic household needs as being served by the current regime? You know what the number is? Zero. Zero. Fallen in the last 2 years from 78 percent of their basic household needs. That is like food, water, down to zero.

Electricity, you know what percent of the people in Baghdad say their service is good? Zero. Zero, down from only half in 2005.

What about clean water? In 2005, 68 percent said they could get clean water. You know what the number is? Zero.

How can this be good? How can America win this? How can we ask our soldiers to fill a failed policy? Our soldiers will do anything we ask them to do. We have the best military in the world. We have the most committed generals, the most committed soldiers. We love every single one of them, but we do not want to give them a mission impossible in a sea of discontent where the Diplomat in Chief has abdicated his responsibility to them and to the kind of strategy that can win America friends again.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and it is a real privilege to be able to participate in this Special Order this evening.

Mr. HINCHEY. Thank you very much. I very much appreciate the statement that was just made by our colleague from Ohio, MARCY KAPTUR, the respect that she has given to our military, appropriately so, and her examination of the consequences that we

are confronting now in Iraq as a result of the incompetent way in which this administration has dealt with the political and economic circumstances there in that country.

I would like now to yield time to my friend and colleague from New York, JOHN HALL.

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank very much Congressman HINCHEY and thank Congresswoman KAPTUR for her remarks.

Today marks the start of the 5th year of the war in Iraq; and as I begin my statement, I want to recognize the honorable service of the men and women who have served our country in Iraq. I want to honor the memories of the 3,188 servicemembers who have given their lives in Iraq, including five men from my district and over 50 officers of the United States Army who graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point, which I am proud is in my district. While I believe the war in Iraq has been a mistake, I deeply respect the honor and integrity of those who have given their lives following the orders of their Commander in Chief.

In light of the sacrifices of so many of our men and women in uniform, it saddens me that I have to come to the floor of the House of Representatives and say I believe this war has been a strategic blunder in our efforts to fight terrorism.

On September 11, our Nation was attacked and many people from my district, including police and firefighters, died at the World Trade Center. The United States correctly responded by pursuing those responsible for 9/11 in Afghanistan. Unfortunately, this administration decided to change its focus and start a war of choice with Iraq, a country which had not attacked us and was not an imminent threat to the United States.

Now our military is trapped in the middle of a civil war instead of pursuing Osama bin Laden, Mullah Mohammed Omar, and other al Qaeda affiliates throughout the world responsible for 9/11 and other similar attacks and groups planning to attack the United States again.

Because we are focused in Iraq, the progress made in Afghanistan is slipping. The Karzai government does not control the territory outside its own capital. We see an increase in the drug trade that funds regional warlords. The Taliban emerges at night to terrorize the local population, and our military expects increasing attacks throughout this spring. However, because of our continuing overcommitment in Iraq, the United States has little ability to increase its troop numbers in Afghanistan and respond to that deteriorating situation.

While the administration and its allies say we are battling the terrorists in Iraq, the United States intelligence agencies say otherwise. The National Intelligence Estimate released in April 2006 stated: ''The Iraq conflict has become a 'cause celebre' for jihadists, breeding a deep resentment of U.S. involvement in the Muslim world and cultivating supporters for the global jihadist movement.'' Iraq is not the central front in the war on terror as the President likes to say. Instead, it is a rallying point, a recruiting poster that Osama bin Laden uses to recruit more terrorists.

The war in Iraq has seriously weakened our military. A recent report found that 90 percent of our National Guard youths are rated ''not ready'' to respond to a national disaster or terrorist attack in the United States. Further, in order to meet their recruitment goals, the military has lowered the minimum standards for being accepted into the service, and our military faces a crippling loss of mid-level officers as larger and larger numbers decide not to reenlist and face multiple deployments.

It is time for a new direction. Our intelligence agencies know it, our military commanders know it, and the American people demanded it last November. General Petraeus, commanding general in Iraq, stated on March 8: ''There is no military solution to a problem like that in Iraq, to the insurgency of Iraq.'' And just last week, Pentagon analysts admitted that the war in Iraq is a civil war.

Unfortunately, our President refuses to face reality and the will of the American people. He wants to put more troops in the middle of a civil war. He wants an open-ended commitment to keep combat troops in Iraq indefinitely. He wants to leave the problem of Iraq to the next President. And, once again, he has returned to Congress and asked for another blank check to continue this misguided war. Unlike the President, this Congress will face reality and realize that we must change direction in Iraq.

Some of our colleagues speaking earlier from the other side of the floor criticized us for trying to, as they say, micromanage the war. There cannot be 435 or 535 Commanders in Chief. We would not need to take this kind of action to manage or, if you will, micromanage the war if the President and Commander in Chief were doing his job, if the leadership were coming from the top, as our structure of government ordinarily calls for it to come.

But because there is a vacuum in the top, because the President has continued to disregard or turn a blind eye to the reality of what is happening, not only around the world, as our Congresswoman just mentioned, in terms of the reputation of the United States, which ultimately in the long term is what will determine our security, our reputation, the approval of the United States and its policies by other peoples and other countries around the world will ultimately determine in the long run how secure we are, we do not have enough money to spend our way into security if we continue to make more enemies and lose our friends.

General Petraeus is correct. We need a political solution to the war in Iraq instead of a military escalation. It is time for a diplomatic surge. The United States must push the Iraqi Government to meet its commitments that it made to its partners in Iraq. It is time the United States reached out to our allies in the region and throughout the world.

By requiring the Iraqi Government to achieve a list of objectives and establishing a timetable for U.S. involvement in Iraq, we can end the culture of dependency developing in Iraq. We can make the Iraqi Government stand up and take control of its own fate. If they do that, we will stick by them. We will help them train police and military forces and rebuild their country. If they are unwilling or unable to take that responsibility, we will know that the United States does not have a serious partner in Iraq.

If we are to defeat the people who did attack our country on September 11, those who continue to seek to destroy us, we must pivot away from Iraq and back to Afghanistan and al Qaeda, the people who actually attacked us. We must draw down in Iraq and let our military redeploy, rebuild, and refocus.

The United States faces a gravely serious threat, and we must be prepared to defeat it. Our 4-year involvement in Iraq has seriously endangered our ability to do that. At home, our National Guard has been undermined. It is unprepared to respond to a terrorist attack or a natural disaster. Abroad, our military forces are stretched thin and unable to shift quickly.

If we really want to defeat Osama bin Laden, al Qaeda and the other terrorist groups that seek to kill us, we must return our attention to that war and leave the civil war we currently face in Iraq to the Iraqis. If we rebuild our forces and refocus on the threats in Afghanistan, Pakistan and throughout southeast Asia, we will be able to truly defeat our enemies and truly protect the United States of America.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend JOHN HALL from New York for his strong presentation and for joining us this evening in this discussion about this critical issue.

I would now like to recognize my friend and colleague from California, BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for calling this Special Order tonight and for your leadership.

Today marks the fourth anniversary of the invasion and bombing of Iraq. It is a solemn occasion that reminds me with a very heavy heart of our brave troops who we want to protect and who we want to bring home.

As the occupation now enters its 5th year, it is really an appropriate time to review some of the history. It is also an appropriate time to recall that the case for this war was false.

All the talk about aluminum tubes and yellowcake, remember that? Right.

Colin Powell's dramatic presentation to the United Nations? I still wonder why such a distinguished Secretary of State would do that.

The fact is there was no connection to al Qaeda. There were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, and there was no connection between the horrific events of 9/11 and Saddam Hussein in Iraq.

Some of us opposed the war from the beginning. In fact, if my amendment to the authorization to use force had been used 4 years ago, the United Nations inspectors would have had the opportunity to finish their job and confirm what we believed and some of us knew at that time, what the world now knows, namely, that Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction.

□ 2145

It is an appropriate time now to review the disaster that has taken place in Iraq, so that the administration does not rewrite this tragic history, and also to put the administration on notice and in check from starting a preemptive war against Iran, which many see as looming. It's appropriate tonight to review this history because the administration who brought us this debacle would now like us to accept an open-ended commitment to it.

Why is it appropriate for us to remind the country of all of this tonight? Because the same people, the same administration who brought us this disaster are now asking us to trust them again. They are saying that we should give the President another chance. They are saying, in effect, that our commitment to supporting their failed policies should be open-ended.

Think about that for a minute. The people in this administration who have been wrong about every single major decision about this war are now trying to make it seem unreasonable to suggest that we should not continue to write blank checks to support this debacle.

Well, it is not unreasonable. That is where the American people are on this issue. They know better. It is time for this unfortunate chapter of our history to close. It is time to end the occupation of Iraq and bring our troops home.

At various points the administration has told us that the mission has been accomplished, that we were turning the corner, or that the insurgency was in its last throes. As we now know, those pronouncements were all false.

The truth is that the administration's conduct of this war has been nothing short of shameful. We may never know how many of the roadside bombs that kill our troops every day are made from explosives looted from weapons depots that were left unguarded because the administration chose to ignore the advice of our military commanders on how many troops would be needed. Whatever the number is, it is too many.

It is an appropriate time tonight to review the cost of the administration's failed policy in Iraq. The human cost of this occupation has been terrible. More than 3,200 United States servicemen and women have died, and more than 32,000 have been wounded. That is an average of 67 deaths and 500 wounded every month, not to mention the death and injuries of countless Iraqis.

The financial cost is unsustainable. Already we have spent more than $400 billion on this invasion and occupation. We are averaging more than $8 billion per month. That is staggering.

The cost of our security has been devastating. The Bush administration's military and foreign policy doctrine of preemptive war, like you can start a war based on perceived future threats, this was supposed to solve the problem posed by the so-called axis of evil.

Four years after putting the doctrine to test in Iraq, the results are in, and it is a total failure. Iraq posed no imminent threat to our security, but today the vast majority of our security resources are bogged down in Iraq. North Korea has obtained nuclear weapons, something the doctrine was to prevent, and Iran is empowered and emboldened. The occupation is undermining our efforts to fight international terrorism.

According to the National Intelligence Estimate of April 2006, and this is in their words, they said the Iraq conflict has been the cause celebre for jihadists, breeding a deep resentment of the United States involvement in the Muslim world and cultivating supporters for the global jihadist movement. Now, this is what the National Intelligence Estimate said.

Furthermore, the toll that the occupation is taking on our Armed Forces is stretching the military beyond the breaking point. The Washington Post reported today that Army and Marine officials are referring to a readiness death spiral in which the ever more rapid pace of war zone rotations has consumed 40 percent of the total gear, wearied troops, and left no time to train to fight anything other than insurgents now at hand.

The administration likes to talk about the situation in Iraq in terms of winning and losing, because it is convenient to portray critics of their policies as opposed to victory or supportive of defeat. The fact is you cannot win an occupation, just as there is no way for the United States to win an Iraqi civil war.

The Bush administration understands this just as they understand that there are no pretty or clean options for bringing a responsible end to our policy there. They are content to mouth the words of victory while they try to run out the clock, playing a cynical game of political chicken, where whoever acts to bring a responsible end to their failed policy will be accused of having lost Iraq.

The trouble is, though, that an average of 67 troops die in Iraq each month, and 500 are wounded, and we can't forget that. As General Petraeus and the Iraq Study Group both pointed out, there is no military solution to this civil war and occupation. For me, the cost of going along with the President's escalation charade and risking our brave young men and women's lives is way too high. It's time to bring this war and occupation to an end. It's time for military measures to be replaced with diplomacy and engagement with Iraq's neighbors. It's time to take the target off our troops' back and to bring them home.

Thank you, Mr. HINCHEY, for this Special Order tonight, and let's hope the American people raise their voices loudly and clearly with regard to what is taking place with this war and bring it to an end very soon.

Mr. HINCHEY. I thank you for your very articulate expression of all of those facts, your leadership here and for joining us this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to recognize my friend from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. First of all, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York for this Special Order and for including me and allowing me to speak once again on this House floor about this war and this occupation of Iraq.

On the evening of March 19, 2003, speaking from the Oval Office, the President of the United States started his address to the Nation with these very words, and I quote him.

''My fellow citizens, at this hour, American and coalition forces are in the early stages of military operations to disarm Iraq, to free its people and to defend the world from grave danger.'' Here we are, 4 years later, and it's fair to ask, indeed, it's incumbent upon us to ask, have we disarmed Iraq?

Well, first off, as we all know, there are no weapons of mass destruction to disarm, so that whole entire premise was flawed.

The question we have to ask is have we made Iraq safer? We may have deposed Saddam Hussein, but with insurgents, militias and vigilantes terrorizing Iraqi neighborhoods, some of them with the tacit support of the Iraqi Government, it's impossible to say we have disarmed Iraq or made its people and communities more secure.

Have we freed Iraq's people? Well, I can think of at least 60,000 Iraqis for starters who haven't been freed. That's the most conservative estimate of Iraqi civilian deaths over the last 4 years, at least 60,000 killed for the cause of their so-called liberation.

Many of those who have escaped death live in fear of it, afraid to go to the market or send their children to school, if there is still a school for them to attend. Too many Iraqis live in communities without electricity, without sewage or basic services. Have we freed them?

What about those who are so flush with freedom that they have chosen to flee their own country? I am talking about the 1.5 million-plus Iraqi refugees. Why don't we ask them if they feel free?

Have we defended the world from grave danger? Indeed not. One study by the Center for Security Studies at New York University Law School concludes that the rate of fatal Muslim terror attacks worldwide has increased by a factor of seven since the Iraq war began. I repeat, that is seven times as much terrorism since we started this occupation, more people call it a war, but it is really an occupation, because this occupation that they keep telling us is the central front in the war on terror is not getting rid of terror.

It's clear our Iraq policy has had a major impact in the war on terrorism. Unfortunately, it appears to be helping the wrong side.

So to go back to the President's statement of exactly 4 years ago, it would appear he has accomplished none of these three tasks, tasks he claimed to have begun that night 4 years ago. Iraq is not disarmed, its people are not free, and the world is more dangerous. It was never supposed to get to this point. You remember this was going to be quick, it was going to be painless. We are going to finish these guys off without breaking a sweat, remember.

On the very same day that President Bush spoke in front of the Mission Accomplished banner, prominent neoconservative Richard Perle actually published an op ed in a major national newspaper entitled ''Relax, Celebrate Victory.'' The cost? Don't worry, they told us, Iraq oil revenues will cover the entire thing.

They fired the top White House economic adviser for daring to suggest that the war had cost as much as $200 billion. What would they have done to him if they had known he was underestimating it by a few hundred billion dollars?

We have to ask our colleagues who authorized the President to launch the preemptive strike on Iraq, is this what you voted for, to invade a country that had no weapons of mass destruction, no link to 9/11; to occupy that country for 4 years, helping foster a vicious insurgency and fan the flames of civil war?

If you had known these things, and if you had known that it would cost us over 3,200 lives to date, and upwards of $400 billion, uncounted civilian deaths, and between 35,000, as the Pentagon tells us, or over 200,000, as reported by the Veterans Administration, wounded, we have to ask, can you look the American people in the eye and say you would have done the same thing all over again knowing what you know now?

If your answer is no, if you believe the war has been a mistake, then it makes absolutely no sense to let it continue any longer, and it makes even less sense to hand the President an additional $100 billion with which to pursue the same disastrous policy.

Our troops have done their job. They and their families have sacrificed more than enough. They have been forced to dig for scrap metal in order to armor their vehicles. They have endured substandard care, bureaucratic delays and squalid conditions at Walter Reed Hospital. They have been betrayed by the grievous mistakes of their civilian supervisors and superiors.

Support our troops. Bring them home.

I have four grandchildren who weren't born 4 years ago. They have never lived in a world unclouded by this shameful, destructive and unnecessary occupation. I fear that if this Congress doesn't act, they will be living with these consequences well into their adult lives. It is for them, for the America they will inherit, that I want this war to end.

It's time to act boldly. Americans are crying out for leadership, for their elected representatives to hear their frustrations about Iraq and to move decisively in response.

This is a gut-check moment. Do you want it said about the 110th Congress that it failed the test of history, that it continued to send young Americans to kill and be killed on a mission that did nothing to enhance our national security or promote U.S. foreign interests? Do you want it said that we made a tragic mistake; even worse, that we blindly rubber-stamped a failed policy that has ignited a civil war and inspired a new generation of terrorists?

The Iraq policy of the last 4 years has proven ruinous and misguided at every turn by any objective measure. As a matter of humanitarian obligation and political accountability, it's time to change course.

In the name of national security, fiscal responsibility and basic human decency, we must get our troops out of Iraq and bring them home by the end of this year. Bring them home for the holidays.

I thank you again, Mr. HINCHEY.

Mr. HINCHEY. I thank you, Lynn Woolsey, for your leadership and the way you have directed your attention to this issue over and over again on the floor of this House so many times, and done it so well.

Mr. Speaker, now I would like to yield time to my dear friend and colleague from California (Ms. WATERS).

□ 2200

Ms. WATERS. I would like to thank my friend from New York for taking this time out this evening and sharing it with those of us who feel a real need to come to the floor of this fourth anniversary of the war in Iraq and share with the people of America how we really feel about what is going on.

First, I think it is important for the people of America to know that some of us are listening. We hear what they are telling us. We know what their expectations are. The polls today are very, very clear about the overwhelming number of Americans who want us out of Iraq.

This war has truly taken a toll on this country: over 3,200 dead; 24,000 injured. And I don't mean just minor injuries. Serious injuries. It has been documented what is happening at Walter Reed, brain injuries, eyes gouged out, limbs lost. Serious injuries. And the information that was just shared with us, about 20 percent of the returning troops with mental illness.

Not only is it taking a toll on these young men and women who are sacrificing in this war; it is taking a toll on our domestic agenda, over $400 billion spent on this war in Iraq and Afghanistan. The President now has a supplemental appropriation before this House asking for $100 billion more. The President recently came to us and told us he was going to increase the troops there by another 21,000, and a few days ago he added to that another 8,500. The requests keep coming: more troops, more money. And there is no end in sight.

The President has said we should listen to the generals on the ground. Whenever we try and share our feelings and give some advice, he rejects it out of hand. Well, he just got information from General Petraeus on the ground, and he said to the world there will be and can be no military solution. But this President continues to persist in increasing the military and misrepresenting to the American people what is going on.

With this request that he has made, the supplemental request, there are those who truly believe that we can ask him for progress reports and he will give us good information. I listened very carefully early this morning to what the President and all of those in his administration would say on this 4th-year anniversary. They simply are spinning the information about this war the way they have always spun the information about this war.

First of all, as it has been said over and over again, they told us we would be welcomed with open arms. They told us there were weapons of mass destruction. They told us we were making progress with the training of soldiers, Iraqi soldiers, and they were just around the corner, they would be prepared and willing to take over the security of that country.

Well, I listened as they did their spin this morning. In the middle of all of this carnage, in the middle of the fact that we wake up to more suicide bombings, more loss of American soldiers, and the expansion of the bombings in putting chlorine into the bombing and into the materials, they were spinning it again this morning saying we are making progress. And that is what I expect them to say if we give them the opportunity to tell us what progress is, come July, as it is indicated in the legislation that some would like to go forth from the floor.

We cannot depend on them to tell us the truth. We cannot depend on them to follow and honor benchmarks that a lot of people are alluding to. We cannot depend on this President to get out of Iraq as long as we are giving him the money. We said that we didn't support the surge, but there are those who could suggest that we turn around and

support the surge, $90 billion to support the expansion of this war. Why should he get out as long as we are giving him the money?

What are we supposed to accomplish? What are we trying to do? The President would tell you that somehow we are supposed to provide the security and we are supposed to train so that the Iraqis will be able to provide security. We are supposed to make the Shiites get along with the Sunnis and the Sunnis get along with the Kurds. I don't think so. I think that we don't understand the history. And I don't think that we understand, no matter who we think we are, we cannot forge the kinds of relationships that somehow we are going to stay there until we make people love and like each other and work together.

Who wants us in Iraq? They call us the occupiers. As a matter of fact, we find that legislators that are supposedly in this new democratic government, one was revealed this morning to have all kinds of weapons found at his house. All kinds of weapons. And they found traces of chemicals in his four automobiles. This is one of the so-called elected members of the parliament. They do not want us there. The Shiites don't want us there, the Sunnis don't want us there, the Kurds don't want us there. And we have our young people at risk. They are at risk. They are being attacked by the militias, and they are being attacked by the very police forces that are supposed to be on the ground helping to provide security.

Well, in the final analysis, our only response must be to have an exit strategy. The Out of Iraq Caucus that was organized 1½ years ago did not say when we should get out; it did not tell the President exactly what the strategy should be. We simply created a platform for discussion and debate so that the Members of Congress would keep their eyes on the ball so that they would understand what was going on and not have information swept under the rug. We invited in speakers. We had generals to come in; we had writers to come in. We had many people come in and talk with us about what is going on there. But this President doesn't get it. He is intending to stay there until he does something called ''win,'' with young people losing their lives, the children of families all over America, not just from inner cities but most of them now we are finding coming from rural America. They will continue to die.

In another year we are going to have thousands that will be dead. In another year there will be thousands that will be injured. And the shame of it all is that they won't find the kind of medical care. They had a big article today and information about the homeless veterans returning from Iraq. They are homeless, they are not being cared for, they are not getting the benefits. But we are going to continue this war. I would submit to you it is time for a change. Bring our soldiers home.

Mr. HINCHEY. Ms. WATERS, I thank you very much for your dynamic leadership and for joining us this evening and for those remarks.

I yield to my good friend and colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Let me begin by thanking the gentleman from New York for this Special Order and bringing to the American people the very important issue that stands before us. And I would like to commend the Out of Iraq Caucus, but primarily the three women from California, Congresswoman WOOLSEY, Congresswoman LEE, and Congresswoman WATERS, who have kept this particular issue alive, have continued to work with us to shape a policy or keep the conscience of America focused on this situation, a situation that we gave preemptive strike authority to the President of United States, which all of us opposed, when they said there were weapons of mass destruction; and when none were found, said, well, it was regime change was the final one.

But today, we mark the fourth anniversary of the occupation in Iraq. Ironically, it was almost 4 years ago on May 1, 2003, that President Bush deemed the operation in Iraq as ''mission accomplished,'' affirming an end to the major combat in Iraq. As you may recall, he flew in a military plane on an aircraft carrier with a big sign and a brilliant smile on his face, ''Mission Accomplished.''

By that time, approximately 175 Americans had lost their lives in combat. Too many, but 175. Yet 3,197 lives later, American lives later, the war continues; 3,197 more from the pronouncement of ''mission accomplished.'' Included in this number are 50 fatalities from my home State of New Jersey.

This weekend, thousands of protesters took to the streets to demand an end to the war in Iraq. As an early and staunch opponent to this war, I have watched every single prediction made by this administration. They have boldly said what they predicted, and every time the prediction was wrong: from the duration of the war, wrong; the reception we would receive, wrong; the costs, wrong; the number of casualties, wrong; the existence of weapons of mass destruction, wrong. This administration has proven itself wrong, wrong, wrong. The countless number of Americans and Iraqis who have lost their lives is sad.

The administration should listen to the Baker-Hamilton Commission, which has offered a stinging assessment of virtually every aspect of the U.S. venture in Iraq and calls for a reshaping of the American presence and a new Middle East democracy initiative to prevent the country from slipping into anarchy.

There is a great sense of sadness among those of us who foresaw over 4 years ago the tragedy that is now unfolding in Iraq. The war that many assumed would be swift and certain now continues to rage, but I urge my fellow colleagues to take this day and all of the days forward to push for a change, beginning with an orderly withdrawal of American forces from Iraq. This approach will send a message to Iraqis that they must take more responsibility for their own security and would reduce the strain on our military forces. For that, we will not need a surge to the war to continue and continue surge after surge.

I thank you very much for the time.

Mr. HINCHEY. I thank my friend DONALD PAYNE from New Jersey for his leadership and for joining us this evening.

Mr. Speaker, the point that we have made here tonight is that perhaps at no time in the history of this country, except for perhaps our own Civil War, have we faced the kind of circumstances that we are presently being confronted with as a result of the way in which this administration incompetently and corruptly has led us into this illegal occupation in Iraq.

We need to correct these circumstances. It is the responsibility of this Congress to do so. We need to hold this administration accountable. It is the responsibility of this Congress to do so. We need to remove our military forces from Iraq in an appropriate and timely way. And it is the responsibility of this Congress to take that kind of leadership.

I thank my friends and colleagues for joining us here on this very important 4-year anniversary of the illegal attack and subsequent occupation of Iraq. We need now to change these circumstances.

OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I discuss a black mark on this administration. And while I realize this is the fourth anniversary, and I have enjoyed the comments of colleagues, comments with which I may have some disagreement, I would like to discuss another issue. Because no matter what we do in Iraq, one way or the other, whether we succeed there or not, if our southern borders are not secure, if the southern borders are open to an invasion of illegal immigrants and open to an invasion of our country by terrorists and others who would do us harm and drug dealers and drug cartels, America is in great jeopardy. So no matter what is happening overseas, and I would grant you that the President may have made some mistakes and he may well have been well motivated, but his motives in determining the policy of what is happening at our southern borders is not what is in question. It is his actions. And what we have today is a dangerous threat to the safety of our people, the security of our country at our southern border.

□ 2215

Today I discuss a black mark on this administration in terms of the security of our country, a vile crime which has been committed against two law enforcement officers whose job it has been to protect our families and our communities by keeping control of America's borders. The sad episode started back on February 17, 2005, just another routine day for Border Patrol Agents Ignacio Ramos and Jose Compean. Both were Border Patrol veterans with unblemished service records. Agent Ramos, in fact, had been nominated for Border Patrol Agent of the Year.

As they made their rounds that day 2 years ago, they checked on a tripped sensor near the border. Agent Compean discovered footprints and drag marks, the usual indication of a drug load being smuggled across the river. He spotted a vehicle, then radioed in the description and followed the suspect. The suspect realized that he had been spotted and turned around to rush back towards Mexico. Agent Ramos then observed the van driving at a very high rate of speed, and, after the driver ignored commands to pull over, Ramos gave chase.

By the way, according to the prosecuting attorney, pursuing a fleeing suspect without a supervisor's permission is against the Border Patrol policy. Now, get this. We are being told that just pursuing someone who has come across the border in a vehicle, without permission of a supervisor, is an illegal act, is against the rules for our Border Patrol agents. Whoever made that rule up? I wonder if the drug smugglers and the terrorists know about that rule?

The drug smuggler, then, in this particular instance, abandoned his vehicle and fled towards Mexico on foot, but he was intercepted by one of the agents, Agent Compean. Once again, ignoring several commands by Agent Compean to stop, a physical altercation ensued, with Compean ending up in the ditch.

Seeing his opportunity, the smuggler ran toward the border. According to Agent Compean's sworn statement, while running, the suspect turned and pointed something shiny with his left hand. Believing that his life was in danger, Agent Compean opens fire. Now, how long do you have to determine whether that is a gun in the man's hand as he runs away and aims something at you?

Hearing the gunshots, Agent Ramos came to the aid of his fellow officer. He, too, shouted for the smuggler to stop, but instead of obeying his command, the illegal drug smuggler once again turned and ran and, as he was running, again turned and pointed something shiny at Ramos, who at that moment shot his weapon once.

After disappearing into the banks of the Rio Grande, the smuggler reappeared on the Mexican side where he jumped into a waiting van, which was waiting for him. Obviously, an organized situation.

Unbeknownst to Officers Ramos and Compean, a bullet hit the illegal drug smuggler in the left buttocks. Other agents, including two supervisors, were nearby and could not see what was going on, but we have every reason to understand they heard the shots because they were that close.

When the abandoned van was examined, 743 pounds of marijuana were found. The payload was seized, and one would think that congratulations were in order. After all, Ramos and Compean were heroes, weren't they? They had been responsible for taking off the street $1 million worth of drugs bound for our communities. Good job, fellas, right? No. Wrong. Agents Ramos and Compean, not the illegal drug smuggler, are at this moment languishing in Federal prison, serving 11- to 12-year sentences, and, in fact, they are in solitary confinement.

This is the worst miscarriage of justice that I have seen in my 25 years of public service. It is a nightmare for the two Border Patrol agents who willingly risked their lives protecting us for 5 and 10 years. For their families, this is a hellish and destructive nightmare. They are losing everything.

And just today the Compean family was sent a letter signed by Attorney General Johnny Sutton, who prosecuted their loved one, their husband, asking for them to pay court costs of $2,800 while their husband has been sent away to prison and their family is being condemned to destitution, losing their health insurance, and then they get a letter asking for them to pay the court costs. I would offer this up for the RECORD.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE,
San Antonio, TX, March 14, 2007.

Re $2,800.00 and penalties and costs; Court No. EP05CR856(2); Judgment Date: October 23, 2006, USAO #2007Z00182/001

JOSE ALONSO COMPEAN,
El Paso, TX.

DEAR MR. COMPEAN: On the date listed above, you were ordered to pay the Court. The Financial Litigation Unit of the United States Attorney's Office is in charge of collecting your criminal debt. With the following exceptions, the amount you owe is due now and will be delinquent after 30 days. Delinquency may result in certain penalties being added to the debt pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §3612. Your cashier's check or money order, payable to the Clerk, U.S. District Court, should be mailed to the United States Clerk's Office, U.S. Courthouse, 511 E. San Antonio St., Room 350, El Paso, Texas 79901. Please note that personal checks are not accepted.

The exceptions to immediate payment in full are as follows:

The terms of your judgment provide otherwise, or

You have made an agreement with the Court or your probation officer, or

You have entered into a satisfactory repayment agreement with this office, or

You are presently incarcerated.

If you are presently incarcerated, you may begin paying on your debt through the Inmate Financial Responsibility Program. Regardless of the foregoing exceptions to immediate payment in full, please be advised that the United States may enforce the judgment for the full amount as provided by law.

If you have paid the debt in full, then please disregard this notice and notify the United States Attorney's Office immediately by returning a copy of this letter with a copy of the receipt(s).

Sincerely,

JOHNNY SUTTON,
United States Attorney.

To add insult to injury, a letter from U.S. Attorney Johnny Sutton's office was sent on March 14 to the families, as I say, of both of these officers. And I have it right here, and let me read that to you, which I have just submitted for the RECORD.

Final Litigation Unit of the United State's Attorney's Office is in charge of collecting your criminal debt. The amount you owe is due now and will be delinquent after 30 days. Delinquency may result in certain penalties being added. Please be advised that the United States may enforce the judgment for the full amount as provided by law.

This is to a family of a law enforcement officer now who is languishing away in solitary confinement, and the family is being destroyed. Talk about cruelty.

The Compean family has already lost their home, and they have no health insurance, and now they receive a letter like this from the U.S. attorney.

I hope the American people are understanding the horror story that we are putting these two Border Patrol agents through. And our President knows about this. His protege, the U.S. attorney, knows about this, and I will tell you that, yes, Attorney General Gonzales knows about this.

So how come the agents were prosecuted and not the drug smuggler? Why is it that the Border Patrol agents have been treated so ruthlessly and without mercy by the U.S. attorney and by the Justice Department, and, yes, by the President of the United States?

The whole rotten episode has turned justice on its head. The book was thrown at heroes who protect us, while the drug smuggler got immunity. According to U.S. Attorney Johnny Sutton, who was a longtime Bush appointee and protege, a friend of the President, Ramos and Compean are not heroes. In fact, he considers the two officers to be criminals, charging them with assault with serious bodily injury, assault with a deadly weapon, discharge of a firearm while committing a crime of violence, which carries a mandatory minimum sentence of 10 years, and a civil rights violation. Sutton claims he had no choice but to prosecute the two Border Patrol agents because, according to Sutton, they broke the law. And when they violated procedures for discharging their weapons, they discharged their weapons at a fleeing suspect. That was not permitted.

The procedures were not followed, and that is true. They didn't know absolutely for sure he didn't have a gun. They thought he did. But where do we have rules saying that a Border Patrol

agent has to be shot and wounded before he can use his weapon?

Sutton could have granted immunity to law enforcement officers and thrown the book at the drug smuggler. That is what would have made sense. After all, these two law enforcement officers had a perfect, clean record. The drug smuggler was a drug smuggler.

But, instead, Johnny Sutton, our U.S. attorney, protege of the President, chose to side with the drug smuggler, and threw the book at the Border Patrol agents. This was totally discretionary on the part of Johnny Sutton, who continues to say he had no choice but to bring charges against the Border Patrol agents. No, he could have given the immunity for a lack of procedure to the Border Patrol agents and thrown the book at the drug dealer. This was an indefensible decision, and now Sutton lies to us with the suggestion that he didn't have a choice to prosecute.

So how does this incident then mushroom into this matter of the ultimate and utter destruction of the lives of these two Border Patrol agents and their families? After the incident, the drug smuggler, also known as Aldrete-Davila, contacted Rene Sanchez, a childhood friend, for advice. Why did he call Rene Sanchez? Because Sanchez is a current Border Patrol agent in Arizona. Now, instead of turning in this drug smuggler, even though he was a friend, an old, longtime friend, he didn't turn in the drug smuggler. He went to the authorities, and this law enforcement officer, who was sworn to uphold the laws of the United States, chose to intervene on the behalf of his childhood friend who was smuggling drugs, a mule for the drug cartel. He was also called as a character witness, this same man, on the drug smuggler's behalf during the trial in which he described how the drug smuggler actually was a very fine and decent man.

Well, Mr. Sanchez contacted the Department of Homeland Security, who, in turn, decided to open an investigation into the conduct of Ramos and Compean. What? A drug smuggler with 750 pounds of narcotics is thwarted from making his delivery and then complains he was shot at, and our government decides to investigate the law enforcement officers? Something is really wrong with this picture.

Mr. Sutton had every chance to focus his enormous prosecutorial powers on the drug dealer. He chose to target the enforcement officers because maybe they weren't following procedure. He chose to turn a possible procedural violation by the Border Patrol agents into a criminal act, rather than prosecuting a career drug smuggler.

As part of their investigation, the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General sent Special Agent Christopher Sanchez, which is no relation to the other fellow, into Mexico, and this fellow offered the drug smuggler immunity, an immunity deal in exchange for his testimony against the Border Patrol agents. The smuggler was then brought back into the United States, given free medical care for his injuries, all at taxpayer expense.

One wonders at the outcome and what would have happened if Mr. Sutton would have spent one-tenth the effort trying to find this criminal and trying to demand his extradition and punishment for smuggling narcotics into our country, rather than focusing on our law enforcement officers who are there to protect us and trying to find a way to bring them down.

The drug smuggler was portrayed by this U.S. attorney as the victim. He was portrayed that to the jury and to the public as the victim because the drug smuggler swears he wasn't armed, and, of course, the U.S. attorney took the word of the drug smuggler rather than the law enforcement agents that he wasn't armed. Sure, a drug smuggler has $1 million worth of drugs and he is not armed.

The jury is told that Davila was just trying to raise money to buy medicine for his sick mother, and he had never smuggled drugs before. So the U.S. attorney made that claim to the jury and painted the worst possible picture of Ramos and Compean.

Then our government takes the word of this nefarious drug-dealing character over two law enforcement officers, again portraying that to the jury as what they believed to be the case.

In short, the initial decision to prosecute the two Border Patrol agents instead of the drug smuggler was indefensible. And then our U.S. attorney moved forward with a vigor to beat these two men down, perhaps just to protect a wrong decision.

Well, Mr. Sutton's only defense of this wrong decision is to cover up the horrendous decision. And how did he do that? He has to demonize the two Border Patrol agents and has to make sure they get the maximum penalty.

But this doesn't meet the smell test. Anyone who comes close to this case knows it stinks. According to the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General's report, which includes Agent Compean's sworn statement that he repeatedly stated that he believed that the drug smuggler had a weapon, and that he felt threatened, the Border Patrol training allows for the use of deadly force when an agent fears imminent bodily injury or death. The two officers said that under oath. Both officers testified they saw Aldrete-Davila turn and point what they believed to be a weapon at them while he was running away.

The wound created by the bullet in this man corroborates the agents' version of events. During the trial, an Army doctor, a prosecution witness, I might add, testified that the drug smuggler's body was bladed away from the bullet that struck him. That is consistent with the motion of a left-handed person running while pointing backwards, causing the body to twist, once again corroborating Ramos' and Compean's belief that the smuggler had a weapon in his hand.

Later, the drug dealer's family, and this is really important; later the drug dealer's family verified to a news reporter that he always carried a gun and that he had been making deliveries of drugs for a long time.

□ 2230

That, of course, never made it into the trial or to the jury.

It is important to understand that only three individuals were eyewitnesses to the crucial events of that day: the two accused border agents and a self-admitted drug smuggler. The other Border Patrol agents who responded to the scene and perhaps heard some of the shots testified under immunity and contradicted themselves several times on the witness stand. And why did that happen? What was the problem there?

Most importantly, when we are looking at this, we know that their view of events was completely obscured. They did not see what was going on, these other agents, the supervisors, because there was a 12-foot-high berm on the edge of a levee right across from an access road where all this was happening. None of the other agents could have seen what transpired on the other side of this berm. Well, they heard the shots; yet these agents, these same agents, two of them at least who were the supervisors of Ramos and Compean, were threatened that if they didn't testify against Ramos and Compean, they would be prosecuted themselves. Is this intimidation?

The fact is these two supervisors didn't make a report on the incident. They didn't ask Ramos and Compean about the incident. It wasn't Ramos and Compean who falsified a report. They were never asked by their supervisors because no one wanted to fill out 5 hours' worth of paperwork. And then in comes the U.S. attorney making this a criminal offense.

Well, it begs the question of why the two supervisors needed immunity before they could testify. Why is it that they needed immunity? If they weren't involved in the incident, why were they offered immunity? Well, they were given immunity by Johnny Sutton because he was threatening them. He was threatening, you either do this, or you are the one who is going to be prosecuted for not filing a report on this shooting incident. This calls into question what effect this all had on the truthfulness of their testimony.

The U.S. attorney's version of what happened that day relies almost exclusively on the testimony of the drug smuggler. We are talking about what happened firsthand. The other people were across and didn't see it. They heard noises. According to the Department of Homeland Security investigation, the supervisors heard or knew about the shooting. That is in the report of the Department of Homeland Security investigation.

So the supervisors heard or knew about the shooting; yet they did not ask Ramos and Compean about it because why? Because they were trying to cover something up? No. Because they didn't want to do 5 hours' worth of paperwork on their own time. And Johnny Sutton, our U.S. attorney, turned that into a felony, attacking our law enforcement officers and letting the drug dealer go, focusing on our law enforcement officers, trying to find anything he can do to get them and bring them down and anything he can do to protect the drug dealer.

Well, it was their duty, meaning the supervisors who were threatened by Sutton, to change their testimony. It was their duty, not the field agents', to write a report about this incident. That is probably what he used to hang over their head: You were the ones who were supposed to write the report. If you didn't, they must have kept this information from you.

It was never brought up even though they were right there. As a matter of fact, the agents that we are talking about, Ramos and Compean, and all agents that are on the border there, are prohibited by Border Patrol policy from filing a written report on a shooting. INS firearms policy section 12(b), 1(g) states: ''Ensure that supervisory personnel or investigative officers are aware that employees involved in a shooting incident shall not be required or allowed to submit a written statement of the circumstances surrounding the incident.'' So Ramos and Compean were not permitted to file a written report, and the supervisors didn't file it, and so Johnny Sutton went after the supervisors and threatened them in order to get them to testify against Ramos and Compean. After all, why then would he have to grant them immunity otherwise?

''All written statements regarding the incident,'' a shooting incident, ''shall be prepared by the local investigating officers and shall be based upon an interview of the employees.''

So here you have Ramos and Compean prohibited from writing their own report. Yet Johnny Sutton continues to claim that the officers filed a false report to cover up their crime; not to cover up that they were not following the right procedures, but to cover up a crime. The supervisors knew about the shooting. They didn't ask Ramos and Compean what had happened, because once they did, it would have required 5 hours of additional paperwork. And because the guy got away, they didn't know that he had been wounded. They just assumed that the incident was closed.

So now because people who were just trying not to have to do 5 hours' worth of paperwork, officers who risk their lives for us every day are being brought down and their lives destroyed because of that, and the drug dealers go free.

By no means did anyone's action raise to the level of criminality. What might be considered unauthorized discharge of a weapon, because, let us face it, Ramos and Compean, again, couldn't prove absolutely that they knew the drug dealer had a weapon, and, of course, if he did and they were wrong, they would be shot, and they would be dead, well, they can't prove it absolutely; so that has been turned into attempted murder by the U.S. attorney.

Again, the agents thought the drug smuggler was pointing something at them. Their story has never changed. They testified to this in court. The drug smuggler had just been in a physical altercation with one of the officers. Of course, the U.S. attorney believed the drug dealer, who swears that Compean just fell down. He believes the drug dealer when he said, ''I didn't have a gun.'' You have to believe the drug dealer because he was the only one on the scene and he got away, although his family has told reporters that he always carried a gun. And it does make sense that someone who carries a million dollars' worth of drugs would be armed.

So even though the Department of Homeland Security Office of Investigation determined that all seven officers on the scene knew about or had heard about the shooting, the U.S. attorney granted those officers immunity, which, now, why did he have to do that if they were just going to tell the truth? To testify against Ramos and Compean. There must have been a threat there: If you don't testify this way, well, I am not going to grant you immunity, which means I can charge you with a crime. So, remember, it is the supervisors' job, not the agents', Ramos and Compean, to fill out the written report.

So this leads to the logical conclusion that these witnesses were intimidated into testifying. Our U.S. Attorney's Office intimidated witnesses. They were threatened and then given immunity if they went along. If this incident would have been kept in perspective, this whole shooting incident, and, yes, if the weapons were discharged without justification, and, still, when you think someone is aiming a gun at you, that is justification, but at the very worst, if all supervisors and agents were failing to report a shooting, that may or may not have been consistent with the regulations governing the discharge of weapons. Maybe that was a violation of procedure, that those supervisors, along with those two Border Patrol agents, should have worked those extra 5 hours and filed that report. And do you know what would have happened? They would have been disciplined, and that would have been the end of it. The penalty for not reporting a shooting is a 5-day suspension.

This was an issue of procedural violation maybe, not criminality, and there is a serious question about the viability of those mandated procedures that we are talking about that you have got to really keep your gun holstered even when you are going up against drug dealers and you are going up against terrorists.

Of course, we have an insane border policy which has resulted in an open border in which terrorists and drug dealers think they can just come across the border, and this was even before Ramos and Compean, and we have had an invasion of millions of illegal immigrants across the southern border, and that border policy now is destroying the lives of the only people who are there trying to defend us.

Over 90 Members of Congress have expressed concern, if not outrage, at the many troubling aspects of this case. Our repeated attempts for Presidential intervention have gone ignored or rebuffed. Our pleas to keep the officers out on bond pending appeal fell on deaf ears. Instead, the President dug in his heels and sent Tony Snow out to chastise our efforts to save Ramos and Compean by suggesting, in the President's words, take a closer look at the facts in the case since these men were convicted by a jury.

Johnny Sutton went on public airwaves and lied to the public to discredit the agents. How many times have we heard they shot an unarmed man in the back as he was running away? He wasn't shot in the back. He was shot in the side, in the buttocks, as he was aiming something at the officers. He wasn't just a man. He was a drug smuggler. He wasn't someone who happened across the border.

It has been discovered that the Homeland Security Department lied to Congress and then covered up their lies because this was all part of the effort by this administration to demonize the two law enforcement officers, to cover up their horrendous mistake and decision in prosecuting them in the first place, but, of course, also trying to keep the lid on the fact that there is a disaster happening in American security to our southern border. And this case, of course, brings attention to the failure of this administration to protect our national security and leaving us totally vulnerable at our southern border.

So even today the Department of Homeland Security released an official statement by IG Skinner, and this statement, which I will also add for the RECORD, is filled with misinformation and inaccuracies about the facts of this case.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD L. SKINNER, INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY REGARDING THE INVESTIGATION OF FORMER BORDER PATROL AGENTS IGNACIO RAMOS AND JOSE COMPEAN

Remarks by certain Members of Congress as reported in the media have stated that members of my staff lied to Congress. At a hearing before the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee on February 8, 2007, I stated, in part, the following:

The decision to prosecute former Border Patrol Agents Ignacio Ramos and Jose Compean was made by the Department of Justice, not by my Office. My Office conducted the investigation in coordination with the United States Attorneys' Office.

I stand by the work of my Office. Our investigators did an outstanding job and I fully support their work.

At no time did any member of my staff lie to Congress about the investigation of Mr. Ramos and Mr. Compean or any other matter. My staff has acted honestly and in good faith.

In a closed Members' briefing on September 26, 2006, my staff reported that Mr. Compean had said that he and Mr. Ramos had stated that they ''wanted to shoot a Mexican.'' My staff reported this statement to me, and then reported it to Representative Michael McCaul and other Members and their staff during the closed briefing. Representative McCaul was then serving as Chair of the Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Homeland Security Committee. At the time my staff made that statement, they believed it to be true, although we later learned it was inaccurate. In fact, Mr. Compean had stated in a sworn statement that ''my intent was to kill the alien. . .and I think Nacho [Ramos] was also trying to kill the alien.'' The alien Mr. Compean and Mr. Ramos attempted to kill, Mr. Olsvaldo Aldrete-Davila, had come from Mexico and escaped back into Mexico.

The statement that Mr. Ramos and Mr. Compean supposedly ''wanted to shoot a Mexican'' never was reported in any document by my office or by the Department of Justice, and was not introduced at the trial of Mr. Ramos and Mr. Compean, which had been completed on March 8, 2006, six months prior to the briefing. That statement also was not reported by my office to anyone other than then Chairman McCaul and the other Members and their staff in attendance at the closed briefing.

The briefing my office provided to then Chairman McCaul and the other Members was initiated at his request in his capacity as Chair of the Subcommittee on Investigations.

Mr. McCaul and the other Members understood that the information my office was providing was not public, and was not to be made public—it was For Official Use Only for the Committee's use in discharging its official business.

At the time my staff tried to accommodate then Chairman McCaul by providing an oral briefing, we did not have the benefit of a trial transcript or even a written report of investigation. Consequently, my staff made some misstatements during the briefing, but nothing that affected the investigation, the trial, the convictions or the sentencings of Mr. Ramos and Mr. Compean.

The only reason the statement that Mr. Ramos and Mr. Compean allegedly said they ''wanted to shoot a Mexican'' has become public is because the terms under which my office briefed the Members have not been honored. Others have publicized that inaccurate information and reported it to the media. That information was not used at trial nor in the sentencing of Mr. Compean or Mr. Ramos.

The evidence that was introduced at trial proved that Mr. Compean and Mr. Ramos attempted to shoot Mr. Aldrete-Davila in the back while he was unarmed and running away from them.

Evidence introduced at trial proved that when Mr. Compean and Mr. Ramos attempted to shoot Mr. Aldrete-Davila in the back, they did not know that he had been attempting to smuggle marijuana into this country.

Evidence introduced at trial proved that when Mr. Compean and Mr. Ramos attempted to shoot Mr. Aldrete-Davila in the back, they did not even know that he was in this country illegally.

At no time did Mr. Compean and Mr. Ramos warn their fellow Border Patrol Agents that they believed Mr. Aldrete-Davila might be armed. Consequently, other Border Patrol agents walked around in the open where they were exposed, rather than taking cover or other precautions.

After shooting Mr. Aldrete-Davila in the buttocks, Mr. Compean and Mr. Ramos made no attempt to arrest him, thus allowing him to escape back into Mexico. Rather than try to arrest Mr. Aldrete-Davila, Mr. Compean picked up the spent shell casings and threw them away and instructed another agent to do the same. Neither Mr. Compean nor Mr. Ramos reported the shooting incident to their supervisor, though required to do so.

In conclusion, I am deeply disturbed that these allegations have been made regarding the integrity of my staff I reiterate my staff acted honestly and in good faith at all times.

And let me note, despite the administration's repeated claims that Ramos and Compean were convicted by a jury of their peers, it is important to note that the jury didn't hear so many of the facts that were important for them to come to the truth in this issue.

Finally, after 11 months, the completed trial transcripts of their trial were made available. So for 11 months we haven't even been able to see the transcript of this trial. And here we have the Department of Homeland Security telling us that when they were giving a briefing to Members of Congress, one of the Members of Congress who is the chairman of an oversight subcommittee, that they had made misstatements, and then this document itself is filled with misstatements. One wonders about the sincerity and the professionalism of the people in this administration in this very volatile issue dealing with border control. Something is amiss. Something is causing the system to go askew.

Federal District Judge Kathleen Cordone, another Bush appointee, I might add, would not permit critically important aspects of this case to be introduced during the trial. She did this at the request of the prosecution. For example, she would not allow any reference to describing the dangerous conditions of the border. Essentially the jury was supposed to imagine that the shooting took place in a completely sterile environment where the likelihood of Border Patrol agents confronting armed drug smugglers was not a plausible scenario.

Well, that is absurd. And a recent headline in the Washington Times is a perfect example. It states: ''Officers Outgunned on the Border.'' The reporter describes in great detail the unprecedented surge in violence along our borders fueled by heavily armed illegal gangs who patrol those areas in order to protect their criminal enterprises; yet this judge didn't think it was important for the jury to find out that these Border Patrol agents were working in extreme danger every day. And thus when they thought they saw him turning around and aiming something at them, would that be justified?

It might not be justified if you are in downtown USA in some very peaceful town someplace around the country, or at some school or church or maybe even in a courtroom, but when you are on the border, and you are off on your own, and you are confronting this type of challenge, yes, if someone is pointing something at you, and you realize he has just escaped, that he has been in an altercation with one of the officers, and then later, of course, we find out that he was a drug dealer, yes, there was every reason for them to be concerned that he might have a weapon and shoot them.

□ 2245

In fact, his family, again has told a reporter, he was armed many times when he went out, and he was someone who had done this many times before, drug smuggling, that is. So perhaps the most troubling omission from the trial, again, was about the drug smuggler himself.

Already under immunity for smuggling $1 million worth of drugs into the country on that day of the shooting, Davila was involved with a second drug smuggling incident in the months later after the first incidents. In October of 2005, he again was part of another drug smuggling incident. According to sensitive DEA documents obtained by my office, the government's star witness against Ramos and Campeon was ID'd as the driver of a van filled with another 750 pounds of marijuana seized during a joint DEA-Border Patrol operation on October 23, 2005. This was only 6 months after he had been intercepted by Ramos and Campeon.

So instead of doing the right thing and throwing the case out because their star witness has proven to be an awful, dreadful human being, a professional drug dealer, instead of throwing the case out, no, the U.S. Attorney chose to ignore this information; not only ignore it, but to pressure everyone in the trial to make sure that this information that their primary witness, the guy who they are portraying as a man who had never done this before, and was simply raising money for medicine for his mother, that the information he was involved in yet another drug operation was never disclosed. The U.S. Attorney did everything he could to make sure that was not disclosed to the jury or the public.

Johnny Sutton has lied to the American people about this. Every time he was asked questions about it, he would give an answer that sounded like he was saying no, there was no second incident. But if you examine the words, that is not what he was saying. He was, as unscrupulous lawyers often do, saying one thing, but making people think that he was saying something else. He was lying without actually having to be technically lying.

So, what happened? We have their prime witness now involved in another drug deal operation, and the U.S. Attorney pressures the judge to not permit anything about the second incident to become known to the jury. They

said ''Mr. Davila is not on trial.'' The prosecutor then insisted that the defense could not even question Davila about a second incident. Unfortunately, the judge went along with the prosecution in this case and then ruled that just because the star witness had been arrested again for drug dealing, that that was not relevant to this case. A gag order was placed on anyone involved in the case so no information open the second drug smuggling incident could ever reach the jury.

So the jury wasn't allowed to hear that the drug dealer's commission of a second offense while he was waiting for that trial had taken place. We are talking about the credibility of the primary witness against Ramos and Campeon.

His credibility is not relevant? The jury shouldn't know that this is not just a man who is raising money for the medicine for his mother, that that is not who he is. Who he really is is a professional drug cartel mule who did this often and was arrested again after he had been given immunity by our government, and a pass, I might add, to go in and out of our country?

The jury also never heard that Christopher Sanchez, the Department of Homeland Security investigator who took Davila, took him and the removed bullet fragment, which had been removed from him, this Department of Homeland Security investigator took him to his personal residence for a night after he was released from an American hospital which got this bullet fragment out and the bullet fragment was in his possession. So we have a negligent action that broke the chain of custody for this vital piece of evidence.

What we are talking about here is something that any lawyer can tell you is the type of sloppiness that taints evidence and disqualifies it from being used by the prosecution. That wasn't permitted to be told to the jury.

What is going on? Our Border Patrol agents make one possible procedural mistake in the field in an instantaneous reaction to a man who might be shooting at them, and the book is thrown at them. ''You make any mistake and we are going to squash you like a bug.'' But when they make a mistake about breaking the chain of evidence and actually taking a witness putting them in a prosecutor's home, totally violating procedures and tainting the prosecutorial case, well, those mistakes in procedure are just ignored. They are just ignored.

Why is it that the two heroes who are protecting us with their bodies every day of their life have the book thrown at them, and if they can possibly turn a mistake into a felony, they are destroyed; but the U.S. Attorney's Office, if they make a mistake, or the Department of Homeland Security, which now admits that they made misstatements to a group of Congressmen investigating this issue, and then I might add for 4 months covered up the fact they had made those misstatements, why is it all forgotten and forgiven on one side, but yet our defenders have to have the book thrown at them? Why is the government bending over backwards to accommodate and protect a professional drug mule?

Our government went to Mexico, sought out the drug smuggler, granted him immunity, issued a border crossing card and provided him free healthcare, all at America's expense, and now the fellow thinks he is going to sue the U.S. Government for $5 million.

Perhaps most perplexing is the fact that three of the 12 jurors in the trial of Ramos and Campeon later submitted sworn affidavits alleging that they had been misled by the jury foreman into believing that if the majority of jurors voted for a conviction, they had to go along and vote guilty, even though they thought the defendants were innocent.

That is right. These are unsophisticated jurors, not very well educated people, but regular human beings; intelligent, but not educated in the ways of the law. They were told by the foreman of the jury that hung juries would not be allowed. The three jurors said, and they have signed written affidavits, that they felt pressured to vote guilty. One of them said, ''Had we had the option of a hung jury, I truly believe the outcome may have been different.''

Another juror said, ''I think I might not have changed my vote to guilty had I known that a hung jury was an option. I did not think the defendants were guilty of the assaults or the civil rights violations.''

The judge, again at the urging of the prosecutor, denied a request that the two agents that we are talking about, Ramos and Campeon, be permitted to remain free on bond until the appeal could be heard. Common criminals are permitted to stay out on bond until their appeal is heard, but not these two Border Patrol agents.

I stand before you, Mr. Speaker. Here we are, and right now as we are speaking Border Patrol agents Ignacio Ramos and Campeon are languishing in solitary confinement in Federal prisons as a direct result of the mean-spirited, ruthless prosecution that was brought upon them by our Justice Department and with the backing of the President of the United States.

Ramos and Campeon were ripped away from their families on January 17, 2007, and forced to begin serving their unjust 11 and 12 year prison sentences all because our own Federal Government chose to take the word of a drug smuggler and give him immunity and take his word over that of two law enforcement officers and throw the book at them, even though those two law enforcement officers had put their lives on the line to protect the borders of the United States, protect our families and our communities for 5 and 10 years, risking their lives for us.

I, along with a dozen other Members, signed on to a letter requesting that the Justice Department release the officers on bond pending their appeal. As I say, it is a courtesy often afforded common criminals.

And, yes, Ramos was severely beaten in prison, and thus we knew that their lives were in danger for them to be in this prison and there was a reason to let them be out on appeal. Yet the Justice Department chose to ignore the pleas of Members of Congress and the pleas for mercy of the families, and the agents were denied bond.

I might add that after a lengthy delay, I finally received a letter from the Justice Department claiming to have no choice but to deny bond. By the way, this was the Justice Department's letter to me. I received it just today telling me why they couldn't give these two, Ramos and Campeon, bond and let them out on bond while they are do going through their appeal.

They really have to be very specific and they have to follow all the rules. They have to be exactly right in what they are doing. Except, of course, they address the letter to ''Congresswoman Rohrabacher.'' Congresswoman Rohrabacher. Well, if they can't get that right, why are they playing with the lives of Ramos and Campeon? If they can't get that right, why is it that if Ramos and Campeon make a little mistake in their procedure, that they get the book thrown at them?

Also let me note this ''Congresswoman Rohrabacher'' letter to me from the Justice Department is just another example of the contempt that this administration has demonstrated time and again for congressional oversight and congressional concerns.

This Attorney General, this President, has time and again, instead of treating the legislative branch as something that deserves the respect that we do deserve, as the presidency deserves, time and again we have been shown contempt. We have had people in communicating to us, we put questions in to the Attorney General and get calls back from people four or five layers down. Here we are getting an answer back from someone who doesn't even know that I am not a ''Congresswoman Rohrabacher.'' Yes, that is contempt, and they will pay the price for that contempt.

Our pleas as Members of Congress were not unfounded. Members warned the administration that Ramos and Campeon faced imminent danger once they entered the respective Federal correctional facilities. Not only were they not properly protected, Agent Ramos was placed in a facility known to be infiltrated by illegal Mexican gang members, and within 8 days of his arrival, Agent Ramos was savagely beaten by five of those illegal Mexican gang members.

Instead of sending him to a minimum security prison or letting him be out on bond, the administration decided to make an example of him. They wouldn't even send him to a minimum security prison where he would be safe.

Instead, the Justice Department chose to keep him at this dangerous facility where he had already been beaten. And Agent Ramos, even as we speak, has been in solitary confinement for 45 days and counting. Solitary confinement. Locked in a cell 23 hours a day, telephone privileges limited to one call of 15 minutes every 30 days, and no interaction with other inmates. Mr. Campeon is suffering the same fate.

The Bureau of Prisons uses the euphemism to describe their incarceration as ''special housing for their own protection.'' Make no mistake about it, they are in solitary confinement, a unit designed as a punitive measure, not a protective measure. Ramos and Campeon, two brave Border Patrol agents, are suffering a fate not even bestowed upon murderers and drug dealers. This amounts to cruel and unusual punishment, intentional cruel and unusual punishment.

These two agents could have been sent to a minimum security prison where they would be safe. We actually asked the President, through back channels, personally, just go to the judge and support the effort to let them out on bond until the appeal is heard. The next day, it was announced that no, the administration officially opposes any letting them out on bond.

Well, basically, that was sending a message to everyone who patrols our borders. He sent the message to every Border Patrol agent when he said not only are you going to be prosecuted, but you will be destroyed, you will be obliterated, you will be smashed like a bug if you get in the way of what we want to happen down at the border.

President Bush has essentially dismantled our ability to control America's southern border. Any agent who gets in the way will be squashed, as I have said. So much for the President's compassion. So much for his talk about Christian charity. Ramos and Campeon are languishing in solitary confinement. They are being brutalized. There is cruel and unusual punishment being dealt out to them because they dared challenge the President.

□ 2300

I don't want to hear anything more about compassion from a man who lets that happen to our brave defenders, and then focuses us on a far-away war while letting terrorists and drug dealers penetrate our southern border.

Since January 17, when the propaganda machine and smear campaign against Compean and Ramos was fully unleashed by the President, by Tony Snow, and his protege, the U.S. Attorney Johnny Sutton, more questions than answers have arisen. Both Tony Snow and Johnny Sutton smugly lectured the American people and Members of Congress to ''take a closer look at this case.'' And as the President said in his own words, ''Take a sober look at this case.''

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have closely examined this case, and maybe it would behoove the President to take some advice and to look at this case honestly.

U.S. Attorney Johnny Sutton, who is probably briefing the President, has his own personal life tied up in this. He is not an unbiased source of information about this case, just as Attorney General Gonzales is not. They have already advised the President in a horrendous way and started him down the road to the situation where he is at today.

John Sutton prosecuted the good guys and gave immunity to the bad guys. He could have done it the other way around, but he didn't. He chose to prosecute the good guys and give immunity to the bad guys. Sutton has continually engaged in a propaganda campaign aimed at creating a prejudicial public view against Agents Ramos and Compean. He has repeatedly stated that ''these corrupt agents shot an unarmed man in the back.'' This is not true.

The prosecution's own witness, an Army surgeon, testified that the bullet hit Adrete-Davila in the buttocks, not in the back. And, of course, he was turned in a way that the bullet entered indicating he was aiming something backwards. And, of course, this was not just a man in the back. It was not a nun or some tourist who happened to stray across the border. It was a professional drug smuggler who works for a drug cartel, a mule, a deliveryman for drugs, bringing dangerous substances into our neighborhoods in order to threaten our schools and our children.

Remember, since the drug smuggler absconded into Mexico, there was no way to know whether he was armed or not, yet Sutton chose to believe the drug smuggler who said he was not armed, even those the smuggler's own family members say he has been smuggling drugs since he was 14 and was ''always armed.''

So there is no question that he was a member of a drug cartel, but Johnny Sutton takes the drug smuggler's word over the law enforcement agents', and he portrays the drug smuggler to the jury in a dishonest way and keeps from them information that would expose the drug dealer as a professional drug dealer and not as he was portrayed before the jury.

Johnny Sutton turned the drug dealer in front of the jury into a victim. He was just trying to raise money for medicine for his dear mother and had never done drugs before. Sutton turned reality on its head. He sided with the drug smuggler over two men who risk their lives every day to protect us.

So now they must be destroyed to protect the mistake that was made not only in prosecuting them, but the mistakes that are made in policy down at the border that are putting our country at risk. These two Border Patrol agents are being destroyed to protect Sutton's failure. They are being destroyed to protect Gonzales' job, and they are being destroyed to protect the President's legacy, because all of those are at stake if the people learn the truth about what is happening on our border, and what the Ramos-Compean prosecution is all about.

Sutton vilifies helpless Border Patrol agents like these guys who get in the way every chance he gets. Just ask David Sipe, Gary Brugman and Gilmer Hernandez, all law enforcement officers who have been prosecuted by Johnny Sutton.

What we are talking about with Ramos and Compean is not only a sin against these men, not only a message to all our Border Patrol agents, but part of a pattern that is going on in which this administration is trying to cower our protectors, our law enforcement officers, from enforcing the law at our border, leaving us totally exposed.

The lies are evident. For example, Johnny Sutton continually refers to Ramos and Compean as corrupt agents. Well, again, why is our U.S. attorney out speaking on radio calling them corrupt agents? There weren't any charges of corruption. In fact, I have looked through this, there has never been a charge of corruption against either of these men. Yet the U.S. attorney is out in the mass media saying they were corrupt Border Patrol agents. They have never been charged with corruption because they have a totally clean work record.

Yes, Ramos had some family problems years ago, not part of his job, and Mr. Sutton, of course, has chosen to bring that personal matter up in order to vilify Mr. Ramos. But in terms of that, everybody understands you can have family problems. This had nothing to do with his job. In fact, Ramos had been nominated for Border Patrol Agent of the Year, and there is no corruption, yet Johnny Sutton lies and says these corrupt Border Patrol agents.

Johnny Sutton, when asked whether there was a second incident, lies and says something that makes it sound like there wasn't a second incident. But in reality his words are just technically not a lie, but what he is presenting is an untruth. That is what unscrupulous lawyers do.

What is the real significance of this case? The U.S. Attorney's despicable prosecution of these Border Patrol agents has put Border Patrol agents on notice: Any use of force to protect America, to secure our borders, and you will go to prison, and your life will be destroyed.

The consequences for Ramos and Compean in this case extend far beyond the destruction of these two men and their families. Yes, it is horrible that these families are being driven into destitution, and now they add insult to injury, sending them a bill. The Compeans have lost their home. There are three kids in that family, and they do not have health insurance, and their lives are being shattered, and Johnny Sutton sends them a bill to rub their nose in the fact that their father is in prison in solitary confinement.

But what are the consequences of this to all of us? These families are being destroyed, but there are more American lives at risk. Our southern border is open not just to an invading army of illegal immigrants, but, yes, to drug dealers like the ones like Ramos and Compean confronted, and, yes, to terrorists.

What if it was found that that van that Davila was in turned out not to possess a million dollars' worth of drugs, but instead it was a dirty bomb in that van; and if that drug dealer wasn't a Mexican, but instead turned out to be an Arab terrorist on the way to a target in the United States? Well, these two men, instead of being in solitary confinement, they would be invited to the White House and be congratulated and be made heroes.

Now there is a bigger agenda here. There is a hidden agenda here at play with the Ramos and Compean prosecution. The American people have a right to know who gave the order to go ahead to prosecute Ramos and Compean in the first place. I am sure Gonzales was in on it, and we need to know that. We also need to know as this case progressed where the President and Mr. Gonzales played a role in making decisions as to where they would be imprisoned, and if they would get out on bail during the time of appeal.

How did an incident that could have easily been resolved through an administrative reprimand within the Border Patrol itself spiral into charging them with attempted murder and a civil rights violation? According to a memo dealing with a meeting between four members of the Texas delegation and representatives of the Department of Homeland Security investigating team, the Mexican Consulate contacted the U.S. Attorney's Office on March 4, 2005, the same day this investigation began.

It seems to fit a disturbing pattern with all of these other prosecutions that the administration has moved forward with.

In the Gilmer Hernandez case, the Mexican Consulate sent 17 letters to our government demanding prosecution. In the Gary Brugman case, the Mexican consul sat in the courtroom during the trial, and Johnny Sutton went so far as to thank him for his assistance in locating the illegals Sutton used to testify against Brugman.

This stinks. We need to get to the bottom of this and find out if a foreign government is having an undue influence on prosecutorial decisions of our own law enforcement agencies and members. This subject of whether there is some type of foreign involvement, meaning the Mexican Government, in prosecutorial decisions here of our own law enforcement officials, that is now going to be looked into by the International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight Subcommittee of which I am the ranking member. Chairman DELAHUNT has stated that we will be holding hearings into this subject. There will be hearings of our oversight subcommittee to explore the pattern of questionable foreign influence on our government's decisions to prosecute law enforcement officers in the United States, especially those law enforcement officers who are trying to stop drug dealers who are coming in from Mexico, and stop the invasion of illegal immigrants who are pouring into our country from Mexico.

□ 2310

The Mexican government is having an undue influence on the decision of our government prosecutors in order to make concessions to the Mexican government. If our government is actually prosecuting people who do not deserve to be prosecuted, the American people have a right to know what political decisions are being made in coming forward with these indefensible prosecutions.

Did Ramos and Campean make mistakes? Maybe. Should they have been punished and reprimanded for them? Maybe. Should they have been charged with a crime? Absolutely not. By doing so, the Justice Department has demoralized our Nation's defenders on our southern border.

These are the facts. These are the facts that have engaged the public, causing Americans to wonder what in God's name is going on with our government, with our President. What is their President thinking? How could our President be as mean-spirited and arrogant as to not hear the pleas of so many citizens and to hear the pleas for mercy from the families of Ramos and Campean.

Yes, there is a hidden agenda here. Powerful economic interests want cheap labor. They want an open border. They want illegals who work cheap and who will depress the wages of working Americans, but the out-of-control flow of illegal immigrants is a nightmare at this moment for the American people.

This administration and past administrations and policy-makers and big corporate interests in Washington are so far out of touch and do not understand the reality of what is going on with this issue, and they do not care about the suffering of the American people. These elites, they do not care that illegal immigrants are pulling down the quality of our health care, shutting down emergency rooms. They do not care that they are undermining the quality of education by overcrowding our classrooms. They do not care that they are driving down the wages of middle class working people. They do not care if our criminal justice system is being stretched to the breaking point, that American citizens are now being victimized and murder and raped and robbed by criminal illegal aliens every day.

The only heroes in this entire system on which ordinary Americans depend are those in the thin green line of the border patrol. The elites have turned against our heroes, our defenders. They smashed two of them to warn the others what will happen to any patriot who actually is trying to protect our southern border and stop the criminal illegal aliens from entering our country.

This case shows why a guest worker program or amnesty program is not even remotely feasible until we can control our southern border. This is a country that cannot or refuses not to stop these illegal aliens that are pouring into our country. This country's policy has not stopped this invasion of our country, and if we do not do this and we do not support those who are protecting us in our southern border, there will be a price to pay.

On 9/11 we suffered a huge loss when people flew airplanes into buildings, but when it is fully understood, and I am sure the message has gone out not just to our border patrol agents but to the drug dealers and the terrorists throughout the world about what the situation is on our southern border, we could end up with a catastrophe in the making. We need to protect our southern border. We need to protect it because that is the protection that we can give to our communities, to our families.

Those border patrol agents, that thin green line of individuals who risk their lives for us, they are our first and last line of defense between chaos and mayhem and murder and the lives of our families.

I would ask that all of us make sure that we let everyone know, our elected officials and the executive branch, the President as well as Members of Congress, know how strongly we feel that Ramos and Campean should be pardoned and that we should protect our southern border and make sure the United States remains safe and secure.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. KANJORSKI (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for the week of March 19.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of attending a funeral.

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 Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, 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. PAUL, for 5 minutes, March 20, 21, and 22.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today and March 20, 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and March 20, 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, March 20.

Mr. KING of Iowa, for 5 minutes, today and March 20, 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and March 20, 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, March 20.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, March 20.

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

Mr. COHEN, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 5. Joint resolution proclaiming Casimir Pulaski to be an honorary citizen of the United States posthumously; to the Committee on the judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 85th anniversary of the founding of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, a leading association for the 1,300,000 United States citizens of Greek ancestry and Philhellenes in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on March 16, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 1129. To provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of an arterial road in St. Louis County, Missouri.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 20, 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:

884. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the report on Measuring Stability and Security in Iraq pursuant to Section 9010 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2006, Pub. L. 109-289; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

885. A letter from the Chief, Federal Duck Stamp Office, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Contest Regulations (RIN: 1018-AU94) received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

886. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfers [Docket No. 051104293 5344-02; I.D. 121806B] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

887. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery Quota Transfers [Docket No. 051104293 5344-02; I.D. 121806B] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

888. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Arrowtooth Flounder and Flathead Sole in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 060216045-6045-01; I.D. 122006D] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

889. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 060216045-6045-01; I.D. 02010F] received February 28, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

890. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Tilefish Fishery; Quota Harvested for Part-time Category [Docket No. 010319075-1217-02; I.D. 121806C] received February 27, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

891. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting the Board's First Quarterly Report on the Status of Significant Unresolved Issues with the Department of Energy's Design and Construction Projects, pursuant to Public Law 109-702, section 3201; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations.

892. A letter from the Chairman, Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation, transmitting the FY 2006 Annual Report of the Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation, pursuant to Public Law 102-281, section 429(b) (106 Stat. 145); jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Science and Technology.

893. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a report on the proposed fiscal year 2008 budget; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture, Oversight and Government Reform, and Appropriations.

894. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a copy of a draft bill entitled, ''Federal Railroad Safety Accountability and Improvement Act''; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Government Reform, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary.

895. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a copy of a draft bill entitled, ''The Next Generation Air Transportation System Financing Reform Act of 2007''; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Government Reform, the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Science and Technology, and Natural Resources.

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:

[Filed on March 19, 2007]

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1433. A bill to provide for the treatment of the District of Columbia as a Congressional district for purposes of representation in the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110–52 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 254. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1227) to assist in the provision of affordable housing to low-income families affected by Hurricane Katrina (Rept. 110–53). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 1559. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from income taxation all compensation received for active service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1560. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to fund breakthroughs in Alzheimer's disease research while providing more help to caregivers and increasing public education about prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 1561. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve drug safety and oversight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 1562. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and expand certain rules with respect to housing in the GO Zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 1563. A bill to amend part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a minimum payment rate by Medicare

Advantage organizations for services furnished by a critical access hospital and a rural health clinic under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 1564. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide additional protection to estuaries of national significance; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 1565. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit the conversion of leadership PAC funds to personal use; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WATT, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. WATSON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 1566. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Stevie Wonder, in recognition of his ground-breaking musical achievements, activism, and contributions to the music industry; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 1567. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide increased assistance for the prevention, treatment, and control of tuberculosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. KNOLLENBERG:

H.R. 1568. A bill to establish the Henry Ford Scholarship program to provide scholarships to high-achieving students to pursue undergraduate degrees in mathematics, science, engineering, and health-related fields; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MCHUGH:

H.R. 1569. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to suspend the excise tax on highway motor fuels when average United States retail gasoline prices exceed $2.75 per gallon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 1570. A bill to provide compensation for certain World War II veterans who survived the Bataan Death March and were held as prisoners of war by the Japanese; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 1571. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate discriminatory copayment rates for outpatient psychiatric services under the Medicare Program; 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. NORTON:

H.R. 1572. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the discriminatory treatment of the District of Columbia under the provisions of law commonly referred to as the ''Hatch Act''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself and Mr. INSLEE):

H.R. 1573. A bill to modify the boundary of the Minidoka Internment National Monument, to establish the Minidoka National Historic Site, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and improvements of the Gooding Division of the Minidoka Project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1574. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to preserve State authority to ensure the security of chemical facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 1575. A bill to reaffirm and clarify the Federal relationship of the Burt Lake Band as a distinct federally recognized Indian Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey):

H.R. 1576. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HODES

H. Res. 253. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BOYD of Florida, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H. Res. 255. A resolution congratulating the Florida A&M University ''Marching 100'' Band for all of its accomplishments, including its performance in the Super Bowl XLI halftime show; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. SHULER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 39: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 82: Mr. HELLER, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. SPACE.

H.R. 140: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 146: Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 172: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 196: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 197: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 201: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 255: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 271: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 303: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 327: Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. WU, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SPACE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BUYER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 423: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 493: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 526: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 545: Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 551: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 553: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H.R. 583: Mr. FARR, Mr. HINCHEY, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 592: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 606: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 612: Mr. HARE and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 634: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 643: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 658: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. HELLER.

H.R. 661: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 695: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 734: Mr. KIND and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 748: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 760: Mr. WOLF and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 790: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 797: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. HARE, Mr. BUYER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 840: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 854: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

H.R. 947: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 969: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 970: Mr. GORDON and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 971: Mr. HAYES, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FARR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. CASTOR, and Ms. HERSETH.

H.R. 1034: Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 1043: Mr. HINCHEY and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.

H.R. 1073: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MCNRNEY, Mr. RANGEL, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1076: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 1091: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 1108: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 1119: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 1125: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 1134: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1144: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1147: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1148: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1153: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1222: Mr. ALLEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KIND, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 1223: Mr. ALLEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FARR, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. HOOLEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 1225: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 1228: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1232: Mr. SOUDER and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1261: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1268: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 1284: Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. BUYER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SPACE, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 1303: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1304: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1306: Mr. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 1307: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1314: Mr. SHULER.

H.R. 1322: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1330: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1363: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1384: Mr. FARR, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 1395: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 1400: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. FERGUSON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. BOREN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. HOLT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WELLER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BONNER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 1413: Ms. CLARKE and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 1430: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1433: Ms. WATERS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 1439: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1441: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 1448: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1457: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 1465: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1497: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1498: Mr. PETRI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. HOLT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 1505: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 1532: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1538: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. REYES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 1542: Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BACA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1551: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. BALDWIN.

H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. FORTUÑO.

H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. PAYNE.

H. Con. Res. 66: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. WEXLER.

H. Con. Res. 71: Mr. FORBES, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H. Con. Res. 75: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Con. Res. 84: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H. Con. Res. 92: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 68: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 118: Mr. BAKER and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H. Res. 158: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 226: Ms. CARSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Res. 227: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 233: Mr. HOLT and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H. Res. 240: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, or a designee, to H.R. 1227, the Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act of 2007, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits, as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 19, 2007 No. 47

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable MARK L. PRYOR, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Lord, You have promised to work for the good of those who love You. Work in the lives of our lawmakers, strengthening them for every problem, trial, and temptation they face. Open their eyes to see Your hand at work even in adversity and keep them faithful to You.

Lord, may their lives become models of godly living as You empower them to live worthy of Your Name. Help them to be quick to hear, slow to speak, and slow to become angry. Be their refuge and strength, an ever present help in trouble. Empower them to maintain justice and to constantly do what is right. Teach them Your ways and give them Your peace.

We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable MARK L. PRYOR 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 19, 2007.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MARK L. PRYOR, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PRYOR thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

FIRING OF U.S. ATTORNEYS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in today's Congressional Weekly, a respected publication we get back there, there is a column on the last page by Craig Crawford which I think is quite illuminating. It is entitled ''The Firing Squad Backfires.''

The fingerprints of the President's top advisers are all over the prosecutors' firing scandal, which means trouble for Bush.

Here is the first sentence:

Of all the scandals that increasingly bedevil George W. Bush's Presidency, none has more direct ties to the President than the flap over firing Federal prosecutors.

I rise today to express my strong support of S. 214, Senator FEINSTEIN's legislation to strengthen the independence of U.S. attorneys. There is growing evidence that the Bush administration fired Federal prosecutors for improper partisan reasons. This legislation is needed to protect the integrity of the Federal criminal justice system and the autonomy of the chief Federal prosecutors across the country.

The U.S. attorney scandal is another example of the arrogance of power. As Lord Acton said, power tends to corrupt, and absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely. For too long, the Bush administration—shielded from oversight by a Republican-dominated Congress—enjoyed absolute power, and they abused it.

After all, this was a President who won two elections by the barest of margins, first by the Supreme Court. Yet after 9/11, instead of uniting the country, he has chosen to push the envelope of his authority. On everything from the runup to the war in Iraq, to the plan to destroy Social Security, to the use of warrantless wiretapping, this administration has governed without compromise.

The political purge of U.S. attorneys is only the latest example of this President's unhealthy disregard for checks and balances. Speedy passage of this bill is only the first step the Senate must take to deal with the administration's dangerous power grab.

We need to get to the bottom of this scandal to find out why these U.S. attorneys were fired. We need to find out whether the Attorney General and his deputies testified truthfully when they first explained the firings to Congress and the American people.

Federal prosecutors are enormously powerful individuals. They are the embodiment of Federal criminal law. They make life-and-death decisions about who to prosecute and who should receive leniency. Their discretion is largely unreviewable. They must be permitted to carry out their solemn duties without any political interference.

No one disputes the authority of the President to name U.S. attorneys at the beginning of his term, subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. But it is unprecedented that U.S. attorneys be terminated in the middle of a Presidential term without proper cause. It is unacceptable for U.S. attorneys to be replaced because they were perceived by the White House to be insufficiently partisan or too aggressive in prosecuting public corruption.

It appears that administration officials took advantage of a provision that they insisted be included in the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

PATRIOT Act reauthorization conference report last year. Now it is becoming clear why they stuck that provision in there. This was a plan they had for some time. That law reversed a longstanding procedure that allowed the chief Federal judge in the Federal district court to appoint a temporary replacement while the permanent nominee undergoes Senate confirmation. The Feinstein bill simply restores the pre-PATRIOT Act procedure.

Conflicting testimony and recently released e-mails strongly suggest the American people are not getting from the Bush administration the full story about this scandal.

In the State of Nevada, as an example, Daniel Bogden, a highly respected career prosecutor, was forced to step down. His chosen vocation in life was to be a Federal prosecutor. He worked as an assistant U.S. attorney for a significant period of time before chosen to be the U.S. attorney by a Republican, JOHN ENSIGN, and by the President, who sent his name to us. We were initially told that Bogden and others were fired for ''performance-related reasons.'' But that explanation proved to be totally bogus. In fact, Dan Bogden's personnel review was glowing. We still don't know why Dan Bogden was fired. What we do know is under the new PATRIOT Act provision, Mr. Bogden could be replaced by someone with no ties to Nevada, and with no input from the Senate. The damage done to Bogden personally is irreparable. He can't work now as assistant U.S. attorney. That is part of the process. That is too bad. He is a fine man whose reputation has been besmirched.

Meanwhile, we learned of a scheme hatched in the White House to replace all U.S. attorneys. At least one U.S. attorney has stated he was forced to resign because he refused to bend to political pressure regarding ongoing investigations. Others were fired under circumstances that raise the same question. In the State of Arkansas, the U.S. attorney was fired and replaced by one of Karl Rove's underlings.

The Attorney General and his deputies told Congress these firings were not politically motivated. But according to newly released e-mails, White House political operatives such as Mr. Rove were involved in the decision-making. Kyl Sampson, who eventually became Chief of Staff to Attorney General Gonzales, wrote an e-mail that distinguished between those U.S. attorneys who were ''loyal Bushies'' and those who were not. Dan Bogden and other U.S. attorneys who were fired last December were not ''loyal Bushies.''

What I am worried about—and it hasn't come out yet—is what about those who were loyal Bushies? Were these people prosecuting people because of the political involvement of the White House? Perhaps so.

The real question is whether being a ''loyal Bushie'' meant letting partisan consideration poison law enforcement decisions. Do prosecutors who are ''loyal Bushies'' go easy on Republican corruption? Do they bring cases against Democrats without legal justification? The actions of the Bush administration call into question every decision by Federal prosecutors in corruption cases across the country.

I applaud the efforts of Senator FEINSTEIN, who wrote this legislation and spoke about it early on. I also applaud the efforts of Senators SCHUMER and LEAHY, as well as colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are committed to getting the truth in this matter. I strongly urge the Senate to pass this piece of legislation. Simply put, we need to begin to keep politics out of the Federal criminal justice system, which is the way it has always been.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today, following the remarks of the leaders, the Senate will immediately proceed to S. 214, the U.S. attorneys legislation. Last week, we were able to agree to a unanimous consent that will govern consideration of this bill.

There will be no rollcall votes today. We will, however, have three votes beginning at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow morning. These votes will be with respect to amendments to the U.S. attorneys bill and then passage of the bill.

Following the recess for the party conferences on Tuesday, the Senate will begin to consider the concurrent budget resolution, which was reported by the Budget Committee to the Senate floor last Thursday.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

PRESERVING UNITED STATES ATTORNEY INDEPENDENCE ACT OF 2007

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 214.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 214) to amend chapter 35 of title 28, United States Code, to preserve the independence of the United States Attorneys.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, as follows:

(The part of the bill intended to be stricken is shown in boldface brackets and the part of the bill intended to be inserted is shown in italic.)

S. 214

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 ''Preserving United States Attorney Independence Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. VACANCIES.

[Section 546 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 546. Vacancies

''The United States district court for a district in which the office of the United States attorney is vacant may appoint a United States attorney to serve until that vacancy is filled. The order of appointment by the court shall be filed with the clerk of the court.''.**]**

Section 546 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) A person appointed as United States attorney under this section may serve until the earlier of—

''(1) the qualification of a United States attorney for such district appointed by the President under section 541 of this title; or

''(2) the expiration of 120 days after appointment by the Attorney General under this section.

''(d) If an appointment expires under subsection (c)(2), the district court for such district may appoint a United States attorney to serve until the vacancy is filled. The order of appointment by the court shall be filed with the clerk of the court.''.

SEC. 3. APPLICABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person serving as a United States attorney on the day before the date of enactment of this Act who was appointed under section 546 of title 28, United States Code, may serve until the earlier of—

(A) the qualification of a United States attorney for such district appointed by the President under section 541 of that title; or

(B) 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) EXPIRED APPOINTMENTS.—If an appointment expires under paragraph (1), the district court for that district may appoint a United States attorney for that district under section 546(d) of title 28, United States Code, as added by this Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the committee-reported amendment is agreed to and the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of S. 214, the bill the leader just referred to. This is a bill that simply reinstates the Senate's role in the confirmation process of U.S. attorneys. It is a bill I introduced with Senator LEAHY on January 9, 2007, days after I first learned in early December that officials from main Justice called a handful of U.S. attorneys from around the country and forced them to resign their positions without cause.

At that time, I had very little information and was unaware of exactly what had occurred and why. As I looked into it, I learned that in March of 2006, the PATRIOT Act was reauthorized and a change was made in the law. It was made in conference without Democratic Senators present. To the best of my knowledge, it was made without the knowledge of any Senator, Republican or Democrat. It is my understanding this was a request from the Justice Department that was presented by Will Moschella to the staff of the Judiciary Committee and, without the knowledge of Senators, was put into the bill. It then gave the President the authority essentially to appoint a U.S. attorney without confirmation for the remainder of his term.

The bill, S. 214, that is before the Senate today simply returns the law the way it was before this action took place in March of 2006.

Today, just a little more than 2 months after I first learned about this situation, additional information has come to light. But rather than alleviating the concerns and answering questions, we are now faced with new and more serious allegations. In fact, the big question looming over this debate is whether the Attorney General and others in the Bush administration have misled the Congress and the public. If true, this is very serious.

There are also allegations that the firings were done because the Department of Justice and the White House were both unhappy with some of the U.S. attorneys' handling of public corruption cases. If true this, too, is very serious.

We now know that at least eight U.S. attorneys were forced from office, and that despite shifting rationales for why, it has become clear that politics has, in fact, played some role.

Last week, we learned that the White House was involved in this process and that discussions took place with such prominent figures as Presidential adviser Karl Rove and former White House Counsel Harriet Miers. We also learned last week that these discussions began well over 2 years ago, almost immediately following the 2004 election, and it appears from recently released e-mails that Attorney General Gonzales was personally consulted, even while he was still serving as White House Counsel.

This information also shed new light on who was being targeted for firing and why. It is this last point—why some were targeted—that has served to raise more questions and more significant concerns. We have learned that as many as six of the eight U.S. attorneys who were involved with public corruption cases. While we don't know what role this played in their selection, it is an unavoidable fact that raises serious questions.

Today, as the Senate begins the debate on the Preserving United States Attorney Independence Act, I would like to discuss some of what we have learned in greater detail and some of the reasons this bill is so necessary.

I believe it is important to look at how interim U.S. attorneys have been appointed over the years. There appears to be an assumption by the Bush administration that the Attorney General should have an exclusive authority to appoint interim U.S. attorneys. But, in fact, history paints a much different picture.

When first looking into this issue, I found that the statutes had given the courts the authority to appoint an interim U.S. attorney and that this dated back as far as the Civil War. Specifically, the authority was first vested with the circuit courts in March of 1863. Then, in 1898, a House of Representatives report explained that while Congress believed it was important to have the courts appoint an interim U.S. attorney, there was a problem relying on circuit courts ''since the circuit justice is not always to be found in the circuit and time is wasted in ascertaining his whereabouts.'' Therefore, at that time, the interim appointment authority was switched to the district courts; that is, in 1898 it was switched to the district courts. Thus, for almost 100 years, the district courts were in charge of appointing interim U.S. attorneys, and they did so with virtually no problems.

This structure was left undisturbed until 1986 when the statute was changed during the Reagan administration. In a bill that was introduced by Senator Strom Thurmond, the statute was changed to give the appointment authority to the Attorney General, but even then it was restricted and the Attorney General had a 120-day time limit. After that time, if a nominee was not confirmed, the district courts would appoint an interim U.S. attorney. The adoption of this language was part of a larger package that was billed as technical amendments to criminal law, and thus there was no recorded debate in either the House or the Senate and both Chambers passed the bill by voice vote.

Then, 20 years later, in March 2006—again without much debate and again as a part of a larger package—a statutory change was inserted into the PATRIOT Act reauthorization. This time, the Executive's power was expanded even further, giving the Attorney General the authority to appoint an interim replacement indefinitely and without Senate confirmation.

Unfortunately, not 1 year after securing this new authority, abuses have come to light. Almost immediately after I first spoke about what I had learned in January, the Attorney General called me to tell me that I had my facts wrong. However, he also sent up his staff to confirm that ''less than 10'' U.S. attorneys had been asked to resign on December 7, 2006.

Despite this, the Attorney General adamantly denied politics had any role in the process. In fact, in an interview with an Associated Press reporter on January 16, 2007, the Attorney General was asked about the charges of political motivation, and he responded:

> Nothing could be further from the truth.

He further stated in response to your comment, Mr. President, that the Department tried to avoid Senate confirmation to reward political allies:

> We in no way politicized these decisions.

Two days later, the Attorney General reiterated this position when he came before the Senate Judiciary Committee on January 18 of this year and said:

> I would never, ever make a change in the United States attorney position for political reasons.

That is a categorical and definitive monosyllabic statement. However, the Department had to backtrack when it became evident that the former U.S. attorney from your State, Mr. President, Arkansas, Bud Cummins, was simply replaced in order to make room for Tim Griffin, who had served as Karl Rove's special assistant and had been in charge of opposition research against Democratic candidates for the Republican National Committee.

Less than a month later, the Deputy Attorney General confirmed this fact when he testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee on February 7, 2007. At that time, he said:

> The fact is there was a change made [in Arkansas] that was not connected, as we said, to the performance of the incumbent, but more related to the opportunity to provide a fresh start with a new person in that position.

Deputy Attorney General McNulty, however, went on to say that all the others who were fired were fired for ''performance-related reasons.'' But this, too, was not the final explanation. The Department next tried to justify the firings by arguing that the U.S. attorneys were let go because there were ''policy disagreements.'' Then the Attorney General said that these U.S. attorneys had ''lost [his] confidence.'' So there are three different reasons so far. Now, most recently, the explanation has been that the Department thought it ''could do better''—the fourth explanation.

These explanations are as slippery as they are misleading. Rather, what documents and e-mails demonstrate is that none of these reasons was the deciding factor that led some U.S. attorneys to be targeted for firing. Instead, it appears these individuals lost their jobs because a number of Department of Justice officials and possibly—we don't know but possibly—White House officials did not judge them to be sufficiently loyal or did not like the cases they were prosecuting or simply wanted to put in new, politically connected, young lawyers. It appears this way because contained in the documents that were released last week is an outline of the Department of Justice's plan for how to determine who should be let go and who should stay.

The first step of that plan was to create a new rating system to evaluate all

93 U.S. attorneys. This was to be separate from the independent performance reports, called EARS reports. Those reports routinely occurred and objectively examined each U.S. Attorney's Office by evaluating their prosecution caseloads, their management, their willingness to follow Department priorities, and their ability to work cooperatively with the FBI, with the DEA, and with other client agencies.

This rating system was developed back in February of 2005, and one of the primary factors to be considered was loyalty to the administration.

One e-mail describing the ratings stated:

> Recommended retaining strong U.S. attorneys who have produced, managed well, and exhibited loyalty to the President and Attorney General. Recommended removing weak U.S. attorneys who have been ineffectual managers and prosecutors, chafe against administration initiatives.

Under this system, two of the eight fired U.S. attorneys received strong evaluations and recommended retaining while three received recommended removing.

One of the U.S. attorneys who received a recommended removing rating was Carol Lam from the Southern District of California. She received this low rating despite her many accomplishments and despite her positive performance evaluations. I am familiar with Carol Lam's career because she served in San Diego. In that position, she has taken on some of the biggest cases and really made a positive impact on the community she has served. But that is not just my opinion. Leaders throughout San Diego have sung her praises. Let me give a few examples.

Dan Dzwilewski, head of the FBI office in San Diego:

> Carol has an excellent reputation and has done an excellent job given her limited resources.

Then, when asked whether she had given proper attention to gun cases, he said:

> What do you expect her to do? Let corruption exist?

Adele Fasano, the San Diego Director of Field Operations, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, said:

> [We have] enjoyed a strong, collaborative relationship with the U.S. Attorney's Office to combat smuggling activity through the ports of entry.

City attorney for San Diego, Michael Aguirre, said:

> [Carol Lam] has been by far the most outstanding U.S. Attorney we've ever had . . . she's won a national reputation as one of the top prosecutors in the country.

This is the city attorney.

Michael Unzueta, Special Agent in Charge, Immigration and Customs Enforcement:

> Carol Lam is truly an example of a dedicated public servant and a law enforcement professional. We will miss her leadership.

John Cooper, Special Agent in Charge, Naval Criminal Investigative Service:

> The departure of Ms. Lam will be a great loss . . . Ms. Lam is the consummate law enforcement executive who leads by example.

And Alan Poleszak, Acting Special Agent in Charge, Drug Enforcement Agency:

> The on-going prosecution of [the] Javier Arellano Felix drug trafficking organization is both historic and noteworthy . . . [Ms. Lam's] commitment to Federal law enforcement in this judicial district, county, and city, will be missed.

We should take note of the fact that the Arellano Felix organization is one of the largest and most dangerous Mexican drug cartels known. They operate out of Tijuana. They have killed hundreds of people. They have murdered Mexican DAs, they have murdered Mexican judges, and they are a blight. This U.S. attorney took them on. I will tell my colleagues more about that in a moment. The reason Carol Lam was well respected is because she worked hard and she took on the tough fights. She has had success after success. Let me give some examples.

In September of 2005, the president of the San Diego chapter of Hell's Angels pled guilty to conspiracy to commit racketeering. Guy Russell Castiglione admitted he conspired to kill members of a rival motorcycle gang, the Mongols, to sell methamphetamine. In December 2005, Daymond Buchanan, member of Hell's Angels, was sentenced to 92 months in Federal prison for participating in a pattern of racketeering as well as inflicting serious bodily injury upon one victim. At that time, Ms. Lam announced:

> With the president, sergeant at arms, secretary, treasurer, and six other members of the Hell's Angels convicted of racketeering charges and facing long prison sentences, the San Diego chapter of the Hell's Angels has been effectively shut down for the foreseeable future.

If that isn't enough, in September of 2006, Jose Ernesto Beltran-Quinonez, a Mexican national, pled guilty to making false statements about weapons of mass destruction. Mr. Quinonez was sentenced to 3 years in Federal prison for making up a story about Chinese terrorists sneaking into the United States with a nuclear warhead. The hoax prompted a massive investigation, Federal warnings, discussions at one of President Bush's security briefings, and a nationwide hunt for the group of Chinese supposedly plotting the attack.

In December 2006 Mel Kay, of Golden State Fence Company, and Michael McLaughlin pled guilty to felony charges of hiring illegal immigrants and agreed to pay fines of $200,000 and $100,000 respectively. The company, which built much of the fence near Otay Mesa, agreed separately to pay $5 million on a misdemeanor count, one of the largest fines ever imposed on a company for an immigration violation.

Was Carol Lam praised for this work? No, she was sent packing without an explanation. Those were not her only cases.

She gained a national reputation for her work on public corruption cases. I think it is important to note that public corruption is the FBI's second highest priority after terrorism-related investigations. Now, I didn't know this, but the Judiciary Committee had an oversight hearing of the FBI on December 6, 2006, where the Director, Bob Mueller, came before us and he mentioned what their priorities were, and he said: Terrorism first, and then public corruption second, and crime was way down on the list.

As a matter of fact, I found it rather startling, and I questioned him about that. He said, with some emphasis, those are our priorities, and we believe if we don't do public corruption, nobody else will. So the FBI has as its second highest priority public corruption. The FBI is going to be out there putting together cases. Who prosecutes these cases? U.S. attorneys. The FBI's second highest priority, and Carol Lam rose to this challenge.

In March of 2004, her office convicted Steven Mark Lash, the former chief financial officer of FPA Medical Management, for his role in defrauding shareholders and lenders of FPA. The collapse of the company left more than 1,600 doctors being owed more than $60 million and patients reporting they were unable to obtain medical care because this company had ceased paying providers.

In January of 2005, Mark Anthony Kolowich, owner of World Express Rx, pled guilty to conspiracy to sell counterfeit pharmaceuticals, conspiracy to commit mail fraud and smuggle pharmaceuticals, and conspiracy to launder money. Mr. Kolowich had run an Internet pharmacy Web site where customers could order prescription drugs without a valid prescription. The judge called him the kingpin and architect of an illicit pharmaceutical ring that recruited many others to smuggle drugs across the United States-Mexico border at San Ysidro.

Another case. In July 2005, Mrs. Lam brought a case against San Diego councilman Ralph Inzunza and Las Vegas lobbyist Lance Malone. They were convicted on multiple counts of extortion, wire fraud conspiracy and wire fraud and were accused of trading money for efforts to repeal a law.

Then, in her most well-known case, in November of 2005, Ms. Lam secured a guilty plea from former Representative Randy ''Duke'' Cunningham for taking more than $2 million in bribes in a criminal conspiracy case involving at least three defense contractors after he accepted cash and gifts and then tried to influence the Defense Department on behalf of donors. He also pled guilty to a separate tax evasion violation for failing to disclose income in 2004.

Now, here is where it gets interesting. Finally, 2 days before she left office, that would be around February 13, Carol Lam announced indictments of Kyle ''Dusty'' Foggo, a former top officer of the Central Intelligence

Agency, and Brent Wilkes, a defense contractor accused of bribing Duke Cunningham and the prime benefactor of secret CIA contracts. It is this latest incident, involving the ongoing investigations stemming from the Cunningham case, that has raised the most significant concerns about Carol Lam's removal.

When I first came to the floor in January, I mentioned rumors were circulating around California that Carol Lam was pushed out because of her efforts in the Duke Cunningham case and subsequent investigations. I have tried to be very careful about talking about these allegations because they are so serious and because, at the time, they were based on mere speculation.

Despite recent materials coming to light, I want to continue to be very careful in talking about these allegations. At the same time, I must say that today there are even more questions to be answered regarding what role public corruption cases played in the administration's decisions about which U.S. attorneys to fire. We have now learned that six of the eight fired U.S. attorneys were involved in public corruption cases.

The Washington Post noted this, I think, very well, as I will point out here on this chart.

David Iglesias, New Mexico—oversaw probes of State Democrats and alleges two Republican lawmakers pressured him about the case. He was respected by the Judiciary agencies and staff, complied with Department priorities.

Daniel Bogden, Nevada—overall evaluation was very positive. Notable cases, opened a probe related to Nevada Governor Jim Gibbons, former Member of Congress.

Paul Charlton, Arizona—opened preliminary probes of Representatives Jim Kolbe and Rick Renzi before November election. Well respected, established goals that were appropriate to meet the priorities of the Department.

These are quotes from the official performance reports. I am not making them up, and I am not taking them from any individual. These are 27 people who go into an office and evaluate the performance of a U.S. attorney. What did they say about notable cases?

Bud Cummins, Eastern Arkansas—Cummins was very competent, highly regarded.

That was his performance review. He conducted a probe related to Missouri Governor Roy Blunt, which he later closed without charges.

There is Carol Lam, Southern California, whom I have already mentioned.

John McKay, Western Washington—here is the job performance: effective, well regarded, capable leader, established strategic goals that were appropriate. Here is the case: Declined to intervene in disputed gubernatorial election, angry GOP.

Those are the six. In Carol Lam's case, these allegations have become even more troubling.

Following the conviction of Duke Cunningham, in April 2006, Federal prosecutors in Carol Lam's office began investigating whether Brent Wilkes, a defense contractor, and Kyle ''Dusty'' Foggo, the third highest ranking official at the CIA, and others were involved in bribery and corruption. Throughout the first week of May 2006, information began to surface in the press regarding this ongoing investigation. Then, on May 10, 2006, Carol Lam quietly sent an urgent notice to officials at Main Justice to inform the Deputy Attorney General and the Attorney General she was about to execute search warrants on May 12—that is 2 days later—to search the home and CIA office of Dusty Foggo. The very next day, after she sent this internal notice, Department of Justice staff sent an e-mail to the White House that said this:

> Please call me to discuss the following: . . . The real problem we have right now with Carol Lam that leads me to conclude that we should have somebody ready to be nominated on 11/18, the day her 4-year term expires.

The real problem we have right now with Carol Lam. And that is the day after she notified Main Justice that she was executing two search warrants.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete e-mail be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From: Sampson, Kyle.
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2006 11:36 AM.
To: 'William_K._Kelley@who.eop.gov'.
Subject: FW: Removal and Replacement of U.S. Attorneys Whose 4-year Terms Have Expired.
Sensitivity: Confidential.

Per-your inquiry yesterday after JSC, this is the e-mail I sent to Dabney last month at Harriet's request. Please call me at your convenience to discuss the following:

———

Tim Griffin for E.D. Ark.; and

The real problem we have right now with Carol Lam that leads me to conclude that we should have someone ready to be nominated on 11/18, the day her 4-year term expires.

———

From: Sampson, Kyle.
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2006 9:31 AM.
To: 'Dabney_Friedrich@who.eop.gov'.
Subject: RE: Removal and Replacement of U.S. Attorneys Whose 4-year Terms Have Expired.
Sensitivity: Confidential.

Also, I would note that two others on my original list already have left office. They are:

———and———

———

From: Sampson, Kyle.
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2006 9:30 AM.
To: 'Dabney_Friedrich@who.eop.gov'.
Subject: Removal and Replacement of U.S. Attorneys Whose 4-year Terms Have Expired.
Sensitivity: Confidential.

Dabney, DOJ recommends that the White House consider removing and replacing the following U.S. Attorneys upon the expiration of their 4-year terms:

Margaret M. Chiara, W.D. Mich., term expired 11/2/2005;

Harry E. ''Bud'' Cummins III, E.D. Ark., term expired 1/9/2006; and

Carol C. Lam, S.D. Cal., term expires 11/18/2006.

We also should similarly seek to remove and replace:

———

Call me if you have any questions. If you pushed me, I'd have 3–5 additional names that the White House might want to consider.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, there could be a straightforward explanation for this e-mail that has nothing to do with public corruption cases Carol Lam was pursuing. However, the timing looks really suspicious and it raises serious questions, questions that need to be answered. Because if any U.S. attorney were removed because of a public corruption investigation or prosecution, this could very well comprise obstruction of justice.

I believe that irrespective of the intent behind the decision to fire Carol Lam and the other U.S. attorneys working on public corruption cases, such a removal sends a message to all other Federal prosecutors, whether intended or not, that creates a chilling effect. Because of this, there should have been very careful consideration given to what steps should have been taken to ensure it was clear there was good reason to remove the prosecutor, that the office itself had a comprehensive plan in place to ensure no cases or investigations would be harmed or slowed in any way and that ongoing public corruption cases had absolutely nothing to do with the removal of the U.S. attorney.

However, in the case of Carol Lam and in the case of five other U.S. attorneys, the administration failed to meet even these bare minimum standards. I strongly believe that removal of a United States attorney who is involved in an ongoing public corruption case should occur only—only if there is a very good reason, and not simply ''we could do better.''

Because of the public corruption cases and allegations that individuals were removed to put in politically connected young lawyers, another issue that must be examined is the appearance of politics impacting how U.S. attorneys are treated and what that means for the prosecution of justice.

As was reported in the McClatchy newspapers, former Federal prosecutors and defense lawyers have said:

> Allegations of political interference could undermine the reputation of U.S. attorneys as impartial enforcers of the law.

And, yes, I really agree with that.

One former Federal prosecutor said:

> One of the things the Department has stood for was being apolitical. Sure, politics does get involved in the appointment process, but this is just nuts.

He is right. Yes, appointees are selected and nominated by the party in power. But once an individual U.S. attorney takes that oath of office, he or she must be independent, objective, and must be free to pursue justice wherever the facts lead.

Bruce Fein, the former Associate Deputy Attorney General for the

Reagan administration, said in an interview last week:

[W]e expect the rule of law to be administered evenhandedly. That's what ties our country together and gives legitimacy to decisions by the court and to the government itself. When it's obvious that the prosecution function is being manipulated for political purposes, that undermines the entire rule of law.

In defending its actions, administration officials and others have tried to argue that both Presidents Reagan and Clinton fired all 93 U.S. attorneys when they came into office, and that is no different than what occurred in December. Right?

Wrong. The implication of this argument has been that it is not unheard of to fire U.S. attorneys in this manner, and that, at some level, it is commonplace. Right?

Wrong, it is not commonplace. In fact, the Department of Justice and the White House knew that this was not commonplace and that comparing its actions to Reagan and Clinton was an inaccurate analogy. A memo, written by Kyl Sampson on January 1, 2006, to the Counsel to the President, clearly stated:

During the Reagan and Clinton Administrations, President Reagan and Clinton did not seek to remove and replace U.S. Attorneys they had appointed, whose four-year terms had expired, but instead permitted such U.S. Attorneys to serve indefinitely under the holdover provision.

That is a memo from the Attorney General's Chief of Staff, Kyle Sampson, again, on January 1, 2006.

So they knew. They knew that just to say President Reagan and President Clinton each formed a new team when they became President couldn't be used as precedent because it was not an accurate precedent.

Despite this, the administration and its defenders have continued to argue that firing U.S. attorneys was ''entirely appropriate'' and that it was justified because executive branch appointees ''serve at the pleasure of the President.'' In fact, this had never been done before. In fact, as far as we have been able to find out so far, and they are still researching it—but the Congressional Research Service has told us that in the past 25 years, only two U.S. attorneys who served less than a full term have been fired.

Interestingly, this talking point about ''serving at the pleasure of the President'' is repeated throughout the documents that have been released as to what the administration should say when asked about the firing of U.S. attorneys. Specifically, it was listed in several versions of a memo that outlined the steps to be taken to execute the plan. This, again, is a memo from the Chief of Staff to the Attorney General:

''Step 3: Prepare to withstand political upheaval.'' We should expect that there will be ''direct and indirect appeals of the Administration's determination to seek these resignations. . . . Recipients of such 'appeals' must respond identically . . . U.S. attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President.''

So those to whom somebody appeals must reinforce this argument: U.S. attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President. That little statement is meant to cover, I am sorry to say, a multitude of sins.

Of course, in the most literal sense, it is true: executive branch employees serve at the pleasure of the President. However, blind adherence and single-minded pursuit of this principle ignores that it is equally true that our Nation's prosecutors must be independent, they must be objective, and they must pursue justice wherever the facts lead.

And it ignores that our country is based on the principle of checks and balances. Of course, in this instance this means that we must return Senate confirmation as a certainty to the law, and this is exactly what we do in S. 214—we simply return the law to what it was before that unknown addition was added to the PATRIOT Act reauthorization without the knowledge of Senators.

Since January when this issue was first raised, the Department of Justice has repeatedly stated publicly that it did not intend to avoid Senate confirmation. For example, before the Judiciary Committee on January 18, 2007, the Attorney General testified that DOJ was ''fully committed to try and find presidentially appointed, Senate confirmed U.S. Attorneys for every position.''

However, in e-mails and memos written by his staff, a strategy was outlined that does not show a commitment to Senate confirmation. For example, on September 13, 2006, 3 months before the firing call on December 7, the Attorney General's Chief of Staff sent an e-mail to Monica Goodling, liaison between the Department of Justice and the White House, suggesting that the Department use the new authority slipped into the PATRIOT Act reauthorization to facilitate firing U.S. attorneys and replacing them with new ones. The e-mail said:

I strongly recommend that as a matter of administration, we utilize the new statutory provisions that authorize the AG to make [U.S. attorney] appointments.

Then, the inference is, by avoiding Senate confirmation, the e-mail goes on:

[W]e can give far less deference to home State Senators and thereby get (1) our preferred person appointed and (2) do it far faster and more efficiently at less political costs to the White House.

This is only one example of discussions among White House and DOJ officials about the benefits of avoiding the Senate, especially when the home State Senators are Democrats.

In another example there is an e-mail chain from December 2006 between the Department of Justice and the White House which discusses how to deal with the opposition of Arkansas' Democratic Senators to the interim appointment of Tim Griffin. I quote:

''I think we should gum this to death.'' . . . The longer we can forestall [the Senators saying they will never support Griffin] the better. We should run out the clock . . . ''all of this should be done in 'good faith,' of course.''

The e-mail went on to say:

Our guy is in there so the status quo is good for us . . . pledge to desire a Senate-confirmed U.S. Attorney; and otherwise hunker down.

That is an e-mail that deserves a lot of questions. In addition, in a November 15, 2006, memo regarding the plan to replace U.S. attorneys, ''Step 2: Senator calls,'' outlines that for my State of California and for Michigan and Washington, the strategy was to have Bill Kelly from the White House call ''the home State 'Bush political lead,' '' since there was no Republican home State Senators.

So while the Justice Department has said: We consulted with home State Senators—that is true only if they were Republican. If they were Democratic home State Senators they were not, in fact, called.

I believe all of this adds up to a very complex and very serious situation that now has even more questions that need to be asked and answered under oath. For example, we need to know who from the White House was involved in these decisions? Was the plan orchestrated by the White House? Who made these determinations about who to fire and who was involved in the loyalty evaluation? What other U.S. attorneys were targeted for dismissal?

We know there were several but their names have been redacted from the documents we have received. We need to know who are they, why were they on the list, and why did they come off the list?

What were the real reasons used to determine who would be fired, since the evaluations don't line up with the EARS reports? What role, if any, did open public corruption cases play in determining who would be fired? What was the Attorney General's role in the process? What did he know and when did he know it? How can he say he didn't know what was going on with the firing of the U.S. attorneys, even though the White House did, and even though there are e-mails showing that he was consulted?

Was the change to the law in March of 2006 done in order to facilitate the wholesale replacement of all or a large number of U.S. attorneys without Senate confirmation? We know that somebody suggested all 93 U.S. attorneys should be replaced, at one point. My question is, was this done to facilitate that?

These are just some of the questions I hope our committee will delve into as the investigation continues.

Finally, in an e-mail that discussed avoiding the Senate confirmation process, the Attorney General's Chief of Staff wrote:

There is some risk that we'll lose the authority [to appoint interim U.S. attorneys indefinitely], but if we don't ever exercise it then what's the point of having it?

Think about that: There is some risk that we will lose the authority to appoint U.S. attorneys indefinitely, but if we don't ever exercise it, then what is the point of having it?

I believe the time has come for the administration to lose that authority. All these unanswered questions and allegations have demonstrated at the very least one real thing: the law must be returned to what it was prior to the reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act, and the bipartisan bill before the Senate would do just that. Through negotiations with Senator SPECTER we are now considering legislation that would give the Attorney General authority to appoint an interim U.S. attorney but only for 120 days. If after that time the President has not sent up a nominee to the Senate and had that nominee confirmed, then the authority to appoint an interim U.S. attorney will fall to the district court.

Given all we have learned in the past few months, I believe this is the least we can do to restore the public's faith in an independent system of justice. This bill will also help prevent any future abuse or appearance of politicization of U.S. attorney positions.

The legislation also makes it clear that the 120-day limitation applies to all the interim U.S. attorneys who are currently in place, including those who are the result of the Department's actions in December. These changes are in line with the way the law used to be and would simply be restoring the proper checks and balances that are needed in our system of government.

I urge my colleagues to oppose all amendments and pass a clean bill.

I have noted the distinguished ranking member of the committee is on the Senate floor. Before I yield, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WEBB). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from California in urging the adoption of the present legislation.

I am a cosponsor of the legislation. I immediately agreed to join Senator FEINSTEIN on this matter when she called to my attention the situation in the Southern District of California in San Diego, which had resulted from the provision which was added in the PATRIOT Act re-authorization. That provision had been added in the PATRIOT Act conference report and had been available for inspection from December 8, 2005, when the conference report was filed in the House, and March 2, 2006, when the report was adopted in the Senate. Though that conference report was available for some 85 days, it was not noted until we saw its application. Then, when the Senator from California called it to my attention, I immediately said there is a problem here and we ought to correct it, and she introduced the bill. I immediately cosponsored it.

There is no doubt there are major problems which we have to confront on the requested resignations of eight U.S. attorneys.

The President has traditionally had the authority to replace U.S. attorneys. That has generally been interpreted, to me, that the President may replace U.S. attorneys without giving any reason. But I think implicit in the application of replacement of attorneys is you cannot replace them for a bad reason, you cannot replace because they are seeking to ferret out corrupt politicians, or if they are refusing to yield, or not bringing a case the administration thinks ought to be brought. So those are the parameters. When President Clinton took office in 1993, the President replaced some 93 U.S. attorneys, as a matter of fact—of course, without giving any specific reason—and no one drew any objection to that.

We have a situation with respect to the eight U.S. attorneys who have been asked to resign and caused the current issues as to whether they are being replaced for bad reasons.

The situation with the U.S. attorney for the Southern District of California, Ms. Carol Lam, raised some issues as to whether she was being asked to resign because she was pursuing corruption charges which resulted in the conviction of former Congressman Duke Cunningham and an 8-year jail sentence.

It has been reported, for example, that U.S. Attorney Lam sent a notice to the Department of Justice saying that there would be two search warrants and a criminal investigation of a defense contractor who was linked to former Congressman Duke Cunningham.

It was further reported that on the very next day, D. Kyle Sampson, the Chief of Staff to Attorney General Gonzales, sent an e-mail message to William Kelley in the White House Counsel's Office saying Ms. Lam should be removed as quickly as possible. Now the communique from Mr. Sampson further reportedly asked Mr. Kelley to call Mr. Sampson to discuss:

> The real problem we have right now with [U.S. attorney] Carol Lam, that leads me to conclude we should have someone ready to be nominated on 11/18, the day her 4-year term expires.

Well, the sequence of events raises a question as to whether Ms. Lam was asked to resign because she was hot on the trail of criminal conduct relating to the Cunningham case. We do not know. But that is a question which ought to be inquired into.

It is my view, as I review all of these matters, that there are disputed questions as to whether the eight U.S. attorneys who were asked to resign were doing their job or whether they were not.

There was a very lengthy article in the New York Times yesterday—starts on the first page and continues in the interior of the paper for a substantial part of another page—where there are issues raised as to whether New Mexico's U.S. Attorney, David C. Iglesias was doing his job properly. There were reports that he was not pursuing prosecutions as he should. Those were relayed to officials in Washington. Those officials, in turn, then relayed them to the Department of Justice. I think it appropriate that if there are complaints, they be relayed to the Department of Justice so an evaluation can be made as to whether they are justified or are not justified. But the person who relays those complaints is acting in the normal course of business and I suggest is doing what ought to be done.

The Judiciary Committee is capable of ferreting out all of the conflicting factors, is capable of getting at the facts and making an evaluation. We have a number of members of the Judiciary Committee who are experienced attorneys, and enough have specific experience as former prosecutors to be able to make an expert evaluation, so to speak, as to whether the U.S. attorneys were doing their job properly. That is what we ought to undertake at the present time.

That, of course, can proceed in due course without affecting the legislation which is pending here today.

I think there is no doubt we ought to change the provision of the PATRIOT Act which gave the Attorney General the authority to appoint an interim U.S. attorney until the President had submitted another nominee and they are confirmed by the Senate, to go back to the old system where the Attorney General could appoint for 120 days, on an interim basis, and then after that period of time the replacement U.S. attorney would be appointed by the district court.

What has occurred here raises broader questions as to whether there ought to be some standards set by Congress on circumstances which would warrant terminating a U.S. attorney either by firing or by asking the U.S. attorney to resign. I certainly think there would be general agreement that you should not be able to remove a U.S. attorney either by way of firing or asking to resign if that U.S. attorney is pursuing corruption cases or if the U.S. attorney was appropriately not initiating a prosecution. That is a discretionary judgment.

A prosecuting attorney vested with broad discretion can abuse that discretion, and there is case law to that effect. A prosecuting attorney's discretion is not unlimited. There is comment published in Volume 64 of the Yale Law Journal which goes into that issue in some detail.

The question on my mind is whether we ought to use the occasion of this

legislation and the attendant controversy about the replacement or asking for the resignation of U.S. attorneys to legislate. Congress has the authority to circumscribe, to some extent, the President's authority to remove prosecuting attorneys. The independent counsel statute, for example, provides that the Congress has provided that the independent counsel may be removed by the Attorney General for cause. That is a legitimate exercise of Congress's constitutional authority under article I and does not impinge upon the President's constitutional authority under article II.

With respect to independent commissions, such as the Federal Trade Commission, the Commissioners may be removed, but it has to have a higher level of showing of impropriety—something in the nature of malfeasance or its equivalent. In taking a look at what might be done, there could be a provision that U.S. attorneys may be removed or asked to resign only for cause. But that would impinge upon the President's traditional authority to remove for no reason at all. I have doubts as to whether we ought to go that far, but I believe there is a strong case to be made for limiting the authority of the President to remove for a reason which is a bad reason, such as the ones I have mentioned.

That kind of legislation would call for a listing of a variety of situations which would justify removal: for example, the U.S. attorney could not be removed for pursuing a corruption investigation; the U.S. attorney could not be removed for declining to prosecute in a situation where that was within the justifiable discretion of the U.S. attorney.

This issue has percolated now for some time, and the deeper we get into this issue, the more we think about various aspects which so far have not been examined. My staff and I are looking at the present time at such an amendment. I was informed today that a unanimous consent agreement was entered into on Thursday which will preclude further amendments. On this state of the record, any such amendment would be out of order. But we intend to pursue it to see if we can structure an amendment which would make sense. If we do, there is always the option of asking for unanimous consent that an additional amendment be permitted on this bill under a limited time agreement.

I know the majority leader is anxious to move through this legislation and move ahead to other items on the docket. I mention that possibility because it is a work in process, and we may find it structurally possible to provide such an amendment which would address some of the underlying problems confronting us in the present situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a sequence of events relating to the interim appointment of U.S. attorneys in the PATRIOT Act reauthorization be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEQUENCE OF EVENTS RELATING TO THE INTERIM APPOINTMENT OF U.S. ATTORNEYS IN THE PATRIOT ACT REAUTHORIZATION

The interim US Attorney provision was first raised with staff on November 9, 2005. The provision was discussed at a staff level and was included in the draft PATRIOT Conference report as a separate section and under the title of ''Interim Appointment of US Attorneys'' and was in each of the draft Conference reports circulated by the House Judiciary Committee, which chaired the PATRIOT Conference.

The House filed the Conference Report, H. Rept. 109–333 on December 8, 2005. The Conference Report was agreed to on December 14, 2005 in the House (House Roll no. 627). The Conference Report contained Sec. 502, which was clearly visible in the table of contents of the Report and titled as ''Interim Appointment of US Attorneys''; it was not hidden, but was in plain view for all Members to consider.

Floor Statements on the Conference Report began in the Senate on November 17, 2005 and ran through the Cloture Motion's initial defeat on December 16, 2005 (Senate vote 358) until December 20, 2005. No mention was made of the Interim U.S. Attorney provision in any floor statement during the 24 days the Senate debated the Conference Report in the First Session of the 109th.

The Conference Report was raised in floor speeches in the Senate again starting on January 31, 2006. Debate ran until March 2, 2006 when the Senate adopted the Conference Report (Senate vote 29). No mention was made of the Interim U.S. Attorney provision in any floor statement during the 21 days the Senate debated the Conference Report in the Second Session of the 109th.

In all, the Senate discussed the PATRIOT Conference Report in some form on the Floor for a total of 45 days. No mention was made of the Interim U.S. Attorney provision even though it was not snuck into a managers' package or included as a technical fix, but was instead clearly labeled and provided its own separate section.

Between December 8, 2005, when the Conference Report was filed in the House, and March 2, 2006 when the Report was adopted in the Senate, the Conference Report was open to review for 85 days. During that entire time, the provision was available for all to see.

My staff searched the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the 85 day period in which the Conference Report was under consideration. There was no objection made to Section 502 or the Interim U.S. Attorney provision in either the House or the Senate during that period. The provision was in no way ''slipped'' into the PATRIOT Act Reauthorization.

Indeed, subsequent to the adoption of the PATRIOT Conference Report, the Congress adopted a legislative package to make additional modifications to the PATRIOT Act. No one requested any modification or elimination of the interim US Attorney provision from the Conference Report in that legislation.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I note the presence of my distinguished colleague, Senator LEAHY, and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania.

First, I thank the Senators who began this debate. I have been told a number of family matters changed the ability of some to be here.

Over the last several months, the Judiciary Committee has used hearings, investigation, and oversight to uncover an abuse of power that threatens the independence of U.S. Attorney's Offices around the country and the trust of all Americans in the independence of our Federal law enforcement officials. We have probed the mass firings of U.S. attorneys. We are trying to get to the truth in order to prevent these kinds of abuses from happening again.

So today, the Senate finally begins debate on S. 214; that is, the Preserving United States Attorney Independence Act of 2007. The bill was initially introduced by Senator FEINSTEIN and me on January 9. On January 18 during a hearing on oversight of the Department of Justice, we asked the Attorney General about these firings. We then followed up with two hearings devoted to the matter on February 6 and March 6. I placed the bill on the agenda for the Judiciary Committee's first business meeting on January 25 but action on the measure was delayed until our meeting on February 8. At the time we debated the bill, considered and rejected amendments, and the committee on a bipartisan basis voted 13 to 6 to report favorably the Feinstein-Specter-Leahy substitute.

We have sought Senate consideration of this bill for more than a month now, but Republican objections have prevented that debate and vote. But through the majority leader's persistence, he was ultimately able to obtain consent to proceed to this measure today. I thank all Senators for finally allowing it to go forward.

My friend from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, gave our bill a straightforward title: ''The Preserving United States Attorney Independence Act of 2007.'' We need to close the loophole exploited by the Department of Justice and the White House that facilitated this abuse.

The bill we have before us was initially fought by the Department of Justice when it was in committee. It appears that even after these scandals, there are people there who want to continue to have this loophole that has been so badly misused. But likely because of the public outcry against the administration's attempt to maintain that loophole and the ability to do what no one intended them to do, we

had a meeting in my office on March 8 in which the Attorney General finally said the administration would no longer oppose this bill. So I trust that tomorrow when the Senate votes on this legislation, we will pass it and take a step toward restoring the independence of Federal law enforcement in this country.

Even if we pass the bill, the Judiciary Committee will continue to investigate the firings. We will summon whoever is needed to learn the truth. What we have already learned from the few documents we have seen from the Department of Justice appear to confirm the Attorney General, officials at the Department of Justice, and officials at the White House had previously misled Congress and the American people about the mass firings and the reasons behind them.

The most fundamental problem is that this administration has apparently insisted on corrupting Federal law enforcement by injecting crassly partisan objectives into the selection and evaluation and firing and replacement of top Federal law enforcement officers around our country—our U.S. attorneys.

When you corrupt it at that level, at the prosecutor level, you affect everybody—all the police, all the investigators, all the agents who report to the U.S. Attorney's Office—because if they think the investigations they carry out have to reflect certain partisan politics, then they cannot do their job. Ultimately, it hurts not just the people in law enforcement, it hurts every man and woman in the United States of America.

We have heard the Attorney General and even the President use what William Schneider has called the ''past exonerative'' tense in conceding ''mistakes were made.'' The ''past exonerative'' tense. I remember conjugating my verbs in grade school. We learned about verbs, adjectives, adverbs, everything else. I guess it took this administration to bring up the ''past exonerative'' tense. Sister Mary Gonzaga probably would have wondered what I was saying had I come up with that when I was in school.

Now let's take a look at their use of this ''past exonerative'' tense. Attorney General Gonzales has yet to specify what mistakes he made. So what mistakes were made? Was it a mistake to allow the White House, through the President's top political operative and his White House counsel, to force the firing of a number of high-performing, Bush-appointed U.S. attorneys? Or when he says ''mistakes were made,'' did he mean it was a mistake for the President and his top political operatives to tell the Attorney General and others in the Department about concerns that U.S. attorneys are not pushing fast enough or hard enough to indict Democrats but were pushing too hard and too fast in indicting corrupt Republicans? Was that the past mistake the President and the Attorney General meant? Or when the Attorney General and the President say ''past mistakes were made,'' did they mean it was a mistake to generate, with White House political operatives, a hit list for firing hard-working U.S. attorneys and to ensure that what they call—and these were their words—''loyal Bushies'' are retained? Or when they say ''mistakes were made,'' did they mean it was a mistake to name more ''loyal Bushies'' to replace those U.S. attorneys who have shown the kind of independence they are supposed to show in exercising their law enforcement authority and who have acted without fear or favor based on political party?

Because when a crime is committed, you do not ask whether the victim was a Republican or a Democrat. You ask if a crime was committed. If a crime was committed, you expect the prosecutor to prosecute. You do not expect them to be fired if they step on the toes of either political party.

This is an administration that seeks to justify its unilateralism by an expansive application of what it calls a ''unitary executive theory''—everything comes from the President on down. But do you know what. With all that authority and all that control, when they get caught with their hand in the cookie jar all of a sudden no one knows anything, no one can remember anything, no one did anything, and no one told the President. ''Oh, my goodness gracious, we didn't know this happened until we picked up the papers.'' Obviously, they did not know it happened when they were testifying up here under oath the first time around to tell us what happened.

Instead, ''mistakes were made.'' Is the only ''mistake'' they are now willing to concede their failure to cover up the White House influence over the Justice Department? Is the only ''mistake'' they will admit that they got caught in a series of misleading statements to Congress, the media, and the American people? I still wonder if those in the administration or the Attorney General understand the seriousness of this problem.

Of course, mistakes were made. That is why we are here. It is our oversight duty to discover who made those mistakes and how and why they made them. I have said many times, the Members of the Senate and the Members of the other body should never be rubberstamps. We are elected independently. We respond to the American people. We are supposed to ask questions when something happens.

What we have seen so far corrupts the Federal law enforcement function. It has cast a cloud over all U.S. attorneys. Now every U.S. attorney is under that cloud. People are asking: If they were not fired, if they were kept on, is that because they are ''loyal Bushies''? Does that mean they will only go after crime if it hurts Democrats but not if it hurts Republicans? What an awful signal to send to law enforcement. This is a crippling signal to send to law enforcement.

Those fired have had their reputations rehabilitated to some degree by coming forward as we have publicly examined the facts of their firings. But those circumstances raise questions with respect to those retained and what they had to do to please the White House political operatives in order to keep their jobs. The mass firings have thus served to undermine the confidence of the American people in the Department of Justice and their local U.S. attorneys.

A recent study of Federal investigations of elected officials and candidates shows a political slant in the Bush Justice Department in public corruption cases. The study found that between 2001 and 2006, 79 percent of the elected officials and candidates who have faced a Federal investigation were Democrats and only 18 percent Republicans. It seems their track record is wanting, and they have been caught again with their hand in the cookie jar.

Of course the President has the power to appoint U.S. attorneys. Nobody questions that. What is raising concerns is the apparent abuse of that authority by removing U.S. attorneys for improper reasons. In the same way any employer has the power to hire, we know people cannot be fired because they are Catholic or because of their race or because they are whistleblowers.

The power of employment is not without limit. It can be abused. When it is abused in connection with political influence over Federal law enforcement, the American people and those of us who are entrusted with the power to represent them have a right to be concerned. We need the facts. We do not need more spin. We do not need another cover story. We do not need another ''We will come up to the Hill. We will brief you on this. Let's have a quiet little briefing. We will tell you what is going on.'' And then we pick up the paper 2 days later and find out what they left out.

Oh, I want a briefing, all right. I want a briefing where they stand before us and raise their right hand and swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help them God. Then we will ask them questions; both Democrats and Republicans will. And the American people will be able to determine who is telling the truth.

I made no secret during our confirmation proceedings of my concern whether Mr. Gonzales could serve as an independent Attorney General on behalf of the American people and leave behind his role as counselor to President Bush.

As the Nation's chief Federal law enforcement officer, he must carry out his responsibilities and exercise his awesome authority on behalf of the American people. He has to enforce the law. He has to honor the rule of law. He

must act with the independence necessary to investigate and prosecute wrongdoing without fear or favor.

The political interests of the President cannot be his guiding light. When he said as recently as January 18 at our hearing that the President is his ''principal,'' when he says in an interview he wears two hats—as a member of the President's staff and as head of the Justice Department—then he has forgotten what the Attorney General is.

The President has a lawyer. The President has counsel. It is not the Attorney General. This is not the Attorney General of the President. This is the Attorney General of the United States of America. His clients are the American people and his principles must be devoid of partisan politics. He is not there as the President's loyal counsel. He is there as the Attorney General of the United States of America, for every single one of us. His mission is not to provide legalistic excuses or defenses for unlawful actions of the administration, such as the warrantless wiretapping of Americans or the use of torture and the issuing of signing statements to excuse following the law. He is not the one who should be excusing this kind of outrageous conduct. He should enforce the law. He should ensure that Federal law enforcement is above politics. What kind of signal do we send to our Federal law enforcement agencies if we suggest to them they cannot do their job without checking the political credentials of the people they are investigating?

The President can pick anybody he wants to serve on his White House staff—and he does. But when it comes to the U.S. Department of Justice and to the U.S. attorneys in our home States, Senators have a say and a stake in ensuring fairness and independence to prevent the Federal law enforcement function from untoward political influence. That is why the law and the practice has always been these appointments require Senate confirmation. The advice and consent check on the appointment power is a critical function of the Senate. That is what this administration insisted be eliminated. They wanted to do away with that check and balance. They wanted to do away with the confirmation process. So they had inserted in the reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act a provision to remove limits on the ability of the Attorney General to name an interim U.S. attorney. That is what our bill intends to restore.

We have seen again the effects of letting politics infiltrate the Department and undermine its independence and the independence of its law enforcement function. As we have learned more about these events over the last few months, I was reminded of a dark time some 30 years ago when President Nixon forced the firing of the Watergate prosecutor Archibald Cox. Not since what came to be known as the ''Saturday Night Massacre'' have we witnessed anything of that magnitude. The calls to the U.S. attorneys across the country last December, by which they were forced to resign, were extraordinary.

Unlike during the Watergate scandal, there is no Elliott Richardson or William Ruckelshaus seeking to defend the independence of the Federal prosecutors. Instead, we have a cabal of the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, the Executive Office of U.S. Attorneys in the White House, all apparently collaborating in efforts to sack a number of outstanding U.S. attorneys. Then when it becomes public and when the first time in 6 years the House and Senate actually dare ask questions about what is going on, the administration, amazed they have been questioned about their actions, starts a series of shifting explanations and excuses. Lack of accountability or acknowledgment of the seriousness of this matter makes it all the more troubling.

The Attorney General's initial response at our January 18 hearing when we asked about these matters was to brush aside any suggestion that politics and the appearance of ongoing corruption investigations were factors in the mass firings. But now we know that contrary to what he told us then, these factors did play a role in this troubling project.

Today and tomorrow we can take a step forward by fixing the statutory excess that opened the door to these untoward actions. I commend Senator FEINSTEIN for leading this effort. I commend Senator SPECTER for joining her. We have all cosponsored the substitute to restore the statutory checks that have existed for the last 20 years. It is time to take that first step toward restoring independence by rolling back a change in law that has contributed to this abuse.

There have been no good answers to our questions about why the administration removed U.S. attorneys without having anybody lined up to replace them or why home State Democratic Senators were not consulted in advance. There is no explanation for why there are now 22 out of the 93 districts with acting or interim U.S. attorneys instead of Senate-confirmed U.S. attorneys.

I look at this in light of my own experience. I am very proud of the fact I was a prosecutor. The only thing in my personal office that has my name on it is a plaque from my prosecutor's office presented to me by the police when I left office, and it also has my shield, my badge as a prosecutor. I used to instill in the police and those prosecutors who worked for me: You don't take sides. Nobody is a Democrat or a Republican when crimes are committed. We don't take sides. If you keep emphasizing this and proving it by the way you carry out your office, then police work better, investigators work better, courts work better, the grand juries work better, because they know you are not playing politics. The American public, whoever is within the area the prosecutor represents, feels safer because they know you are not playing favorites. I lived my life that way as a prosecutor and I know many Republicans and Democratic Senators in this Chamber who are former prosecutors did the same.

I am worried that even successfully restoring the law is not going to undo the damage done to the American people's confidence in Federal law enforcement. For that, we need to get to the truth and real accountability. But then I think all of us in both parties now, and no matter who holds the White House 2 years from now, must renew a commitment to insulate Federal law enforcement officers from the corrupting influence of partisan politics and the corrosive influence of White House intrusion into law enforcement activities.

Mr. President, I will have more to say on this later. I see my friend from Arizona who has been waiting patiently, and I yield the floor.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks a letter I wrote to all of my colleagues in the Senate, dated March 19, regarding interviewing U.S. attorneys be added to my statement as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, there has been a lot of discussion over the course of the last couple of hours about the firing of seven U.S. attorneys and a lot of speculation about why that occurred. I suggest it is important to find out the facts and then we can quit speculating and we will know what those facts were.

I wish to change the subject a little bit to what we are going to do about it. Actually, the Judiciary Committee passed a bill which is on the floor and will be amended tomorrow, I hope, and then we will vote on that bill tomorrow. It relates to what was conceived to be at least part of the problem here. The problem was that in the PATRIOT Act, a provision of law relating to appointment of U.S. attorneys was amended to allow the Attorney General to put into office what is called an interim U.S. attorney who would never have to come before the Senate for confirmation. Early on, there was speculation that the reason these seven U.S. attorneys were asked to resign was so the administration could put someone else in their place without going through the regular confirmation process of a nominee by the President. Except for the U.S. attorney in Arkansas, however, there appears to be no evidence that was the case.

In the case of Arizona, for example, it is clear it was not the case. There was no one ready to be appointed as interim U.S. attorney. In fact, Senator MCCAIN and I have recommended an individual to the President for his consideration to be nominated to fill the

vacancy that now exists. Nonetheless, there was concern this statute shouldn't remain on the books, that it shouldn't be that the Attorney General can appoint an interim U.S. attorney who never has to come to the Senate for confirmation.

I think there is a general consensus that that statute should be changed and that the President should nominate people and the Senate should have an opportunity to act on the nomination.

An interesting thing has occurred, however. The legislation which has been proposed doesn't achieve the objective. It doesn't even begin to achieve the objective. So I drafted an amendment which I will be offering tomorrow that actually achieves the objectives. It says: The President has to nominate to fill the vacancy and the Congress has to act on the nomination, and it provides a very strong incentive for the President to comply with the law because if he doesn't, then Congress's requirement to act on any of his U.S. attorney nominations for the entire remainder of his term is vitiated. So if he wants strong and quick action by Congress on his nominees, he has to do his part and actually nominate somebody within the 120 days required by my amendment.

Now, that achieves both objectives we are trying to achieve here: that the President will actually nominate and the Congress will have a chance to act on the nomination. The underlying bill, unfortunately, does not achieve that objective. It reverts to the old law which doesn't require the President to nominate, and if he doesn't, it has U.S. district court judges nominating U.S. attorneys, something they don't want to do and they haven't been very good at, and, in any event, confuses their article 3 responsibilities with the article 2 responsibilities of U.S. attorneys. It is not a good idea, and it doesn't solve the problem that people perceive existed.

My amendment also eliminates the current statute relating to interim nominees so the President could no longer appoint these interim nominees who would have to be confirmed by the Senate, or at least acted upon by the Senate. So I believe my amendment goes directly to the concern that our Democratic colleagues have had regarding this issue. I would hope politics wouldn't play a part in the consideration of my amendment. This issue generally has been so politicized—everybody has chosen up teams. I would hope that conversation would not be confused with the practical solution to the problem everybody has agreed exists, and that Members on both sides, in a very clear-eyed way, could consider which of the solutions represents the best option of solving the problem.

My colleague Senator SESSIONS has a proposed solution which, in the event my amendment were not adopted, I would support as well, because it at least improves somewhat on the underlying bill. But the reality is we shouldn't have Federal district judges making these nominations, and if our goal is to have the President make the nomination and enable the Senate to act on the nomination, the only amendment that does that is my amendment.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to remember we are not always going to have a Republican President and a Democratic Senate. We are going to have a Democratic President some day and a Democratic Senate or a Republican Senate or a Republican President and a Republican Senate. All the permutations will exist and politics should play no role in it. We should want the President to nominate to fill the vacancy and we should want the Congress to have a chance to act on that nomination. That is what my amendment provides.

The committee-passed bill, the number is S. 214, restores the interim U.S. attorney appointment statute that existed between 1986 and 2006. As I said, that system, which delegates to Federal judges the authority to appoint interim attorneys, has several flaws. First, as I said, S. 214 does not ensure the President will nominate a U.S. attorney. Whoever serves in a district should be someone who is nominated by the President, not a district judge. It is the President, not the district court, who is charged by the Constitution with ensuring that the laws are faithfully executed. It is the President's job to enforce the law. To do that effectively, he needs to have in place U.S. attorneys who are accountable to him. If he is not bringing important prosecutions or enforcing particular statutes, he and his superiors need to be held accountable. But if that U.S. attorney were appointed by a district judge, there is no one to complain to. Judges, after all, have lifetime tenure. It is only by ensuring that U.S. attorneys are appointed by the President that we can ensure there is ultimate accountability in the system.

This is, after all, the way in which the Constitution envisioned that accountability for enforcing the laws would be charged—by charging the President with the duty to enforce the law.

The second flaw in the underlying bill is that the Senate has no say in the selection of U.S. attorneys appointed by a district judge. One of the major complaints about the administration's handling of the interim U.S. attorney appointment authority is that it did not consult with home State Senators; that, in fact, some individuals sought to use the authority to avoid consulting with Senators.

It is right that the Senate take action in an effort to protect its prerogatives, but letting judges pick U.S. attorneys does not protect the Senate's rights. Senators have absolutely no say in the selection of a U.S. attorney who is picked by a judge. There is no confirmation of the judge's selection as there is when the President nominates someone. This system, which S. 214 puts back in place, is a solution that doesn't solve the problem that we have set out to address.

There is a third problem with this underlying bill. The judges don't want the authority. In the past, when district judges have had the authority to appoint interim U.S. attorneys, some have simply refused to do so. Incidentally, the statutory language is ''may,'' not ''shall.'' If they don't appoint judges, then the very concern that the Democratic Senators have had that an interim U.S. attorney is appointed and serves is exactly what happens. So judges don't want the authority, and there have been at least three such occasions during the current Bush administration when a district judge has refused to appoint an interim U.S. attorney and, in fact, they have had good reason. It is at least a potential conflict of interest for the district judge, who presides over criminal cases, to also select a U.S. attorney who prosecutes those cases. It is for this reason that some judges have refused to intervene in this area and select U.S. attorneys.

Yet with the committee-reported bill, we once again foist this authority on the judges. Why are we doing this—restoring power to the district judges that those judges don't want and have refused to use in the first place? Why are we forcing them to take actions that judges themselves, for good reason, see as a potential conflict of interest?

There is a fourth reason why this is not a good idea. Unfortunately, some district judges have not acquitted themselves very well when they have exercised the power to appoint U.S. attorneys. A Federal district judge may have the measure of the legal abilities of the lawyers who practice in his district, but he has no way to gauge their managerial skills, which is an important quality in a successful U.S. attorney. A district judge doesn't even have access to a candidate's personnel file and would not know of potentially disqualifying information or conflicts of interest in that file.

Allow me to describe two cases under the old system where the appointment of a U.S. attorney by a district judge led to a situation that can only be described as a fiasco:

In the Southern District of West Virginia, in 1987, the U.S. attorney for the District of West Virginia was confirmed to be a Federal judge. When the term of the interim U.S. attorney expired, the chief district judge appointed another individual as U.S. attorney. This individual was not a Justice Department employee and had not undergone an FBI background investigation. The court's appointee came into office and started asking about ongoing public integrity investigations, including investigations involving the mayor of Charleston and the State's Governor. Not only were this mayor

and Governor under investigation by the U.S. Attorney's Office at the time, both were later indicted and convicted of various Federal crimes.

The first assistant U.S. attorney, who knew that the district court's U.S. attorney had not undergone a background investigation, believed that these inquiries about pending investigations of local politicians were inappropriate and reported them to the Executive Office for United States Attorneys in Washington, DC. The Justice Department eventually had to remove the investigative files involving the Governor from that U.S. Attorney's Office for safekeeping. The Justice Department also had to direct the court's appointee to recuse herself from some criminal matters until a background check could be completed. This situation wasn't resolved until another U.S. attorney was confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. President, at the very time that some Democrats are suggesting that it just might be—there is no evidence, but it just might be that one or more of these U.S. attorneys was removed because they were hot on the trail of some Republican officeholder, they were involved in a political investigation or an investigation of a political person, and that was the reason they were removed—again, there is no evidence, but that is the suggestion—why would you want to substitute for that situation a statute that goes back to the way it used to be, which allowed the same thing to occur as in the case in West Virginia that I just cited? Why not change the situation so that the President must nominate, and the Senate explicitly has a right to act on that nominee by either confirming or rejecting the nominee?

That is the check and balance we need, rather than going back to the way it used to be, where the judge can appoint and we end up with problems like this involving investigations of political corruption.

Another case occurred in the District of South Dakota. In 2005, when the term of an interim U.S. attorney was about to expire, the chief district judge told the Justice Department he wanted to appoint an individual who didn't have any Federal prosecutorial experience, had not undergone a background check, and did not have the necessary security clearances. The Justice Department strenuously objected. Once the Justice Department believed the matter had been resolved, the Attorney General appointed another candidate. A Federal judge executed the oath of office for this appointee and copies of the Attorney General's order were sent to the district court.

Ten days later, the Justice Department received a fax indicating that the chief district judge had changed his mind and ''appointed'' the earlier, unacceptable candidate as U.S. attorney.

This created a situation where two different people claimed to be the U.S. attorney for the District of South Dakota. Defense lawyers representing criminal defendants in the district indicated that they would challenge ongoing investigations and cases on the basis that they could not know who was in charge. The chief judge then refused to negotiate a resolution to the situation. Eventually, in order to protect ongoing criminal cases, the President was forced to resolve the situation by firing the district judge's U.S. attorney. The matter was not completely resolved until another U.S. attorney was confirmed by the Senate the next year.

Don't we want to avoid this situation in the future? We are going to be asking for this kind of problem if we pass S. 214, the bill pending before us now. Far better it would be to adopt the amendment that I will offer that precludes this from occurring.

Let me point out another very serious problem that I don't think the authors of the legislation have even thought of or they clearly would have tried to fix it. S. 214 does not prevent the Attorney General from making multiple consecutive appointments of the same interim U.S. attorney. In other words, the very thing they are afraid of—that the President got rid of these people so the Attorney General could put his own person in office—is precisely what would be permitted under the bill pending before the Senate because it reinstates the exact language that existed before the statute was amended in 2006: the Attorney General could make consecutive 120-day appointments of interim U.S. attorneys.

Has this ever been done? There is at least one case where the Attorney General appointed a U.S. attorney to four consecutive 120-day interim terms. Well, that is a year and a half, by my reckoning. This incident occurred in the Eastern District of Oklahoma during the years 2000 and 2001. As a result, that district had an interim U.S. attorney who had been appointed by the Attorney General for over a year. Similarly, in Florida, in 2005, an interim U.S. attorney was appointed by the Attorney General. After the 120-day term ran out, the Attorney General appointed that individual to another interim term. After that term ran out, the Attorney General appointed him to a third interim term.

This practice is what the language of the 1986 law allowed. It is the same language that is in the bill that is before us now. It is obvious that much of the impetus for the present legislation is a desire to rein in the Attorney General's authority to appoint interim U.S. attorneys without Senate confirmation. Yet I submit that such power hasn't exactly been ''reined in,'' and the Senate's prerogatives are not protected, by a system that allows the Attorney General to make consecutive appointments of non-Senate-confirmed U.S. attorneys, which is precisely what the bill before us would allow. That system clearly falls short of ensuring that U.S. attorneys are subject to U.S. Senate confirmation, which is one of our two goals.

Finally, I note that S. 214's system of judge-made interim appointments is duplicative of the designation of acting U.S. attorneys under the Vacancies Act. We are effectively creating two different and redundant systems for appointing ''temporary'' U.S. attorneys. That makes no sense and creates obvious potential problems. For example, this system would make it possible for an individual to be consecutively designated as an acting U.S. attorney and serve in that post for 210 days and then be appointed as interim U.S. attorney and serve another 120 days. So he can be reappointed and reappointed again, if the Attorney General wanted to do so. This is nearly a whole year that someone could serve as U.S. attorney without ever being confirmed or acted upon by the Senate, without the nomination ever being sent to us.

Mr. President, we can all agree there is a problem. The solution, which was very quickly devised, is not a solution at all, as I have demonstrated. We can do better. There is nothing partisan about what I suggest. It would work equally for Republican and Democratic Presidents and Republican and Democratic Senates. To that end, I will offer an amendment on Tuesday that will achieve these goals of ensuring that U.S. attorneys are promptly nominated by the President and that the Senate has an opportunity to act on the nomination.

My amendment, again, requires that the President nominate a U.S. attorney candidate within 120 days of vacancy. It then requires that the Senate consider the nomination within 120 days after it is submitted. In order to encourage the President to abide by these time limits, the amendment provides that if the President fails to nominate an attorney candidate in any district within the time limit, then the 120-day limit on Senate consideration is vitiated for all U.S. attorney nominations for the remainder of the President's term in office. In effect, in order to enjoy the substantial benefits of prompt Senate consideration of his nominees, the President would be required to, himself, nominate promptly.

My amendment makes one other important change. It completely repeals the interim U.S. attorney statute, as I said, which is what people have gotten all concerned about in the first instance but seem to have forgotten. The interim authority is unnecessary in light of the Vacancies Act and has caused a host of problems. By repealing this authority, my amendment would effectively bar the President or a judge from appointing any long-term U.S. attorney without Senate confirmation. Any temporary gap in the office of U.S. attorney would be addressed by the Vacancies Act, which applies to all Senate-confirmed executive appointments and allows another employee or officer—presumptively the first assistant—to carry out the function and duties of the office subject to various time limits and other requirements.

Mr. President, especially those who are upset about recent events should support a complete repeal of the interim authority. It is only a complete repeal that will ensure that U.S. attorneys are appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. It is only a complete repeal that will prevent consecutive appointments of U.S. attorneys by the Attorney General. It is only a complete repeal that will prevent the stacking of the interim and acting terms as U.S. attorney. Only a complete repeal ensures that Senators will always have a say in who serves for the long term as the U.S. attorney in their State.

The interim appointment authority has lately become a contentious and very politicized issue. It need not be. It is particularly in times such as these that the Senate must do what was designated by the Framers to do: cool the passions and look to the long term. I hope my colleagues will do this when I present my amendment tomorrow. I hope we will lay partisanship aside and that my amendment will be supported.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE

Washington, DC, March 19, 2007.

Re Interim U.S. Attorneys.

Dear Colleague: There is a consensus that the changes made to the interim U.S. attorney statute, 28 U.S.C. §546, by the Patriot Improvement and Reauthorization Act, Pub. L. 109–177, were a mistake. It is my hope that we will not compound that mistake with another—namely, involving Federal district judges in the appointment of U.S. attorneys.

During Monday's debate and Tuesday's vote, I urge you to consider that in the future both Democrats and Republicans will control the Senate, and both a Democrat and a Republican will serve as President. The solution that we adopt should be one that we are ready to live with under all combinations of these circumstances. It should be a solution that ensures that the President timely nominates U.S. attorneys, and that those U.S. attorneys are subject to confirmation by the Senate.

S. 214, the committee-reported U.S. attorneys bill, does not meet these goals. My proposed amendment does. S. 214 restores the interim U.S. attorney appointment statute that existed between 1986 and 2006. That statute, which delegates to Federal judges the authority to appoint interim U.S. attorneys, has several flaws. First, it does not ensure that the President will nominate a U.S. attorney. Second, the Senate has no say in the selection of a U.S. attorney who is appointed by a district judge.

Moreover, judges do not want this authority. Some have simply refused to appoint interim U.S. attorneys, finding it a potential conflict of interest for the district judge who presides over criminal cases to also select the U.S. attorney who would prosecute those cases. And finally, some district judges have not acquitted themselves well when they have exercised the power to appoint U.S. attorneys. A Federal district judge may have the measure of the legal abilities of the lawyers who practice in his district, but he is in no position to gauge an individual's management skill—an important quality in a successful U.S. attorney. A district judge does not even have access to a candidate's personnel file and would not know of disqualifying information in that file or of potential conflicts of interest.

An additional problem, which may be of concern to those who are eager to respond to recent events, is that the permissive language of the pre-2006 statute—the same language that S. 214 restores—was understood to allow the Attorney General to make consecutive 120-day appointments of interim U.S. attorneys. In at least one case, the Attorney General appointed a U.S. attorney to four consecutive 120-day ''interim'' terms. Such a system falls short of ensuring that U.S. attorneys are subject to Senate confirmation. And finally, S. 214's approach is duplicative of the designation of Acting U.S. attorneys under the Vacancies Act, 5 U.S.C. §3345 et seq., and potentially allows an individual to be consecutively designated as an Acting U.S. attorney, and then as an interim U.S. attorney—again avoiding Senate confirmation for a substantial period of time.

I believe that we can do better. To that end, I will offer an amendment on Tuesday that will achieve our goals of ensuring that U.S. attorneys are promptly nominated by the President and that the Senate has an opportunity to act on those nominations. My amendment: (1) Would require the President to nominate a U.S. attorney candidate within 120 days of a vacancy. It then would require the Senate to consider the nomination within 120 days after it is submitted. In order to encourage the President to abide by these time limits, the amendment also would provide that if the President fails to nominate a U.S. attorney candidate in any district within the time limit, the 120-day limit on Senate consideration is vitiated for all U.S. attorney nominations for the remainder of that President's term in office. In effect, in order to enjoy the substantial benefits of prompt Senate consideration of his nominees, the President would be required to nominate promptly.

Finally, my amendment: (2) Would completely repeal the interim U.S. attorney statute, 28 U.S.C. §546. The interim authority is unnecessary in light of the Vacancies Act and has caused a host of problems. By repealing this authority, my amendment would effectively bar the President (or a judge) from appointing any long-term U.S. attorney without Senate confirmation. Any temporary gap in the office of U.S. attorney would be addressed by the Vacancies Act, which applies to all Senate-confirmed executive appointments and allows another employee or officer (presumptively the First Assistant) to carry out the functions and duties of the office subject to various time limits and other requirements.

The interim appointment authority has lately become a contentious and very politicized issue. It need not be. It is particularly in times like these that the Senate must do what it was designed by the Framers to do: To cool the passions and look to the long term. I hope that you will do so—and that you will support my amendment.

Sincerely,

JON KYL.

AMENDMENT NO. 459

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which, I understand, is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL] proposes an amendment numbered 459.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that United States attorneys are promptly nominated by the President, and are appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate)

On page 2, strike line 10 and all that follows and insert the following:

SEC. 2. PROMPT NOMINATION AND CONFIRMATION OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Section 541 of title 28, United States Code is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b)(1) Not later than 120 days after the date on which a vacancy occurs in the office of United States attorney for a judicial district, the President shall submit an appointment for that office to the Senate.

''(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3), not later than 120 days after the date of the submission of an appointment under paragraph (1), the Senate shall vote on that appointment.

''(3) If the President fails to comply with paragraph (1) with regard to the submission of any appointment for the office of United States attorney, paragraph (2) of this subsection shall have no force or effect with regard to any appointment to the office of United States attorney during the remainder of the term of office of that President.''.

SEC. 3. REPEAL OF INTERIM APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY.

Section 546 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank Senator KYL for his work and thoughtfulness on this subject. A situation that has always caused enemies is when judges—the judicial branch—appoint officials of the executive branch. In particular, a judge is supposed to be a neutral arbiter for the contest going on before him. If he appoints the coach or the quarterback of one of the teams it seems as though he may not be facilitating a fair trial. It creates a perception that I believe is not healthy. Some judges have actually refused to appoint a U.S. attorney. They didn't think they should be taking sides in lawsuits that would come before them or stating to the world that they were, in effect, choosing and validating the integrity and their support for one of the advocates who appears before them.

That is pretty basic to our system. But we have had a different procedure for appointing interim attorneys for many years. It has been discussed over time as being unwise, but nothing ever happened until the PATRIOT Act reauthorization. Then, when we finally changed the procedure for interim appointments, I think we didn't do it well. We fixed the problem but left a big loophole that does need to be worked on. On balance, the Kyl amendment is preferable to going back to the old system, and I support it.

I also note there has been a lot of talk about politics and the Department of Justice. I served as a U.S. attorney for 12 years. I served as an assistant U.S. attorney for 2½ years. I came to know and love and respect that office. It is a very great and important office. To be able to go into a court of the United States of America and to stand before that jury and that judge and all the parties who are there and the court says: Is the United States ready? And you say: The United States is ready, Your Honor—to speak for the United States of America, to represent the United States of America in court is a high honor and a tremendous responsibility.

My impression, my entire experience was that when faced with difficult choices, if I called the people in Washington and sought their advice or help or insight into how to handle a difficult matter, they were very respectful of my decisionmaking process.

They would provide support and advice, and they usually deferred to the decision of the prosecutor.

They have strict regulations that require cases to be reviewed at various levels in the Department before an indictment can be returned because the U.S. attorney is not a free agent. They are not entitled to indict anyone they choose without any review within the Department of Justice, any oversight at all. A lot of us thought sometimes there was too much of that, but it was mainly a bureaucratic headache you had to go through with some cases.

The U.S. attorney is appointed by the President. Presidents who take office routinely replace U.S. attorneys who were there and appoint people they believe are able and who will execute their approaches, their policies of law enforcement and litigation. That is what a Presidential election entails.

When we elect a President, we understand they are going to appoint U.S. attorneys who will be responsible for their effort, and if they refuse to prosecute immigration cases, for whatever reason they might decide, and the United States public knows about this, what recourse do they have? They can vote against the President if he appoints somebody who won't enforce the law, gun prosecutions, or any other kind of prosecutions. That is an accountability of sorts. But to have a judge who has a lifetime appointment make these appointments and who has no accountability to the public is not healthy. I believe it undermines accountability.

I guess I had the occasion to be fired. They have been talking about a lot of people being fired. When President Bush took over from President Reagan—I had been appointed a U.S. attorney by President Reagan—even though I had been a Republican and was supported by a Republican President, he wanted everybody to resign so he could replace all the U.S. attorneys. This was a perfectly logical decision for him to have made.

As a matter of fact, I remember it being discussed, although not acted on, at the midterm of President Reagan's Administration whether U.S. attorneys should be asked to resign after 4 years and bring in new blood. They chose not to do that.

When President Bush took office, many U.S. attorneys did not stay on. Over a period of weeks and months, they submitted their resignations, and he appointed new U.S. attorneys, many excellent U.S. attorneys. I asked that I be allowed to stay on, and after some time, they said: You can stay on. So I stayed for 12 years. There were a handful of U.S. attorneys who stayed during that period—I mean literally half a dozen or fewer who stayed 12 years.

I say that to say these appointments are appointments of the President. The U.S. attorneys have to be responsible, if Presidential elections mean anything at all, in executing the policies the President sets forth with regard to criminal cases or civil cases, for that matter. That is what he does.

We have this sense in which an appointment of a U.S. attorney is both political and nonpolitical. Let me tell my colleagues how it works. This is very important. Most U.S. attorneys are recommended to the President or known to the President to have certain abilities. People make recommendations. If it is a Republican President, they tend to appoint Republican U.S. attorneys. If it is a Democratic President, they tend to appoint Democratic U.S. attorneys. Local Congressmen and Senators—particularly Senators, since we are in the confirmation process—make these recommendations to the President. He listens to them and gives great weight to the recommendations.

So most of the people who are appointed have some sort of political heritage or background, but when you take that oath, when a person becomes a U.S. attorney and they are asked to evaluate the merits of an existing case before them as to whether a person should be charged, as to what kind of plea bargain should be entered into in the course of a prosecution, they should follow the law, they should follow their personal integrity and do the right thing regardless of any politics, regardless of whether that defendant or the person involved in a civil lawsuit is a Republican, a Democrat, rich or poor, whatever. They have taken an oath to enforce the laws fairly against everyone. I took it seriously. It was an important oath to me. I don't think I have ever done anything of which I am more proud than serving as a U.S. attorney. I believe I fulfilled that oath as God gave me the ability to do so, and I made some tough calls. I handled cases against people I knew—friends. I felt it was my duty, and I did my duty as best I could. I am convinced that most U.S. attorneys do the same.

The appointment process has a political component, as everyone in this body knows, because I submit to my colleagues and to anyone who is listening, there has not been a U.S. attorney appointed who doesn't have some sort of Senate recommendation to it. In fact, they have to get our approval to move the nomination through the Senate. That is a political process. So some of these e-mails which are being talked about I think are not so unusual at that level, where they are talking about appointments. Are we appointing people who are loyal to President Clinton or are we appointing people who are loyal to the administration of President Bush, who wants his administration to succeed and wants his priorities to succeed? That is how appointments are made. But once you take that position, nobody in the Department of Justice, for corrupt or ill intent, should ever try to influence a legitimate, proper decision of a grand jury or a U.S. attorney with any improper motive because of politics. That is a tradition which most of the public may not know but is deeply understood throughout the Department of Justice.

Years ago, assistant U.S. attorneys would resign when Presidents were not reelected. The whole office would resign. As a matter of fact, when I came on in 1980, several offices still had that tradition, and in several offices, when the new U.S. attorney walked in, there was nobody there. They thought that was the right thing to do—to turn it over and let the new President and new U.S. attorney hire whom he or she wanted to run the office.

That has ended, I think correctly. Now in every U.S. Attorney's Office, there is a deep cadre of experienced career prosecutors. The U.S. Attorney's Office is much larger today. They have grown in size, and they have a deep cadre of professional assistants, many of whom are appointed by different political parties of different Presidents, different Attorneys General, and selected by different U.S. attorneys.

Everybody, if they are doing their job correctly—and I am convinced that most do, overwhelmingly they do—they make decisions on cases based on the merits. If someone in the office tries to upset that or if some U.S. attorney tries to squash or cover up a case that should be prosecuted or a U.S. attorney tries to prosecute someone and there is not a legitimate basis for it, there are Federal agents involved in these prosecutions, assistant U.S. attorneys, people talk about these things, and it comes to the surface. Really, it is very difficult for anybody to not do what is right. I am not saying it can't be done, but I am just emphasizing that U.S. attorneys have a responsibility to do what is right. Their assistants are raised in that concept, they are trained in that concept, and if some political shenanigans are attempted, those assistants will usually push back and can appeal to the Department of Justice in Washington or state their claims. That is just the way it is.

What about this deal of President Bush firing 8 of U.S. attorneys? Let me say it this way: The President was in midterm. He had been reelected. Apparently, there was a discussion as to whether U.S. attorneys should be kept or replaced. Somebody said: Why don't we replace them all? He said: No, that is not a good idea. We ought to evaluate them and see which ones we want to keep and which ones we want to replace. There is nothing wrong with that. In fact, in my view, Presidents and Attorneys General have a greater responsibility than they have exercised to ensure that U.S. attorneys are carrying out aggressively the policies they set forth. It is mainly a question of policy.

They made that decision. They battled it down and came out with eight U.S. attorneys whom they wanted to replace out of 93 U.S. attorneys. That is not a holocaust of U.S. attorneys.

When I was U.S. attorney and President Clinton was elected President, he sent out a notice that everybody would resign almost immediately. In the past,

President Carter, President Reagan, and President Bush gave people 6 months or more notice to get their affairs in order and trundle on off in a nice fashion, give you an opportunity to find another job. But President Clinton sent out a notice immediately: You are out of there. It caused an uproar, and then they backed off and said: OK, take your time; we respect you more than that. We will let you take some time before you are out of here, but you are out of here. I have seen that twice. I saw it when President Bush took over from President Reagan and when President Clinton took over from President Bush.

I wish to talk about this question of how you fill a vacancy in the U.S. Department of Justice, a U.S. attorney position. I always thought it odd that the court makes that appointment under certain circumstances. Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty, in a Judiciary Committee hearing on February 6, said:

> Allowing the district court to appoint U.S. attorneys would deprive the Attorney General of the authority to appoint his chief law enforcement officials in the field when a vacancy occurs, assigning it instead to another branch of Government. The President is elected to do this. He is the chief law enforcement officer. He sets the prosecutorial policy, not the courts.

McNulty further testified:

> Some district courts recognize the conflicts inherent in the appointment of an interim United States attorney who would then have matters before that court—not to mention the oddity of one branch of government appointing the officers of another branch of government—and they have simply refused to exercise the appointment authority.

Some judges felt so strongly that this is an unhealthy way of doing business, that they should appoint the prosecutor who is going to be appearing before them trying to convict somebody, yet they are supposed to be a neutral arbiter of the facts and the law, that they wouldn't make the appointment.

McNulty pointed out:

> Other district courts ignored the inherent conflict and sought to appoint as interim United States attorneys wholly unacceptable candidates who lacked the required clearances or appropriate qualifications.

You have to have a secret clearance to be a U.S. attorney. This is very serious business, who gets appointed U.S. attorney in these matters. Let's say there was a U.S. attorney who had a meeting with the judge—and I have had these judges who like to tell you what the policy should be. They like to tell you, you are prosecuting too many drug cases; you are prosecuting too many gun cases. We are the judges; we think you, prosecutor, you work for us, basically you are prosecuting too many immigration cases. You need to do other kinds of things more fitting for the Federal Court, Mr. Prosecutor.

Well, who is the prosecutor working for? Is he working for that judge or is he working, in effect, to set forth the policy of the person duly elected President of the United States and thereby empowered to appoint him and thereby to set those policies? So you have to tell the judge, you know, I like you, Judge, and I appreciate all that. I know you, but that is not our policy. We believe we should prosecute gun cases. We think there is too much violence in America, and drugs and gangs are out there killing people and doing all these things, and our policy is to prosecute drug cases.

What about immigration cases? Nobody else will prosecute an immigration case. One U.S. attorney had a lax record because she did not prosecute those cases to the level of other similar districts and was criticized for it by a lot of people. Let's say there was a vacancy, and under S. 214 the Senate majority now refused to confirm a Bush appointment to that district and the judge appoints somebody who agrees with him who wouldn't prosecute immigration cases or gun cases or drug cases, and they could be in there permanently.

This idea that the Executive Branch, or President, can abuse the system is as true and possible as the idea that a judge can abuse the system. If the President does it, at least we in this Congress have a vote, and the American people have a right to vote on a President. So there is accountability at least in this system that is not in the Judicial branch of government.

Paul McNulty, the Deputy Attorney General, said this:

> The Department of Justice is aware of no other agency where Federal judges, members of a separate branch of government, appoint the interim staff of an agency.

I would ask my colleagues here to name one where the Federal judges fill a vacancy somewhere in the Government. In addition to the constitutional separation of powers that is of concern with this approach, McNulty says:

> At a minimum, it gives rise to an appearance of potential conflict that undermines the performance or perceived performance of both the executive and judicial branches.

Tough cases come up before courts and they are litigated before judges with great intensity. There is a lawyer for the defendant and there is a lawyer for the Government, the prosecutor, and imagine now that the judge has appointed the prosecutor. It creates some unease, I submit, and it is not a little bitty matter.

I am talking about a matter that will linger for 100 years. I am not talking about the immediate media flack we are having now, that we are digging into and seeing whether everybody can figure out exactly what happened, and get a complete story of how the eight U.S. attorneys were asked to move on. We will get into that. That will all happen. I don't know exactly what happened there, but I am saying that, as a matter of policy, the appointments of executive branch officers should be maintained, so far as possible, by the executive branch.

I will say one more thing. I do support the Kyl amendment. I think that is a principled approach. I think the PATRIOT Act language we passed was not carefully thought through and did leave a loophole that could allow the President to avoid confirmation process, and I think that is not healthy. I believe the Kyl amendment, consistent with the separation of powers, will confront and deal with that problem. I will say this, regardless of how my colleagues might vote on that, I do believe we ought to consider an amendment I have offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 460

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is set aside, and the clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SESSIONS] proposes an amendment numbered 460.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: to require appropriate qualifications for interim United States attorneys)

> On page 2, line 23, strike the quotation marks and the second period and insert the following:
>
> ''(e)(1) A district court appointing a United States attorney under subsection (d) shall not appoint a candidate—
>
> ''(A) unless that candidate is an employee of the Department of Justice or is a Federal law enforcement officer (as that term is defined in section 115 of title 18); or
>
> ''(B) if the court learns that candidate is under investigation or has been sanctioned by the Department of Justice or another Federal agency.
>
> ''(2) Not less than 7 days before making an appointment under subsection (d), a district court shall confidentially inform the Attorney General of identity of the candidate for that appointment.''.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, if the Kyl amendment is not approved, my amendment would require interim U.S. attorney appointments made by a district court have appropriate and proper background checks. That is, whoever the judge appoints would have background checks and security clearances in order to maintain efficient operation of the office during this transition period.

The Feinstein bill that reverts to the previous process does not allow for that to happen, and we do know that in the past judges have nominated candidates who have serious difficulties. In 1987, an interim U.S. attorney for the Southern District of West Virginia, who was not a Department of Justice employee, did not have a background investigation, and was appointed by a district judge, started demanding to find out everything that was going on in the files related to a prosecution of prominent public officials. The First Assistant U.S. attorney there, a career

person, was taken aback by this. The judge appointed interim U.S. Attorney didn't have security clearance to see the files, yet he had been appointed by the judge. So they had to remove the files from the office. Not everybody can go in and see an investigatory file or see grand jury transcripts. Those are, by law, available only to law enforcement officers who meet certain security clearances.

There was another example where the chief district judge in South Dakota told the Department of Justice he wanted to appoint an individual who did not have any Federal prosecutorial experience, had not undergone a background check, and did not have the necessary security clearances. The Department of Justice strongly objected. It goes against the policy of the Department of Justice and the efficiency and effectiveness of the nominee. The Department of Justice appointed a different candidate, under an existing law, and the Federal judge executed the oath of office for this appointee and copies of the Attorney General's order were sent out to the district court. Ten days later, the Department of Justice received a fax indicating that the chief district judge had decided to appoint the earlier unacceptable candidate as U.S. attorney. They had two of them appointed. So I think we can fix that problem. That turned out to be an unpleasant mess, if you want to know the truth, and we can do better about that.

I see Senator KENNEDY is here, so I won't go on at length about this, except to say if we go back to the previous system that had been in effect for many years, it has been effective but we will face the same serious problems I just mentioned. Also, as a matter of principle, it is inconsistent with the responsibilities we give to the President of the United States to appoint these officers and to give it to a separate branch of Government that is not given the constitutional authority to make those appointments. But I think we can fix it. We can do better. We can fix this.

I think the Kyl amendment represents the appropriate principled approach to it. However, if the Kyl amendment does not succeed, I would suggest my amendment, which makes for a limited modification to Senator FEINSTEIN's amendment by ensuring that only qualified people be named, people who meet the requirements, people who have a security clearance as part of the executive branch of the Government, who may be picked by a judge, whoever they choose, but they at least would be qualified through security clearances and professional background to be a U.S. attorney. Maybe that would be a compromise that would help eliminate some of the practical difficulties, even if it does not eliminate the philosophical difficulties of having appointments made by a different branch of Government.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I strongly support S. 214 as an urgently needed step in our effort to restore our constitutional system of checks and balances and to protect the rule of law.

In recent weeks, Congress has finally begun to investigate the damaging politicization of the administration of justice by the White House and the Department of Justice. The problem did not begin with the recently disclosed firings of eight U.S. attorneys. It was well underway in 2002 when Attorney General Ashcroft abolished the process for hiring new career attorneys for the Department of Justice.

That process had been established by the Eisenhower administration half a century ago to eliminate partisanship and cronyism in the Department's hiring. Under Attorney General Ashcroft, however, the process was placed entirely in the hands of political appointees who set out to remake the ranks of career attorneys by hiring new attorneys based on partisan and ideological qualifications. Predictably, the result has been partisan and ideological law enforcement.

The civil rights division virtually stopped enforcing the Voting Rights Act on behalf of African Americans. It even sued African-American officials in Mississippi for discriminating against White voters. Contrary to the recommendations of career attorneys, the new regime also approved the Texas redistricting law that was later struck down by the Supreme Court. It also approved a Georgia photo identification law for voting that was subsequently struck down by a Federal Court as a poll tax. Approval of the Georgia photo identification law was driven by the same partisan motivation that produced the current U.S. attorney scandal.

Georgia's Republican-dominated State legislature said it was enacting the law to respond to allegations of voter fraud. But evidence of fraud to justify the law did not exist. The ID law was passed anyway, with full awareness that it would disproportionately prevent minorities from voting.

When the law was submitted to the Civil Rights Division for approval under the Voting Rights Act, the career staff of attorneys and analysts recommended an objection by the Department, which would have prevented the law from going into effect, but the recommendation was rejected by the political appointees.

The Federal Court struck down the law as the equivalent of a poll tax, because the State offered to sell ID's for $20 to prospective voters who did not have them. Tellingly, the State did not establish offices selling ID's in many of the State's most heavily minority districts.

After the law was blocked, the State reenacted it without the $20 fee, in a blatant effort to gain partisan advantage by manipulating the law. Once again, the political appointees in the Civil Rights Division approved it. Fortunately, a court struck down the new law, finding that it placed an undue burden on the voting rights of minority and elderly voters.

The story does not end there. Shortly after political officials rejected the career attorneys' recommendation to block the law, they transferred Robert Berman—the leader of the career team that reviewed the Georgia law and a 28-year veteran of the Civil Rights Division—out of his job as a Deputy Chief of the Voting Section and into a dead-end training job.

When the Attorney General testified before the Judiciary Committee last July, I asked whether this transfer was retaliation for the career attorney's role in recommending that the Department object to the Georgia photo ID law. I still haven't received an answer. When Wan Kim, the head of the Civil Rights Division, testified before the Committee in November, I asked him if Mr. Berman was transferred in retaliation for the Georgia matter. I still haven't received an answer.

As the problems in the Civil Rights Division make clear, the real danger with this administration's politicization of Justice Department's hiring is the corruption of the rule of law. U.S. Attorneys and other Department of Justice officials are selected by the President, but they are the people's lawyers. Their first duty is to enforce the rule of law—not to push a partisan agenda. This administration has forgotten that basic truth, and the rule of law has suffered.

The conclusion is inescapable that the Department of Justice ended Mr. Berman's long and distinguished career as a voting section attorney because he applied the law faithfully and well, and refused to serve the partisan interests of his political superiors. His plight is one of many examples of loyal career public servants who have been pushed aside for their failure to toe the partisan line in the Department of Justice.

Incredibly, Bradley Schlozman, the inexperienced political appointee who oversaw approval of the Georgia ID law and the retaliation against the career staff, was rewarded with an appointment as interim U.S. attorney for the Western District of Missouri. He has served in that capacity for a year without Senate confirmation. Mr. Schlozman's appointment is symptomatic of the problem that the bill before us will solve—the appointment as U.S. attorneys of unqualified partisan operatives who would be unlikely to win Senate confirmation, but who can serve for extended periods of time anyway.

The continuing revelations about the 8 fired U.S. attorneys show how thoroughly partisanship has infected the administration of justice in the Bush administration. As explanation after explanation has unraveled, it has become increasingly clear that the purge of U.S. attorneys had its genesis in the White House and its roots in a desire to remove U.S. attorneys who were not sufficiently committed to the political agenda of the administration.

The initial explanation that 7 of the 8 were fired for poor performance was a smokescreen manufactured out of thin air. Their performance assessments were largely outstanding. Evidence is mounting that the administration was concerned that Carol Lam was too successful in her investigation and prosecution of Republicans in the Duke Cunningham scandal. John McKay was on the list because of his refusal to open an unwarranted investigation into voter fraud after a close 2004 election victory by a Democrat. David Iglesias was the subject of Republican complaints about his unwillingness to pursue voter fraud investigations of Democrats, and he was pressured by Republicans in Congress to indict Democrats before last November's election to help the Republican candidate in a tight congressional race.

Recently released e-mails show that part of this scheme was to use the little-noticed change in the law inserted in the reauthorization of the Patriot Act last year which permitted the Attorney General to appoint interim U.S. attorneys to serve indefinitely without Senate confirmation. The bill before us eliminates that provision and reinstates the 120-day limit on service by interim U.S. attorneys appointed by the Attorney General. This change will force the administration to send nominees to the Senate to fill vacant slots, or have them filled by a court instead.

This change in the law is an important first step we can take to remedy the problem, as we continue to investigate the political purge of U.S. attorneys. That investigation must continue. A full investigation is essential if we hope to restore confidence in Federal law enforcement. U.S. attorneys protect the Nation from violent crime, terrorism, violations of civil rights, organized crime and public corruption. They must be above partisan or ethical reproach, if the rule of law is to have any meaning in our modern society.

There are few greater threats to our democracy than such efforts to turn our system of Federal law enforcement into a partisan political tool. As Justice Robert Jackson said:

> The prosecutor has more control over life, liberty and reputation than any other person in America.

That awesome power must not be used in the service of partisan goals. U.S. attorneys are political appointees, but once they are appointed, they can no longer be part of the political process. Politics can shape policies and priorities but the decision whether or not to investigate or prosecute cannot be influenced by the slightest hint of partisanship. No U.S. attorneys should be subjected to partisan political pressure to make a particular decision in a prosecution, and no U.S. attorney should be retaliated against for making decisions that are politically unpopular in the eyes of his superiors.

The bill before us will help guard against such partisanship, by restoring the requirement for the administration to submit nominees for U.S. attorneys promptly to the Senate for confirmation, and I urge my colleagues to pass this bill without amendment.

IRAQ

Mr. President, as our Nation begins its fifth year of the war in Iraq it is abundantly clear to the American people that our current policy has failed, and that we need a new policy that will better serve both our national security and our service men and women.

President Bush continues to look for good news with a microscope. Despite his repeated claims that success is just around the corner, Iraq is falling deeper and deeper into the chaos of civil war. Our troops are in the untenable position of policing a nation at war with itself.

More than 3,200 American soldiers have made the ultimate sacrifice, and more than 24,000 have been wounded during the 4 years of his failed policy.

Tens of thousands of Iraqi civilians have been killed, and nearly 4 million have been displaced inside Iraq and across the region.

The insurgency is growing in strength, and its lethal explosives are growing in sophistication.

Attacks on American soldiers continue to increase.

Militias are increasing their power, and their ability to brutalize the Iraqi people is increasing as well.

No amount of American military might can end Iraq's civil war. Only a political settlement by Iraqi leaders and the Iraqi people can end the bloodshed and suffering.

Rather than fanning the flames of chaos by sending more U.S. troops into Iraq's civil war, it is time for the President to begin to redeploy our troops out of harm's way.

The war in Iraq has been a disastrous and deeply dangerous debacle in American foreign policy. It has made America more hated in the world than at any other time in our history. It has emboldened terrorists across the globe. It has stretched our military to the breaking point. As a result, our national security is increasingly at risk.

The President's policy of escalating the war will not make success any more likely. It will only result in more death and more tragedy for American soldiers, and it will undermine our national security even further.

The American people have been patient. But America has now been in Iraq longer than it took us to win World War II. Instead of progress, we continue to see unacceptably high levels of violence, death, and destruction.

The American military and the American people deserve far better. The President seeks more funding for the war without strings and without delay.

Because the President stubbornly insists on escalating the same failed strategy, Congress must stand up to the President and stand up for our troops by requiring him to redeploy our combat forces out of Iraq as soon as possible. We have an opportunity to do so on the supplemental appropriations bill that will soon be before us, and it is an opportunity we cannot afford to miss.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am going to speak on two timely issues. I would like to first speak on the issue of S. 214, the bill pending before the Senate.

I would like to ask my colleagues in the Senate who followed this debate over the firing of eight U.S. attorneys to reflect a little bit about history. It was over a century ago that the U.S. Department of Justice undertook plans to fire certain Federal prosecutors in the U.S. Attorney's Office in Alabama for political reasons. It was August 9, 1904, when Republican President Theodore Roosevelt wrote a letter to his Attorney General, William H. Moody. In this letter, President Theodore Roosevelt opposed the political firing of Federal prosecutors. This is what he said:

> Of all of the officers of the Government, those of the Department of Justice should be kept most free from any suspicion of improper action on partisan or factional grounds . . . so that there will be gradually a growth, even though a slow growth, in the knowledge that the Federal courts and the representatives of the Federal Department of Justice insist on meting out even-handed justice to all.

Those words were spoken over 100 years ago. They ring true today. Our democracy is based on the rule of law. It is based on meting out evenhanded justice, as President Theodore Roosevelt said.

The forced firing of eight U.S. attorneys, nearly all of whom had been judged qualified and favorably reviewed, calls into question the credibility and integrity of Federal prosecutors. It calls into question our Nation's commitment to even-handed justice.

I have heard my colleagues on the floor today and in committee say: This is much ado about nothing because whenever a new President comes along, they replace all of the U.S. attorneys; that is clearly political. They are replacing those serving as U.S. attorneys with people of their own choosing after they have replaced the Attorney General. There is truth to that.

The fact is, with the new Attorney General, a new team is in place. We have 93 U.S. attorneys. As President George W. Bush took office a little over 6 years ago, he replaced all of those U.S. attorneys appointed by President Clinton with his own. No one called for an investigation. No one screamed

''scandal.'' It is a tradition. It is one we accept. A new President has that chance. But we know those U.S. attorneys serve at the President's discretion and can be removed at any time for any reason.

We have an unusual circumstance we face right now. Never before in history has a President and an Attorney General fired a group of U.S. attorneys en masse, in a group, other than the expected turnover, as I mentioned, with the change of administration.

We asked the Congressional Research Service if they could undertake an analysis of U.S. attorney firings that occurred other than the changeover of a Presidency. This is what they found: Only 2 U.S. attorneys out of 486 confirmed by the Senate over the past 25 years have been fired in the middle of a Presidential term for reasons unrelated to misconduct—2 out of 486. So for some to argue that this is routine, to fire those attorneys, the facts say otherwise. Only 2 out of 486 have been fired in the midst of their term.

Why is that the case? Why have U.S. attorneys been insulated from Presidential politics? Because Federal prosecutors are supposed to be independent. They are nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, but, unlike other Federal public servants, they have a measure of independence.

Former Supreme Court Justice and Attorney General Robert Jackson once said: The prosecutor has more control over life, liberty, and reputation than any other person in America.

Discussing Justice Jackson's words, a scholar of the Justice Department named Lincoln Caplan has written:

> The power of law enforcement to tarnish reputations, end people's liberty and ruin lives, in other words, is so great that it has to be exercised judiciously and, above all, nonpolitically. That's one basic element of the rule of law.

That is what is at stake here. Eight U.S. attorneys who did not play ball with the political agenda of this White House were dropped from the team. Members of Congress have a responsibility to ask: What was that political agenda? Why were they dismissed? Does this scandal rest at the feet of the Attorney General, Mr. Gonzales; Harriet Miers, the former counsel to the President; Karl Rove, the President's political adviser; or does it reach the President's office itself?

Over the next several weeks, we are going to look into this. Passage of S. 214, the bill we will vote on at the end of this debate, will not end the inquiry. We have a lot more work to do. We need to learn whether Attorney General Gonzales and his deputies told Congress the truth when they testified just a few weeks ago. We need to have Karl Rove, Harriet Miers, and other top administration officials testify under oath about their role in these firings. I hope they will come voluntarily. If they do not, the Senate Judiciary Committee should subpoena each and every one of them. I am a member of that committee. We plan to vote on these subpoenas this Thursday.

The White House is reluctant to have senior officials testify. That is understandable. But when the shoe was on the other foot—a Democratic President and a Republican Congress—administration officials testified all the time. Under President Clinton, 47 White House officials testified before congressional committees during their service. We need to hear the truth—all of it and nothing but the truth—about the firing of the eight U.S. attorneys.

There is a second question we have to ask which is equally important: How many other U.S. attorneys were approached by the White House and asked to play ball and did play ball? Of the Nation's 93 U.S. attorneys, how many of them kept their jobs as a result of political cooperation?

We gained some insight into this question from a new study by two professors, John Cragan of Illinois State University and Donald Shields at the University of Missouri. They compiled a database of Federal indictments and investigations undertaken by U.S. attorneys against elected officials and political candidates since President Bush took office in 2001. Here is what their study found: U.S. attorneys across the Nation have investigated 298 Democrats and just 67 Republicans—nearly 5 times as many Democratic officials as Republicans. These statistics are troubling, and we have to look into them. The firings of the U.S. attorneys and documents that have been turned over to Congress really call into question the legitimacy of all prosecutions brought by the U.S. attorney in cases involving partisan interests.

This is regrettable. There is no place for politics when it comes to prosecution, especially when it comes to public corruption and voting rights cases. If there is belief that people in the White House in either party are pushing for prosecutions to seek a political advantage, we have seriously undermined the integrity and credibility of our system of justice.

As President Teddy Roosevelt warned: Even the appearance of political interference in the process of justice is damaging to public faith in Government. Last night, as I left a Chicago restaurant, a young man and his wife were sitting at a table. He asked me to come over. He introduced himself and said he was an assistant U.S. attorney in Chicago. That is a hard job to get. It is not a political job at all. In fact, you have to be really talented to be qualified to serve in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Northern District of Illinois.

He said to me: Senator, I would like to ask you to do your best to get to the bottom of this. We think we are doing a professional job. This suggestion that some U.S. attorneys were fired for political reasons really casts a shadow over all of us who are trying to represent the people of the United States effectively through our Department of Justice.

We owe it to him. We owe it to the U.S. attorneys across this country who have been independent in their judgment and all of the assistants who work with them to get to the bottom of this and ask the important questions. I hope the Senate Judiciary Committee will be able to move this week, perhaps next week, to get to the bottom of this and call these witnesses before us.

Mr. President, today marks a somber milestone. It was 4 years ago today that President Bush ordered our military to launch a preemptive invasion of Iraq. I can recall the vote on the Senate floor—I have spoken of it many times—which led to that decision by the President. We cast thousands of votes as Members of the Senate, the House, and most of them are hard to remember. One can never forget a vote cast about war. You know people will die as a result of that decision. We focus on eliminating the enemy—as we do in our war in Afghanistan—but we know good American soldiers will give their lives as well, and innocent people will die.

I can remember well that decision. It was a tough one, a very difficult one. But now we face 4 years of this war having been completed. As of today, we start the fifth year of this war, a war that has lasted longer than World War II.

Yesterday, on the ABC News program ''This Week,'' Stephen Hadley, the President's National Security Adviser, was asked: If the President had known 5 years ago how much this war would cost—in dollars and in lives—would he have still ordered this invasion of Iraq?

Mr. Hadley replied:

> I think he would. The point is, this war has made the U.S. safer.

Those were the words of Stephen Hadley. Unfortunately, they are wrong.

A National Intelligence Estimate released last spring warns that the war in Iraq has helped create a whole new generation of terrorists around this world.

The latest report from the Defense Department confirms our troops are now trapped in a civil war. For the longest time, we danced around using the words ''civil war.'' But even that term does not adequately express the complexity of the deadly situation we find ourselves in today.

Before our military was diverted to fight this war of choice in Iraq, they had driven the Taliban from power in Afghanistan and splintered the leadership of al-Qaida. We were in the hunt for Osama bin Laden. We knew who was responsible for 9/11, and we were determined to get him and those who worked for him. We were on track to demolish the terrorists who brought such grief to our Nation on 9/11.

What is the story today? According to Mr. Hadley in his comments yesterday on television, the war has made us ''safer.'' The fact is, today al-Qaida is regrouping and the Taliban is still fiercely fighting for control of Afghanistan.

Our military—especially the Army—is stretched to the breaking point.

There is not one Active or Reserve Army combat unit outside of Iraq and Afghanistan today that is rated ''combat ready''—not one. If we were called on to respond to another military emergency in the world with our great military, they would be hard pressed to respond because they have been depleted in terms of personnel and resources and training and equipment by this war in Iraq.

National Guard units in Illinois and across the Nation have about one-third of the equipment they need to respond to a domestic crisis or to train for an overseas mission. A recent audit by the Department of Defense inspector general found the Pentagon has failed to properly equip the soldiers it already has in Iraq and Afghanistan. Many soldiers have found themselves short on guns and ammunition, body armor, communications equipment, armored vehicles, and electronic jammers to disable IEDs.

Two hours ago, I was at Walter Reed Hospital. I make visits there and try to meet with soldiers and talk to them about how they are doing. I go to the rehab unit where amputees are trying to learn to walk. Some have lost one leg, some two. Some have lost an arm. They are struggling to get their lives back together. These are real heroes for America, and they are profiles in courage, as they struggle every single day to try to put their lives back together again.

I sat down with a group of these soldiers, all of whom had lost a leg, in this rehab room. I went around, and I said: What happened to you? Each one of them said the same thing: Well, it was an IED that hit my humvee. It was an IED that hit my humvee. It was an IED that hit my humvee.

I thought to myself: When this war started, in my first visit to Walter Reed, I met a member of the Ohio National Guard who lost his left leg. He could not wait to get back to his unit. I doubted if he ever would. I asked him what happened? He said: Well, this homemade bomb, this IED, hit my humvee. That was 4 years ago, and we still have soldiers coming into our hospitals with similar injuries without the protection they need.

The President's response to this terrible situation is to order 30,000 more troops into battle.

We will pay for this war for the rest of our lives. But the people who have paid the highest price, by far, are the men and women of the military and their families. Many soldiers and marines, sailors and airmen in Iraq are on their second, even their third or fourth tour of duty. We are pushing them to the absolute limit. They have endured great danger. Their families have endured great hardships.

As of this morning, it is sad but must be reported that 3,210 American soldiers, including 123 from my home State of Illinois, have given everything. They have given their lives in Iraq.

This is a hallowed rollcall. These are the names of every Illinois servicemember killed in Iraq since the start of this war. As we begin the fifth year of this war, I ask unanimous consent to honor these great men and women by having printed immediately after my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this list of those Illinois brave soldiers and marines, airmen and sailors who have given their lives in Iraq.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DURBIN. In addition to these fallen heroes, thousands of our troops have come home with serious injuries, disabilities—blindness, amputations, and the signature injury of this war, traumatic brain injury. We have been outraged in recent weeks to read about the shabby way some of these wounded veterans have been treated.

I went out today and I asked to finally see this infamous Building 18, which is about a block away from Walter Reed Hospital. It is a rundown, old motel that our military took over. Under Secretary Rumsfeld, they had this passion to privatize—taking the men and women who were responsible for maintaining this building and removing them and bringing in a private contractor. That is when the worst happened. The men and women who were involved in the private contract clearly did not do the job.

As a result, the Washington Post ran this well-publicized series about mold and mice droppings and evidence of bugs and the general rundown condition of Building 18—an outpatient facility for our soldiers at Walter Reed Hospital.

Every day, we learn—as I have learned back in Illinois—of wounded soldiers who have been denied proper medical care, housed in substandard and even deplorable living conditions, and forced to fight a massive bureaucracy and endure long waits for decisions about disability compensation. Meanwhile, their families suffer and many of the wounded soldiers go without medical care.

Sadly, these problems are not unique to Walter Reed, nor are they new to many of the top Pentagon officials.

Mark Benjamin is a reporter who has written some of the groundbreaking stories on the veterans health care crisis. He wrote an article in 2003, 4 years ago, about wounded National Guard soldiers being housed in sweltering cinder-block buildings at Fort Stewart in Georgia.

The Pentagon pledged then, in 2003, that no wounded soldier would be subjected to that shabby treatment again. That was 4 years ago. Yet 2 years later, in 2005, Jeff Romig, a physician's assistant from Danville, IL, and a captain in the Army National Guard, found himself living in similar conditions at a military base in Indiana after he ruptured his Achilles tendon during training.

Captain Romig had a cast on up to his hip following surgery, but he had to walk a half a mile on crutches every day to eat lunch. When it rained, mud washed into the cinder-block barracks and coated the cement floors where he was asked to live. His foot became infected. He has had five surgeries on it. He still has a hole in the back of his foot and his foot drops. He needs a brace to walk properly.

When he was released from active duty, the Army told Captain Romig the VA would pay for the brace. But then the Veterans' Administration refused. They told Captain Romig he was not entitled to VA health care until he received a disability rating, which takes 2 years. In the meantime, he would have to pay the bills himself or go without the brace and any other VA health care.

Now, who is Captain Romig? He happens to be a soldier who has served 23 years in the military—12 in the regular Army and 11 in the National Guard. He was one of the lucky ones, though. Through his employer he had private health coverage. They paid for the brace and his medical care when the VA and our Government failed him.

He worries about other wounded veterans. In an e-mail he sent me recently, he said:

> Who is going to help pay the bills for a soldier's family if he or she is disabled? The mortgage companies won't wait two years to receive their payment and the VA made it perfectly clear to me that if I didn't pay my bill, they would send me to [a collection agency]; they don't want to wait two years for payment, either. So why should a soldier be expected to wait two years for care and financial assistance?

There is another story I would like to share. It is about SGT Garrett Anderson of Champaign, IL. He and his wife Sam share a similar worry. He is 30 years old. She is 29. They have a 6-month-old daughter. On Wednesday, they will celebrate their second wedding anniversary.

Three months after they were married, he went to Iraq with the Illinois National Guard. Four months after that, an IED exploded next to his armored humvee in Baghdad.

The blast tore off Sergeant Anderson's right arm below the elbow, shattered his jaw, severed part of his tongue, took away much of his hearing, and punctured his body with shrapnel.

He spent 7 months at Walter Reed, and he praises the care that was given him there recently in Ward 57. He said the amputee ward could not have treated him better. I have heard the same thing. There are many outstanding individuals at Walter Reed who should not be lumped into the critical articles about Building 18. These are men and women, medical professionals, who are literally working miracles every day on these soldiers. So criticizing the situation at Walter Reed should not bring them in as well. Many of them are extraordinary and receive the highest praise from men and women who are treated there.

But after the treatment at Walter Reed for Sergeant Anderson, the months of outpatient care that followed were filled with ''massive paperwork and red tape.'' After 3 years in the Army and 4 in the National Guard, Garrett Anderson finally retired from the military last June.

Last week, 9 months later, he received his disability rating from the VA. You will recall the injuries I told you he sustained. His disability rating, after waiting, 90 percent. His wife Sam said the VA ruled that some of her husbands's shrapnel wounds were not service related because Walter Reed had not taken the time to document each and every one of them.

The Andersons are appealing the rating. They are hoping for a 100-percent disability rating, which would make Sergeant Anderson eligible for better health coverage and other benefits. Do you know how long that appeal will take? Two years—2 more years for Sergeant Anderson to wait to determine whether the VA is going to rate him as 100 percent disabled.

In the meantime, he is looking for a civilian doctor with experience treating amputees, and doing without the speech therapy and PTSD counseling he needs.

He is also going to college. His wife is trying to finish law school. They are both speaking out to try to change the system. Here is what his wife Sam says:

> Each obstacle renews our desire to fix the system so that future soldiers can serve proudly and take comfort knowing that their country will take care of them just as they took care of their country.

I applaud Defense Secretary Gates for the decisive steps he has taken to fix the problems at Walter Reed and to determine how widespread they are. But firing a few people—even a few generals—is not enough. The stories about wounded soldiers being mistreated raise serious questions about our planning for this war, about the capacity of the Pentagon and the VA to deal with the long-term health needs of our soldiers—post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, amputations. Ten years ago, the VA could never have anticipated all these challenges. Today they face them.

Every year since the war in Iraq began, the President has failed to request adequate funding for the VA. The President's proposed budget for next year would enable the VA to serve 54,000 Iraq and Afghanistan veterans—54,000. It sounds like a large number. It is. But it is 50,000 patients short of the VA's expected demand.

The President's budget provides for half of what is needed. Unbelievably, it would cut funding for defense health facilities such as Walter Reed by 13 percent. I think about that $12 billion in cash—$12 billion in U.S. taxpayer dollars—that was flown into Iraq and cannot be accounted for, sent to Mr. Bremer and his Coalition Provisional Authority. How far would that money go to help the VA?

Here is another great statistic. In late January, the Army Times reported that in the last few years, the number of soldiers approved for permanent disability retirement decreased by more than two-thirds—from 642 in 2001, to 209 in 2005. Think about that: a two-thirds drop in permanent disability ratings in the midst of a war? It does not make sense.

With the horrific wounds our troops are suffering—and thanks to the outstanding care they receive in the field—surviving, how can permanent disability rates be declining? Declining disability rates are part of the pattern of failing to plan properly for this war.

I know Dr. David Chu, who is an economist and mathematician by training, and he holds one of the top positions at the Pentagon. He is the Under Secretary for Defense for Personnel and Readiness. He is one of the two top Pentagon officials responsible for making sure that returning vets receive prompt outpatient care and fair compensation.

In January 2005, Dr. Chu told the Wall Street Journal that America was spending too much on benefits for soldiers and veterans. He said:

> The amounts have gotten to the point where they are hurtful. They are taking away from the Nation's ability to defend itself.

The truth is, health care and disability benefits for wounded soldiers are not threats to our national security; they are an essential part of the cost of war and part of our national security. Somehow the Pentagon has to come to realize this.

I want to tell my colleagues one more story and then turn the floor over to my colleague from Arkansas. This is about an Illinois soldier, Army 1LT Terry Peterson of Warrenville, IL. I first met Lieutenant Peterson in January 2006 when he was recuperating at Walter Reed. I invited him to come to the President's State of the Union Address last year as my guest. He was 23 years old. He is a graduate of the Citadel. From the time he was a little boy, he wanted to be a soldier.

On December 8, 2005, 3 weeks after he arrived in Iraq, an IED ripped apart a humvee in which he was riding in Baghdad. The blast killed one soldier in the humvee and nearly killed Lieutenant Peterson. It shattered his right foot, ripped three knuckles off his right hand, and severed an artery in his left arm. He has had 20 surgeries so far. If he is lucky, he will only need two more surgeries. He has five screws in his foot, and he deals with pain all the time. He can't stand for more than 30 minutes, and it will take a miracle for him to ever be able to run again.

Lieutenant Peterson received outpatient care at Walter Reed for 9 months. Someone from home was always with him—usually his mother, his girlfriend, or his sister—trying to cut through the redtape, trying to make sure he received the very best care. His mom spent $8,000 flying back and forth between Illinois and Washington to be with her son. Lieutenant Peterson spent $10,000 out of pocket to rent hotel rooms near Walter Reed for 6 months because there was no room for him in the infamous Building 18. He has yet to be reimbursed for that expenditure. The Army says he still needs to turn in more paperwork.

Terry Peterson suffers from PTSD. He didn't see a psychiatrist until months after his injury, and then only because his father insisted. When he went back for a follow-up appointment a month later, they told him his records had been lost.

Today Lieutenant Peterson is back at Fort Stewart in Georgia waiting to finish his surgeries and get his disability rating to leave the Army. He says:

> It took me a long time to stop making excuses for the system.

Some days he says he feels like he was abandoned by the Army. But he is determined to try to fix this system so other soldiers won't go through the same thing.

Before the State of the Union Address, some 15 months ago, Terry and I met with some reporters. Terry said: I don't know if I ought to say this, but I am a conservative and a Republican. He said:

> What I'm really looking forward to is just hearing that the President is behind us.

He said he didn't want the sacrifices that he and other soldiers had made to be for nothing.

As we enter the fifth year of this war, America needs to demonstrate to all our troops and families that we are behind them, and that takes more than words. It requires that we stand with our soldiers on the battlefield and when they come home wounded, for as long as they need our help.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM CASUALTIES LISTED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

Marine Corporal Brian Kennedy, 25, of Glenview, IL.

Marine Captain Ryan Anthony Beaupre, 30, of St. Anne, IL.

Marine Private Jonathan L. Gifford, 30, of Decatur, IL.

Marine Corporal Evan James, 20, La Harpe, IL.

Army Specialist Brandon Rowe, 20, of Roscoe, IL.

Army Reserve Specialist Rachael Lacy, 22, of Lynwood, IL.

Marine First Sergeant Edward Smith, 38, of Chicago, IL.

Army Staff Sergeant Lincoln Hollinsaid, 27, of Malden, IL.

Marine Lance Corporal Jakub Henryk Kowalik, 21, of Schaumburg, IL.

Marine Lance Corporal Nicholas Brian Kleiboeker, 19, of Iuka, IL.

Marine 1st Lieutenant Timothy Louis Ryan, 30, of North Aurora, IL.

Army Staff Sergeant Andrew R. Pokorny, 30, of Naperville, IL.

Army Private First Class Shawn Pahnke, 25, of Manhattan, IL.

Army Specialist Cory A. Hubbell, 20, of Urbana, IL.

Army Private Matthew Bush, 20, East Alton, IL.

Illinois Army National Guard Specialist Brandon Ramsey, 21, Calumet City, IL.
Army Pfc. Christopher A. Sisson, 20, of Oak Park, IL.
Army Spc. Ryan G. Carlock, 25, of Macomb, IL.
Illinois Army National Guard 1st Lt. Brian Silavenas, 30, of Genoa, IL.
Army Spc. John R. Sullivan, 26, of Countryside, IL.
Army Spc. William D. Dusenbery, 30, of Fairview Heights, IL.
Army Pvt. Scott M. Tyrrell, 21, of Sterling, IL.
Army Spc. Uday Singh, 21, of Lake Forest, IL.
Michigan Army National Guard Staff Sgt. Michael Sutter, 28, of Tinley Park, IL.
Marine Corps Captain Adam Miller, 29, of Midlothian, IL.
Army Sergeant First Class James Hoffman, 41, of Palatine, IL.
Illinois Army National Guard Sgt. Ivory L. Phipps, 44, of Chicago, IL.
Marine Pfc. Geoffrey S. Morris, 19, of Gurnee, IL.
Army Cpl. Forest J. Jostes, 22, of Albion, IL.
Marine Lance Cpl. Phillip E. Frank, 20, of Elk Grove, IL.
Army Reserve Spc. Gregory R. Goodrich, 37, of Bartonville, IL.
Marine Lance Cpl. Torrey L. Stoffel-Gray, 19, of Patoka, IL.
Army Pfc. Shawn C. Edwards, 20, of Bensenville, IL.
Army National Guard Sgt. Landis W. Garrison, 23, of Rapids City, IL.
Army Staff Sgt. Oscar D. Vargas-Medina, 32, of Chicago, IL.
Army Capt. John E. Tipton, 32, of Collinsville, IL.
Army National Guard Sgt. 1st Class William D. Chaney, 59, of Schaumberg, IL.
Army National Guard Spc. Jeremy L. Ridlen, 23, of Paris, IL.
Pfc. Jeffrey R. Wallace, 20, of Hoopeston, IL.
Army Maj. Paul R. Syverson III, 32, of Lake Zurich, IL.
Army 1st Sgt. Ernest E. Utt, 38, of Hammond, IL.
Army Sgt. Christopher A. Wagener, 24, of Fairview Heights, IL.
Army Pfc. Collier E. Barcus, 21, of McHenry, IL.
Army Pfc. Torry D. Harris, 21, of Chicago, IL.
Army Corporal Demetrius Rice, 24, of Chicago, IL.
Marine Lance Cpl. Jonathan W. Collins, 19, of Crystal Lake, IL.
Marine Cpl. Christopher Belchik, 30, of Jersey, IL.
Army Spc. Charles L. Neeley, 19, of Mattoon, IL.
Army National Guard Sgt. Shawna Morrison, 26, of Paris, IL.
Army National Guard Spc. Charles Lamb, 23, of Casey, IL.
Marine Lance Cpl. Drew M. Uhles, 20, of DuQuoin, IL.
Marine Sgt. Benjamin K. Smith, 24, of Carterville, IL.
Marine 2nd Lieutenant Ryan Leduc, 28, of Pana, IL.
Army Sgt. Jack T. Hennessy, 21, of Naperville, IL.
Army Spc. Jessica L. Cawvey, 21, of Mahomet, IL.
Army Spc. Jaime Moreno, 28, of Round Lake Beach, IL.
Marine Lance Cpl. Branden P. Ramey, 22, of Boone, IL.
Marine Cpl. Joshua D. Palmer, 24, of Blandinsville, IL.
Marine Sgt. David M. Caruso, 25, of Naperville, IL.
Marine Lance Cpl. Nicholas D. Larson, 19, of Wheaton, IL.
Marine Lance Cpl. Aaron C. Pickering, 20, of Marion, IL.
Marine Cpl. Peter J. Giannopoulos, 22, of Inverness, IL.
Marine Cpl. Matthew A. Wyatt, 21, of Millstadt, IL.
Army Sgt. Donald B. Farmer, 33, of Zion, IL.
Marine Lance Cpl. Neil D. Petsche, 21, of Lena, IL.
Marine Lance Cpl. Hector Ramos, 20, of Aurora, IL.
Marine Cpl. Nathaniel K. Moore, 22, of Champaign, IL.
Marine Cpl. Jonathan S. Beatty, 22, of Streator, IL.
Cpl. Christopher E. Zimny, 27, of Cook, IL.
Lance Cpl. Sean P. Maher, 19, of Grays Lake, IL.
Sgt. Jessica M. Housby, 23, of Rock Island, IL.
Marine Cpl. Kevin M. Clarke, 21, of Tinley Park, IL.
Marine Cpl. John T. Olson, 21, of Elk Grove Village, IL.
Army Staff Sgt. Daniel G. Gresham, 23, of Lincoln, IL.
Army Spc. Jacob C. Palmatier, 29, of Springfield, IL.
Army 2nd Lt. Richard B. Gienau, 29, of Peoria, IL.
Army Spc. Adriana N. Salem, 21, of Elk Grove Village, IL.
Army Sgt. Kenneth L. Ridgley, 30, of Olney, IL.
Army Pfc. Wyatt D. Eisenhauer, 26, of Pinckneyville, IL.
Army Spc. Brian M. Romines, 20, of Simpson, IL.
Navy Petty Officer 1st Class Thomas C. Hull, 41, of Princeton, IL.
Marine Gunnery Sgt. Terry W. Ball Jr., 36, of East Peoria, IL.
Army Spc. Miguel Carrasquillo, 25, of River Grove, IL.
Army 1st Lt. David L. Giaimo, 24, of Waukegan, IL.
Army Spc. Jeffrey A. Williams, 20, of Warrenville, IL.
Army Staff Sgt. Gary R. Harper Jr., 29, of Virden, IL.
Army Spc. James T. Grijalva, 26, of Burbank, IL.
Army 1st Lt. Debra A. Banaszak, 35, of Bloomington, IL.
Army Staff Sgt. Kyle B. Wehrly, 28, of Galesburg, IL.
Army Sgt. Joshua A. Terando, 27, of Morris, IL.
Pvt. Christopher M. Alcozer, 21, of DeKalb, IL.
Sgt. 1st Class Eric P. Pearrow, 40, of Peoria, IL.
Sgt. Grzegorz Jakoniuk, 25, of Schiller Park, IL.
Lance Cpl. Adam W. Kaiser, 19, of Naperville, IL.
Lance Cpl. Andrew G. Patten, 19, of Byron, IL.
Spc. Brian A. Wright, 19, of Keensburg, IL.
Sgt. 1st Class Shawn C. Dostie, 32, of Granite City, IL.
Lance Cpl. Jonathan K. Price, 19, of Woodlawn, IL.
Pfc. Sean T. Cardelli, 20, of Downers Grove, IL.
Lance Cpl. Philip J. Martini, 24, of Lansing, IL.
Sgt. Edward G. Davis III, 31, of Antioch, IL.
Spc. Ronald W. Gebur, 23, of Delavan, IL.
Pfc. Caleb A. Lufkin, 24, of Knoxville, IL.
Cpl. Ryan J. Cummings, 22, of Streamwood, IL.
Petty Officer 1st Class Gary T. Rovinski, 44, of Roseville, IL.
Sgt. Sirlou C. Cuaresma, 25, of Chicago, IL.
Staff Sgt. Mario J. Bievre, 34, of Constantinople, IL.
Cpl. Ryan J. Buckley, 21, of Nokomis, IL.
Sgt. Terry M. Lisk, 26, of Fox Lake, IL.
Sgt. Bradley H. Beste, 22, of Naperville, IL.
Sgt. Steven P. Mennemeyer, 26, of Granite City, IL.
Army Spc. Kristofer C. Walker, 20, of Creve Coeur, IL.
Spc. George R. Obourn Jr., 20, of Creve Coeur, IL.
Pvt. Edwardo J. Lopez, 21, of Aurora, IL.
Sgt. Thomas M. Gilbert, 24, of Downers Grove, IL.
Sgt. Kraig D. Foyteck, 26, of Skokie, IL.
Pfc. William R. Newgard, 20, of Arlington Heights, IL.
Senior Airman Daniel B. Miller Jr., 24, Galesburg, IL.
Petty Officer 1st Class Jennifer A. Valdivia, 27, of Cambridge, IL.
Capt. Kevin C. Landeck, 26, of Wheaton, IL.
Sgt. Pedro J. Colon, 25, of Cicero, IL.
SSG Paul M. Latourney, 28, of Roselle, IL.
Marine Lance Cpl. Raymond J. Holzhauer, of Dwight, IL.

Total OIF Casualties: 123 Soldiers

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I come to the floor to voice my strong support of S. 214, Preserving U.S. Attorneys Independence Act.

We all know the story by now. In the dead of night, the Justice Department slipped into the PATRIOT Act, which was under consideration in the House—it was in the conference, apparently, when this happened. They slipped in a provision to allow itself carte blanche authority to strategically handpick judges and bypass Senate confirmation, which I believe was done to carry out a political scheme to fire and replace U.S. attorneys. I don't say this lightly. We have seen the e-mails now. Most of my colleagues in the Senate and, in fact, most people around the country have seen all or some or bits and pieces of these e-mails. They are damning.

The Department of Justice has taken deliberate steps to mislead Senators and abuse its misbegotten authority. Put quite simply, we can't trust this administration to use its authority in a fair and constructive manner. They have proven that to us. It is time we restore justice at the Justice Department. We can begin that process with two steps: First, we can move this legislation to which I referred a moment ago very swiftly and restore the confirmation process that our Founding Fathers envisioned. Allowing interim U.S. attorneys to serve for a limited 120 days is a reasonable solution and will put an end to the slippery tactics of this administration and, might I say, future administrations.

By the way, I think one of the reasons we all should support this legislation is not because this administration—I think they have abused the law they have—but there is always that tendency for the President to try to bully something through the Senate. The easiest way of all is to get around the Senate completely and circumvent the Senate's authority which, by the language of the PATRIOT Act, as I mentioned, was slipped in. I think most Senators inadvertently allowed that to happen.

The second of these two steps I refer to is—I said this on the Senate floor the other day, and I still believe it—the Attorney General should resign. In an e-mail dated August 18, 2006, to the Attorney General's Chief of Staff, it says that we have a ''Senator problem'' in Arkansas. Well, guess who the Senator problem is. You are looking at him.

I was by that time making calls, checking around. I had heard these rumors that the Justice Department was going to fire Bud Cummins and was going to replace him with Tim Griffin, and we will get to that specific case in a moment. But the bottom line is that—I know I was the problem, but the bottom line is that today the Attorney General, Attorney General Gonzales, has a bigger problem than the junior Senator from Arkansas. He has a credibility problem. He has a trust problem. He has a growing national scandal problem. I think it is best for the Justice Department, for the administration, probably for all the U.S. attorneys and all the things that Justice does all around the country and, quite frankly, it is probably best for him as a person to go ahead and step down and move on.

The Attorney General is different from any other Cabinet-level officer. He is mentioned in the Constitution. This is a role that our Founding Fathers envisioned, I believe, to be about the pursuit of justice. The Attorney General should always be held to a higher standard. We should look to him—and we understand that the Attorney General is by nature a political appointment. That is the way the Founding Fathers set it up. But we also look to him to have integrity for that department and to not play politics with the office. He is a political appointee but not to play politics with that office.

One of the things that concerns me the most is some of the things I have been reading in these e-mails that have come out in the last several days between the White House and the Justice Department. Again, many of us have read these e-mails or read parts of them. They talk about the ''Bushies.'' They actually use that term in an e-mail. They talk about loyalty to the Bush administration and how that criteria is paramount in deciding whether to keep or to let go these U.S. attorneys.

Well, I would say this: that is exactly the wrong standard. There is no question in my mind that is the wrong standard. Again, being a U.S. attorney should not be about being loyal to the administration or being political; it should be the exact opposite. It should be about being nonpolitical and about being loyal to the Constitution and the law of the land; to be loyal to the duty you were sworn to uphold. I think this administration has it backwards.

I think U.S. attorneys on the local level have demonstrated over the last couple of centuries that they have been very good at trying to stay above politics and stay out of the political fray. Let me tell my colleagues, I have seen U.S. attorneys all over the country during my lifetime who have taken on very dicey, very difficult cases, and more often than not they do an outstanding job and are very professional in their pursuit of justice.

Things have changed with this administration. From the very top, they want the U.S. attorneys out in the districts, out in the 93 districts around the country to play politics. This is not a hypothetical situation. One would think hypothetically we would want to change this law we are talking about today to make sure those U.S. attorneys would qualify, to make sure they wouldn't play politics with their office, and one would think hypothetically it could be that at some point in the future, maybe some of these U.S. attorneys might decide to go after and prosecute and investigate people who are in the other party but not prosecute and investigate and go after people in their own party. That would be absurd. Apparently, according to these e-mails, that is exactly what was happening in at least some cases.

Let me speak for a moment—I know there are other Senators waiting to speak and, certainly, I want to give them plenty of time. But let me talk about the situation in Arkansas just for a few moments because it was the first one that I became aware of. In fact, it was the first one that any Senator became aware of.

I mentioned to the Judiciary Committee and very briefly to PAT LEAHY in the summer and in the early fall about some of the things I was hearing in Arkansas and that I had concerns because, by all accounts, from everything I understood, Bud Cummins, the then-U.S. attorney in the Eastern District of Arkansas, in Little Rock, had done a good job. Everybody I talked to in the legal community—the judges, people who are familiar with what that office does—thought Bud Cummins had been very professional and thought he had done his job. They thought he had done exactly what he was supposed to do.

I began hearing rumors over the summer that they were going to replace Bud Cummins with Tim Griffin. At that moment in time, I didn't know Tim Griffin. I am not sure I had ever met him. I don't think I had ever met him. I barely even knew who he was. I probably heard some people from Congressman Bozeman's office mention him, but I really had almost no knowledge or no recollection of who he was at all. That is all beside the point. I had never met him. I had been the attorney general in my State. I had been a practicing lawyer in Little Rock for a decade or more before I was attorney general, and I had never run across this guy in the legal community. It turns out nobody else had either because he really hadn't been in Arkansas but maybe about 1 year for his whole professional life; 1 out of maybe 15 years or something like that.

So the bottom line is he didn't have any stature in the legal community. People didn't know who he was. They didn't know anything about him. So that was my concern. I didn't know who he was. I knew he had a very political background. The first question I would have had is, can he check that at the door? And that is something I would want to talk to him about and I think the Senate Judiciary Committee would want to talk to him about. But the bottom line is from the very beginning, what I wanted—the President can nominate whomever he wants to nominate. That is his business. I think it would be smart to check with Senators before he makes a nomination, but it is his business. He can nominate whomever he wants.

From the very beginning, what I was asking for is that they nominate Tim Griffin and send him through the normal confirmation process. I think the people of the Eastern District of Arkansas are owed that. I think we owe it to them to do our best and to have the very best U.S. attorney there. He may be very qualified, but again, because he was an unknown and because he had no real presence in the Arkansas legal community, I thought certainly he was the type of guy who should go through the confirmation process.

So that is really what I have been saying from the very beginning, and this bill, S. 214, does that. It restores the traditional balance. I think that is a healthy balance. I think that is a good balance. I think it is something we need to go back to immediately.

Now, I mentioned Bud Cummins and Tim Griffin. Listen. In my mind this issue is much larger than those two people, and it is much larger than Democrats and Republicans. This issue is really fundamental to the Constitution; that is, should the Senate have the ability to confirm, give the advice and consent, on U.S. attorneys. I say the answer to that is, yes. I think that is something we as Senators should fight for. I think we need to do this to the best of our ability. We need to be fair. We need to move them through the process.

By and large, when one looks at the history of U.S. attorneys being confirmed, we haven't had big knockdown, drag-outs over U.S. attorneys. But given the fact that U.S. attorneys go through Senate confirmation, it keeps the administration honest on whom they nominate. I think that is a very important point.

Here again, with S. 214, we are trying to restore that balance that had worked so well before.

One last thing. In the e-mails you see, in my view, a real abuse of power. Over and over you see e-mails between the Justice Department and the White House, and among themselves, where they say they need to do this, and they need to have this appointment power, and if they don't use it, why in the world should they have it. There again, I think that approach to Government

is dangerous. It is shortsighted, and it seems to me someone who would make that type of statement is more interested in the power of the office rather than doing what is right. If there is one agency in the Federal Government about doing what is right, it ought to be the Department of Justice.

With all that said, I urge my colleagues to please support S. 214. It is good legislation. It restores the natural balance of what has worked so well for a long time around here. Once we can restore that natural balance, I think the people all over this country will feel better about their local U.S. attorney.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas, Mrs. LINCOLN, is recognized.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Madam President, I come to the floor this evening as a cosponsor of Senator FEINSTEIN's legislation, S. 214, regarding the interim appointment of U.S. attorneys. I am here this evening to vigorously restate my support for this bill and urge my colleagues to support its passage. I signed on to this legislation in January following the interim appointment of Tim Griffin as U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas, who replaced former U.S. Attorney Bud Cummins.

I take this opportunity to compliment Senator PRYOR, who has done a tremendous job in working with Senator FEINSTEIN and others on this legislation. His background as attorney general in our State, along with his real ability within the Senate to work through these issues to bring a calm and respectful response to the concerns that exist here has been a tremendous asset to this body in being able to bring the bill forward. I thank him and compliment him so much for his service. I am very proud to serve alongside him here in the Senate.

When the Congress reauthorized the PATRIOT Act last year, we granted the administration the authority to appoint U.S. attorney vacancies on an interim basis. Remember, this was for emergency circumstances. The administration asked for this authority based upon the idea that if a national security issue arose requiring a new U.S. attorney, the Attorney General could step up and provide a replacement in a time of crisis without the delay of the confirmation process. For those of us who come from places such as Arkansas, close to Oklahoma, the Oklahoma City bombing comes to mind where a Federal building may be destroyed, and all of a sudden you need to make sure the proper authorities in public service are in place to be able to continue to serve the public there. So we have certainly references of where emergencies might occur. But in these instances we have seen reviewed, I don't think anybody else could substantiate a real emergency circumstance.

One of the first questions I asked the Justice Department, when they asked to do an interim appointment so quickly, was: Was there an emergency in this situation? I had not heard about one.

In a January Senate Judiciary hearing, Attorney General Gonzales stated this emergency provision would not be used for political purposes or to circumvent the nomination process. Yet how else could it be explained?

Furthermore, the Attorney General pledged he would work with home State Senators to provide replacement U.S. attorneys. I listened to the Attorney General's comments, but we now know the actions of his Justice Department in recent months do not match the rhetoric he delivered.

Specific information revealed last week shows the Justice Department deliberately and deftly planned to circumvent the rules for appointing U.S. attorneys by politicizing the emergency provision we authorized.

In one e-mail exchange between White House staff and officials at the Department of Justice, the administration specifically plotted to ''gum this to death'' and otherwise to ''run out the clock'' in an effort to avoid the confirmation process to replace former U.S. Attorney Bud Cummins in Arkansas.

These actions are a disservice to the Justice Department, to this administration, and to all Americans. They demonstrate a willful lack of transparency and respect for the system of checks and balances our forefathers instituted. They foresaw the need to make sure the three coequal branches of Government would remain separate, that there would be a balance and a check to make sure these different branches of our Government were operating as they should.

I recognize the U.S. attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President and they are political appointees. Lord, we have heard that ad nauseam in this debate, that these U.S. attorneys serve at the pleasure of the President. But that does not mean they can politicize the law. It does not mean they serve the President and they serve in these positions for political purposes. They serve in these positions as stewards of the law of this land. They serve in these positions as public servants to defend the rule of law in this country. However, they have a duty and a responsibility, as well, to implement the laws of our Nation without political favor or bias.

That is why the confirmation process is so very important, to ensure that nominees are qualified and are committed to the rule of law. We know they are going to be nominees of the President and that perhaps they certainly are acquaintances or those whom the President or administration would know, but they still have to be qualified and they still have to be able to implement the rule of law. It is an important check and balance that has served our Nation well, and any attempt to undermine it represents a breakdown in our system.

The e-mails released last week show either a blatant attempt to deceive the Senate or, at the very least, serious mismanagement under the Attorney General. This controversy has caused a serious breach between the Justice Department, Congress and, most importantly, the American people—a breach I am not sure can be repaired if Mr. Gonzales remains Attorney General.

That is why I am here this evening to preserve the Senate's role in the confirmation process and to restore our system to the way our forefathers envisioned it.

I compliment Senators FEINSTEIN, LEAHY, and SPECTER for their leadership on this issue. This bill represents a compromise on this issue, and the bipartisan leadership they have shown should serve as an example to this entire body.

I also thank the numerous U.S. attorneys and their staffs all across this great Nation for the critical work they do to protect our communities by enforcing the laws of our Nation. Far too often, they do not receive the credit they deserve.

It is unfortunate the Senate is having to set aside time to debate this legislation because we have so many pressing priorities that must be addressed as this year progresses. Yet we have had to step aside and look at what has gone wrong and how we can prevent it from happening again.

How has this breach of trust affected our overall system? Most importantly, we have to look at what it has done to the sentiments of the American people—those who want desperately to trust us, to trust those of us in the legislative branch, to trust those in the executive branch, and to trust those in the judicial branch to do our jobs, to be there for them as part of the American democracy and what it is we stand for in this country, so they can trust that the laws we create will be implemented without political bias, and that we would work together as branches of Government.

When we look at, unfortunately, what has happened, the mismanagement that has occurred time and time again, from this administration particularly—whether it was the civilian mismanagement we saw early on in Iraq, or the mismanagement of FEMA in Katrina, and the response the Government has to the people of the gulf region, we look at these areas where the mismanagement that occurred has eroded the faith of the American people in this incredible democracy we are all so proud of.

Our democracy relies on independent and unbiased law enforcement. It is our duty to ensure that these problems are corrected. I encourage my colleagues to support Senator FEINSTEIN's bill, S. 214.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, first, I thank the Senator from

Iowa for his courtesy in allowing me to proceed.

I rise to commend Chairman LEAHY of our Judiciary Committee, and Senators CHUCK SCHUMER and DIANNE FEINSTEIN, my senior Senators on that committee, for their very deep concern about the politicization of the Department of Justice by the Bush administration.

As you know, I am new to this body, but having served as Rhode Island's U.S. attorney for 4 years, I want to share some thoughts based on that experience.

First, I want to point out that even if everything the administration has said about their firing of these U.S. attorneys were true—and we certainly have cause to doubt that—there is still a very real concern here that merits the attention of this body over the independence of the U.S. attorneys.

My experience convinces me—and it convinces me firmly—that Main Justice and the U.S. attorneys in the field check and balance each other in a way that is very healthy for the administration of justice in this country. Even if the mass firings—the purge of U.S. attorneys—had been done to punish policy differences with the Department of Justice, the firings would still defeat that healthy check and balance.

Bear in mind that nothing has been shown that suggests the exercise of graduated discipline one would expect in any kind of a well-managed setting. For instance, Carol Lam was ostensibly fired for not prosecuting enough low-level immigration cases. But when she was here testifying before us, she testified she was not told that when she was fired; nor, evidently, was she ever told beforehand this issue was a serious problem for her or that it might cost her job.

Even enemy ships usually get a warning shot. So the message of these firings to the U.S. attorneys from the Bush administration is this: You serve at our whim. You displease us at your peril. A sudden firing awaits you if you cross us.

That is a very bad message to send in the context of this traditional balance. Intimidation by purge is a tactic far better suited for a Soviet ministry of justice than for the U.S. Department of Justice—that is, if everything they have said is true, which brings us now to the question of the Department of Justice telling the truth.

Let me start by saying, as I have said to the Attorney General directly, unless you are first a department of truth, you will never be a Department of Justice. Without truth, there can be no justice. We know already—because they have admitted it—the Department of Justice came before the Senate days ago and told us things that were not true. We also know they have said things that are inconsistent. They have not yet told us which statement is true and which statement is not true, but they have said things that cannot both be true. At least one must inevitably be false. We also know they have said things that boggle the imagination. Perhaps they are true, but it seems mighty unlikely.

The big question within this shameful cloud of admitted falsehood, inevitable falsehood, and probable falsehood is this: What truth hides behind the bodyguard of lies? Is it this: U.S. attorneys who prosecuted public corruption cases against Republicans or those who did not bring public corruption cases against Democrats were terminated with extreme political prejudice? Is that what made them fail the Department of Justice test that they be ''loyal Bushies''? Is that what made Carol Lam a ''real problem'' for the Department of Justice on the day Republican corruption indictments were announced?

Like dead flesh that must be excised before a wound can heal, like rotten wood that must be scraped away before rebuilding can begin, the cloud of falsehood that now wraps around the Department of Justice must be dispelled. It must first, again, become a department of truth or else it can never again be our American Department of Justice. We cannot tolerate a Department of Justice or an Attorney General who will not give the complete truth and face the consequences.

I think at least three questions must be pursued by the Judiciary Committee or, if and when necessary, the entire Senate.

One, let's review authoritatively the historic relationship between U.S. attorneys and the Department of Justice, if necessary with expert assistance from historians and input from U.S. attorneys who served in past administrations.

The President of the United States has said this selective mass firing of U.S. attorneys is—this is his quote—''customary practice.'' As a former U.S. attorney myself, I believe that statement by the President of the United States to be false. His own Department of Justice officials seem to have conceded in their e-mail traffic that it is false. But let's take a thorough look because—I should not have to state the obvious—our President should not be saying things that are not true and also because that historic balance between independent U.S. attorneys serving in the field, in their districts, before their judges, and knowing their communities, against the group here in Washington that runs Main Justice, that historic balance has value which should not be destroyed.

Two, let's get the full, exact, unvarnished truth of what happened, and let's fix accountability for things that were said that were false. Falsehood has no place within the halls of the Department of Justice. Whatever needs to be done to dispel the clouds of falsehood, we must do.

Three, if, indeed, the worst is to be feared and this Department has infected its pursuit of political corruption with partisan bias, let's find that out. Let's start by looking at the cold, hard, numerical statistics on public corruption matters under this administration, again with expert help, if necessary, and certainly with full regard for the confidentiality of such investigations, and let's see what the factual record is and what it suggests. We can then proceed as necessary.

God forbid this should be so, but the air is thick with reasonable suspicion which must be laid to rest, and if the worst should prove true, God forbid the Senate fail in its duty to preserve, protect, and defend the integrity of our Government where its integrity should least be questioned—in the U.S. Department of Justice.

I look forward to working with my learned colleagues on the Judiciary Committee to do whatever is necessary to restore the honor and credibility of a once-proud department and the tradition of its able and independent U.S. attorney corps. In the meantime, I hope we will all support Senator FEINSTEIN's commendable legislation, S. 214, to close the PATRIOT Act loophole that may have invigorated the Bush administration in its unprecedented assault on the U.S. attorney corps.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). The distinguished Senator from Iowa.

THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION: CANCEL THE CHAMPAGNE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, every year hundreds of thousands of Americans come to our Nation's Capital for what will be for many a once-in-a-lifetime vacation. A highlight of that visit for most families is seeing the Smithsonian museums.

The Smithsonian, as everybody knows, is home to many of our Nation's treasures, from Lincoln's top hat to the Hope Diamond. I have a picture of the Hope Diamond here. The Smithsonian receives over 70 percent of its support from the Federal taxpayers, over $700 million a year of taxpayers' money just in the last year. In addition, the Smithsonian receives over $200 million in donations each year. These donations are tax deductible, so the taxpayers also subsidize these charitable gifts as well. Thus, Federal taxpayers either pay for or subsidize almost the entire Smithsonian budget. Given that money is fungible, when taxpayers' dollars are paying for one thing at the Smithsonian, that frees up other money for the Smithsonian to spend elsewhere.

Despite the strong support the Smithsonian receives, the Government Accountability Office recently found in a record that there was significant damage to Smithsonian buildings and some exhibits because of water leakage. In fact, one of the Smithsonian buildings on the Mall, the Arts and Industry Building, has been closed to the public because of damage to the roof.

The Smithsonian seems, on one hand, to have recognized the need to tell their employees they need to pinch

pennies. The Washington Post, in a story in this morning's paper, cites a Smithsonian memo sent to employees urging them to save energy by turning off decorative and accent lighting.

Unfortunately, while the rank-and-file at the Smithsonian and the strength of this great institution were told to count the pennies and turn off the lights, the Secretary of the Smithsonian, Mr. Lawrence Small, was throwing hundreds of thousands of dollars out the window. Money was thrown at his house, his office, and first-class travel for Mr. Small and his wife.

One of the great treasures in the Smithsonian is Dorothy's ruby slippers from ''The Wizard of Oz,'' as shown in this picture. What Dorothy learned in that classic movie is that ''there is no place like home.''

Just like for Dorothy, for Mr. Small, there is no place like home. The Secretary of the Smithsonian has taken that sentiment to heart, spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on paintings, repairs, house cleaning, lawn service, even his cable, and presenting the bill to the Smithsonian for payment.

The Smithsonian Board of Regents wants to justify the million-dollar-plus in expenses paid for at Mr. Small's house, which he owns, because the Board of Regents claims he does official Smithsonian entertainment at his home.

What are some of the expenditures at Mr. Small's house? Perhaps most incredible is that the Smithsonian has paid for roof repairs for the Small's house at a time when the Smithsonian can't find the money to fix the roof at the Smithsonian museum. But along with the roof, let me list some other items we are paying for: a chandelier cleaning for $2,535; a pool heater for $4,225.77; three new French doors for $14,525.

Having the taxpayers and the Smithsonian donors pay for what I describe as a champagne lifestyle? Priceless.

Let me turn now to Mr. Small's office at the Smithsonian castle because he has turned that castle into a palace. Again, the Smithsonian tells its hard-working employees that they need to save every cent possible by turning down the lights but wasted every dollar possible on Mr. Small's office suite.

We have just one example here. These chairs reported in the Washington Post this morning are ''probably some of the best quality chairs you can buy.'' Those are the words of the Washington Post. These chairs are $2,000 each. There is a conference table for $13,000, thousands of dollars on carpeting and upholstery, and even finding the money to spend $1,502 on a wall sconce. I don't know if they turn that off, as he has told the employees to turn off lights.

In addition, Mr. Small has decorated his office suite with enough paintings and artifacts from the Smithsonian collection that it would be the envy of many museums. Making one's personal office a museum annex goes against the best practices of museum directors. The Smithsonian's collection is for the people's enjoyment, not for private enjoyment.

It is a sad statement of the Secretary and the board's priorities when one of the newest rooms at the Smithsonian is the Secretary's office—this at a time when the Smithsonian is struggling to keep the buildings open.

In addition to spending on his house and office, what hasn't been reported yet are the enormous amounts of funds spent on top-of-the-line travel by both Mr. and Mrs. Small. The accountant hired by the inspector general found example after example of Mr. Small and his wife traveling with expenses that far exceeded what Federal employees are allowed to spend. I will highlight just two trips for my colleagues, but I want you to know there are many more about which I could speak.

Mr. Small and his wife decided to take a trip to Las Vegas in 2002. The reason ostensibly was to attend the opening of a portrait and a press conference. That, of course, meant a $3,464.50 first-class airline ticket for each. They then stayed at one of the best hotels in Las Vegas, the Venetian, at nearly $500 a night, and enjoyed a $170.79 dinner for two at the Belaggio.

They say what happens in Vegas stays in Vegas, but I am going to make an exception. I posted on the Finance Committee Web site these travel vouchers.

While the Vegas getaway is bad enough, I think the trip to California in 2001 shows a real window into the problems at the Smithsonian. Mr. Small spent over $2,800 in chauffeured limousine service in 4 days, including a whopping $1,319 in 1 day. I want everybody to know I have a car I would be glad to sell to the Smithsonian for what they paid for that car service.

What is even worse, if that is possible, is the excuse given for this out-of-control spending.

In a memo justifying the car service in California, the claim is made that there would be ''a safety risk for [Small] to carry as much cash as would have been needed to pay for a taxi. . . .'' Even children who claim dogs ate the homework are embarrassed by that excuse. These are very serious problems, and I would say the more we look, the worse it gets in regard to the leadership at the Smithsonian.

I am pleased that the Smithsonian Board of Regents is announcing today the creation of two boards: one a group of outsiders to review the work of the board, and a second group, comprised I understand mostly of Board of Regents members to look at board governance at the Smithsonian.

I am pleased that the Board of Regents is taking these needed steps. I may not agree with the members of the board and how they have handled things, but let me say that I have looked at the governance setup, established over 100 years ago for the Board of Regents, and I feel that architecture is one of the biggest dinosaurs in the Smithsonian. We have to look at that architecture of that governance. The board structures and duties have clearly not kept up with the times in terms of the best governance practices in the nonprofit sector.

In addition, the board's actions of blessing, after the fact, of Mr. Small's expenditures and actions is extremely troubling. In my State of Iowa, we call this the legislature passing a ''legalization act,'' and it raises very real concerns in my mind of whether the board is running the Smithsonian and its secretary or whether the Secretary is running the board.

The actions of the Smithsonian Board of Regents calls to mind my work with some problems with the American Red Cross. This is another organization on which I have conducted oversight. I am pleased that the Senate recently passed legislation that I sponsored that reforms the governance of the American Red Cross. The Red Cross is a great American institution that also needed to modernize its governance, and I worked closely and successfully with the Red Cross leadership and was pleased that they recognized the need for fundamental change. I hope the Smithsonian Institution will look at the Red Cross's experience for guidance.

While the board has much to account for, that does not excuse where the responsibility lies—with the Secretary of the Smithsonian, Mr. Small. While the board should have been more vigilant in its work and overseeing its public trust, make no mistake, it is Mr. Small who ordered the champagne and handed the bill to the Smithsonian.

So let's put to rest this argument that I have heard from some that Mr. Small should not be held accountable for his actions because the board allowed it to happen. I think that excuse is way beyond the pale. We have a right to expect the Secretary of the Smithsonian to have the common sense to know if he wants Dom Perignon, he needs to pay for it out of his own pocket.

The other argument I hear is that Mr. Small should be excused of his taxpayer-supported lifestyle because he has raised money. First, let's remember that 70 percent of the dollars come from the Federal Government. Secondly, I think it is insulting that Mr. Small's supporters are trying to give him credit for every dollar raised at the Smithsonian. There are dozens of people being paid top dollar at the Smithsonian, including the museum directors, to help raise money as well. They are all helping to pull that very big weight.

Finally, Mr. Small's supporters act as if no one raised a dime before he showed up. The Smithsonian is our Nation's great museum. Many patriotic Americans want to show their support and give to this institution regardless

of who is in charge, if they have the confidence that the money is going to be spent wisely. For example, the Smithsonian received $123 million in donations in 1999, and that was more than double the amount the year before in 1998. This included, by the way, $60 million from Steven Udvar-Hazy to build the new Air and Space Museum near the Dulles Airport, as well as $10 million from Ralph Lauren to preserve the Star-Spangled Banner. All of this fundraising was done before Mr. Small's arrival.

Thanks to the growing economy and new tax laws that I have helped champion that encourage greater charitable giving, it should be expected that charitable giving will be up at the Smithsonian. In fact, charitable giving is up across the country.

The supporters of Mr. Small who want to point to fundraising to wash away the thousands of dollars spent painting Mr. Small's own house reminds me of the rooster who crows and thinks he caused the Sun to rise.

The Smithsonian is the people's museum, and it contains America's treasures. The American people have a right to have someone as a Secretary of the Smithsonian who enjoys their confidence. I believe the Secretary of the Smithsonian has lost the confidence of the American people with his actions, actions that have been contrary to the public trust that he has been given. It is proper and needed for the Board of Regents to take a hard look at itself and the actions from the board. More immediately, however, I would suggest the Board of Regents needs to consider whether the Secretary of the Smithsonian should continue in his position, a position that he should continue in only if he has the trust and confidence of the American people and their representatives.

I think the board itself has learned a lot recently, and if the Board of Regents looks closely at the facts and listens to what the people are saying, it will have to consider very hard whether the time has come to turn off the lights in the Office of the Secretary of the Smithsonian.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, first, I have had the opportunity to listen to my colleague from the great State of Iowa, and I want to tell Senator GRASSLEY that I couldn't agree with him more in the speech he just gave concerning the leadership of the Smithsonian museum. I find it is not dissimilar to some of the problems we found from time to time with college presidents of public universities, that somehow we get off the beaten path in terms of taxpayer funding. I certainly commend him for the work he is doing in that area.

I rise this afternoon, however, to talk a little bit about something that is so close to the heart of our democracy, and that is the rule of law. As a very young lawyer out of law school, I was very blessed to have the opportunity to begin my legal career as an assistant prosecuting attorney in the courtrooms of Jackson County, in Kansas City, MO. I learned so much in those first few years that I toiled as an assistant prosecutor. I had a felony docket, and I was learning from great prosecutors. It is inspiring when I think back on the quality of legal work that was going on in those courtrooms on behalf of the public by the prosecuting attorneys who worked there for very little money.

I was mentored on the rules of evidence and on courtroom strategy, but, most importantly, I was mentored on the rules as they relate to the ethics of a prosecutor. Where is that line and how do you draw it? How does a prosecutor make the decision as to whether this is justice in terms of a sentence or this is not justice, and it must be put in the hands of a jury when you are trying to decide plea bargains. Charging decisions: how do you decide when someone is charged with a felony or whether you let it go with a misdemeanor, or perhaps not charge at all?

Those lessons were so fundamental to the work that was done. It was from that experience that I began to revere—revere the rule of law in the United States of America. It is fundamental to our democracy. It is the engine that runs our democracy. It is the envy of the rest of the world.

As I have traveled from time to time in other countries, I have seen this firsthand. I will never forget a time when I was in a foreign country and we got pulled over by a police officer. We asked the native who was helping us around the country that day: What is this? He said we have to pay him. I remember thinking to myself how fortunate we are in America that there isn't an ingrained system of bribery on the streets of our cities because we have this rule of law.

What is the heart of the rule of law? At its very essence, if you strip away everything else, what is core and central to the rule of law? It is the independent prosecutor. It doesn't matter if you become a prosecutor by election or selection. Once you take that oath, once you raise your hand and swear to the job that you are about to take, you must become blindfolded to any political considerations. You must see all lawbreakers as equal whether the lawbreaker is a Congressman, a police officer, or a high school dropout who is unemployed.

What is so offensive about the e-mail traffic that has been discovered at the Department of Justice surrounding the firing of eight prosecutors in the Federal criminal justice system has been their reference to loyalty—''loyal Bushies''—loyalty to the President and, by implication, to his party.

Prosecutors I have known, and I am lucky that I have known hundreds, have loyalty to only one thing, and that is to the law. Good American prosecutors are slaves to the facts of the case and loyal only to the law of this great country. They have great power, prosecutors in our country. The decisions they make, as they apply those facts to our law, can achieve justice. Those same decisions can also ruin lives.

What is happening right now in the United States as it relates to these eight U.S. attorneys, frankly, isn't that important in the grand scheme of things to those eight U.S. attorneys, or those eight prosecutors. Am I sorry that they have been caught up in what appears to be a political scandal as it relates to their firing? Am I sorry that they have been maligned, and it was said that they were underperforming when, in reality, this was about being a ''loyal Bushie''?

By the way, I am quoting the e-mail when I say ''loyal Bushie.'' That is the only reason I would use that term on the floor of the Senate, quoting that document.

What really is happening is very important to all the other prosecutors across the United States of America, particularly those prosecutors in the Federal system because, frankly, what the Justice Department is implying is if you still have your job as U.S. attorney, you are loyal to the President of the United States and that is why you kept your job; not that you were loyal to the law. The Attorney General's action implies they kept their jobs because they were loyal to the President.

It is not OK to judge a prosecutor through a prism of political loyalty. The facts show that these decisions included discussions of the prosecutor's loyalty to the President, and because of that fact, and that fact alone, the Attorney General owes them and the rest of America much more than an apology. He owes them his resignation.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER SENATOR TOM EAGLETON

Also, as a young prosecutor, I was very fortunate to have a man who was a mentor to me and continued to be a mentor until, very sadly, the end of his life just a few days ago. He was a great politician, and there is no place he would prefer to be called that than on the floor of the Senate.

There is a hole in the heart of Missouri with the death of Senator Tom Eagleton. He was a giant among leaders and leaves a legacy that should guide public servants and Senators for generations to come.

Beginning in 1956, at the age of 27, he also became a prosecutor. He was elected the prosecutor of St. Louis city, a circuit attorney. In a brief 12-year span, he became elected prosecutor of St. Louis, went on to be elected to the attorney general's position and then on to Lieutenant Governor and on to U.S. Senate—a whirling dervish of energy, intellect, and ambition.

In 1968, when Missourians sent our ''boy wonder'' to Washington, we knew he would achieve greatness, and he certainly didn't disappoint us. Within his first term, he had already begun to turn the tide on the environmental damage that had ensued within the

half century after the industrial revolution by helping craft the Clean Air Act of 1970 and the Clean Water Act of 1972. He was a strong advocate for children with disabilities and created the National Institute on Aging.

While much of what Senator Eagleton did in the Senate made a true impact on America and the world, no action may have been as great as his handwritten amendment that stopped the bombing in Cambodia. This courageous act changed the course of history by subsequently ending the Vietnam war. His complete grasp of the complexities of foreign policy continued until his death.

As he talked to me in February of 2005 and tried to convince me to run for the Senate, he said to me: Claire, this war in Iraq is a disaster and, believe me, it is going to get much worse before it gets better.

Even in the later years of his life, he was a virtual fountain of information about foreign policy across the world. Despite the fact that Senator Eagleton was a scholar at Amherst College in Massachusetts and Oxford and a cum laude graduate from Harvard Law School and prominent attorney and politician, he could relate to anybody. ''Just call me Tom,'' he would always say, with a warm grin and a firm handshake. That was his style—plainspoken, genuine, and usually the funniest man in the room.

His ability to be the voice of everyday Americans was the reason he was elected to three terms in the U.S. Senate and the same reason it was so hard for him to leave public service in 1986. But, characteristically, he left office with very modest words. He said:

> There is no sadness in leaving public life while you still have something worthwhile to do and the time and motivation to do it.

And that he certainly did. In the famous style and personality that was Tom Eagleton, he went from public office but not from public life. A university lecturer, political commentator, writer, philanthropic fundraiser, community advocate, sports enthusiast, Tom continued to pursue dreams of a different kind.

While Tom shied away from claiming due credit, his good friend and colleague from the other side of the aisle, Senator John Danforth, summed up his amazing political career by saying:

> What has set Tom Eagleton apart from the rest of us is not his intellect and his energy, as impressive as they are. It is his moral passion, his capacity for outrage, his insistence that justice be done, that wrongs be made right.

More than what Americans gained from his victories, achievements, degrees, and accolades is the lessons we find in his words that we can take into the future:

> Be civil and modest. Act with courage and integrity. Pursue your dreams and do right by your neighbors. And most of all, don't take yourself too seriously.

His memorial service was a wonderful tribute to Tom Eagleton. We all laughed and we cried. Some giants from the Senate were in attendance, and some Democratic ward workers from a nearby political ward who had been working the phones and putting up yard signs for 30, 40 years—all sat together and listened to great stories about a great man.

We all appreciated the fact that Senator Tom Eagleton wanted the last word. So, a year before his death, he wrote a letter—I would like to make it part of the RECORD today—that everyone who attended the memorial service was lucky enough to receive. It talks about his life, it talks about his service in the Senate, it talks about the things that were important to him, and about his family—which was most important to him. But you got the sense of the man even from his farewell address, and I will close today by using the last line he used in the letter he wrote that he wanted distributed at his memorial service:

> So go forth in love and peace—be kind to dogs—and vote Democratic.

I ask unanimous consent the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From STLtoday.com, Mar. 11, 2007]

THOMAS F. EAGLETON FAREWELL ADDRESS

Senator Tom Eagleton wrote the following words of farewell in May, 2006, with instructions that they be shared with his family and friends at Saturday's memorial service.

Barbara, Terence, Christy, Michael, grandchildren Barbara, James and Greg, and friends all:

This is my last audience and, thus, I think I am entitled to the last word.

Using Lou Gehrig's famous quote, ''I consider myself the luckiest man on the face of the earth.''

I have had a wonderful, understanding wife. She has endured all of my foibles and I love her for it. I have been an absentee father. Politics is an all-absorbing, all-consuming profession. It takes a total, exclusive grip on one's life. So I apologize to Terence and Christy and express how much I love them.

I most fondly remember my mother. I was her favorite. I am reluctant to use Nixon phraseology, but my mother was a saint. She was a gentle woman and had the strength to put up with such determined personalities as my father, my brother and me.

From early days, I wanted to be a senator. My father would have made a great one. He was a magnificent trial lawyer. He was, in my mind, as great a speaker as FDR. He did not do so well in politics because he insisted on making every campaign decision by himself. I think, in a subliminal sense, I oozed into politics because I knew I could not be as great a lawyer as him and maybe I could prove to be a good politician.

My father was one of my three idols along with FDR and Eugene Hecker, my English teacher at Country Day School. Mr. Hecker thought every American should be able to read, write and speak the English language—including his students.

My dad did not think in insular or parochial terms. He thought a youngster should be exposed to all sorts of views. Once he took me to the old Coronado Hotel to hear Norman Thomas, the frequent Socialist candidate for president. Another time he took me to see a Gerald L.K. Smith protest at Kiel Auditorium. Smith was a racist ''preacher'' in the style of Bob Jones of Bob Jones University.

Until 1944, dad was a Teddy Roosevelt Republican. He took me to the 1940 Republican convention in Philadelphia where Wendell Willkie was nominated. Dad thought Willkie was the ''second coming'' of Teddy Roosevelt.

In 1938, dad drove me by a German Bund (pro Nazi) meeting at Grand and Lafayette and explained the dangers of Hitler and anti-Semitism.

He did not take me, but he arranged to have someone else take me to Winston Churchill's ''Iron Curtain'' speech at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri. I wrote up the speech for the Country Day News, but left out the ''Iron Curtain'' part as being lesser importance than other portions of his speech.

Let me make it clear that my father did not push me into politics. His advice to me was to first get established as a lawyer and then consider politics. When I ran for Circuit Attorney at age 26 he said, ''You are making a mistake. Wait a few years.''

In the Senate, I tried my best to express and vote my conscience. I confess to several ''hold your nose'' votes, like support for the dreadful price support program for cotton which, at one time, was the crop of choice in the Bootheel of Missouri. I think Senator Phil Hart, Senator Mike Mansfield, my wonderful friend Gaylord Nelson and Jack Danforth were amongst senators who voted their true conscience on every vote.

You may wonder why I mention Jack Danforth. There is a possibility that God is a Republican, and at this point I feel it best to cover all my bases.

I am most proud that the ''Eagleton Amendment'' was the legislative act that finally ended U.S. participation in the dreadful Vietnam War. I am proud of the original version of the War Powers Act which, had it been enacted as the bill left the Senate, would have re-established the shared powers of the President and the Congress when our nation went to war. This is what our Founding Father envisioned.

I am proud that, when Senator Muskie ran for President in 1972, he directed me to take over our Environmental Subcommittee and we passed the first major Clean Air and Clean Water Acts. By Muskie's anointment, I was the first Vice Chairman for a standing committee in the Senate.

After leaving the Senate, I never missed being there—except for the debate on the nomination of Bork and the horrible, disastrous Iraq War. That war will go down in American history as one of our greatest blunders. It will be remembered, in part, as a curse to our Constitution when Attorney General John Ashcroft attempted to put a democratic face on torture. Vice President Richard Cheney and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld also will go down in history for their total lack of planning for postwar Iraq.

I think, frankly, people stay too long in Congress. The world changes so rapidly that I think there should be a consistent and continuing infusion of new blood and fresh brain power into the legislative process. Eighteen years for me was enough.

I set forth my own critique of my Senate service. I could and should have done more. I had the energy. I had the desire. In analyzing myself, I blame it on my quickly moving attention span. Ted Kennedy has spent 30 plus years on National Health Insurance. I could not do that. I was too impatient. I wanted quick action and if I didn't get it in a few years, I would move on. That is a major fault for any legislator.

Finally, a word about the Catholic Church. This may seem to be a strange topic to be raised by me, but we are here in church and this is my final word. I do not pretend to be the world's greatest Catholic. Nevertheless, I think the Catholic Church is a vital part of American life, conscience and thought. Just as our Constitution is a remarkable, living code of governance and made relevant to the time in which we live, so too the doctrine of the Catholic Church is a living code of moral behavior and belief which must be relevant to the time in which we live. Its timeliness relies upon its capacity to adapt.

I am a Pope John XXIII and an Archbishop John L. May Catholic, believing in what they said and what I believe they would have said had they lived longer.

The outreach of the Catholic Church from Pope Pius IX to Pope Pius XII was not the outreach of Pope John XXIII. It is John XXIII who made the Catholic Church relevant to the 20th Century and future popes must make it relevant to the 21st Century. It was Archbishop May who made the Catholic Church relevant to the 20th Century in St. Louis. In the era of a Christian right, we seem to have merged God's power into political power.

I am an optimist about death and believe there is a there there. Somehow, in some manner, I will be meeting my parents, my brother and my friends. Somehow, Bob Koster will be waiting for me to tell me where I can buy everything 10% off.

So go forth in love and peace—be kind to dogs—and vote Democratic.

Tom E.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NISEI LINGUISTS

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, as we mark our fourth anniversary of our involvement in Iraq, I wish to highlight an important chapter in our military history. With foresight that proved to be a significant factor in America's victory in World War II, the U.S. Army established a Japanese language school a few months before the attack on Pearl Harbor, and recruited students, second-generation Americans of Japanese ancestry, or Nisei, who would become interpreters and translators in the Military Intelligence Service. Their ability to infiltrate the psyche of our enemy through their knowledge of Japanese culture and language is credited with bringing the war in the Pacific to a quicker conclusion and later, helping turn bitter foes into strong allies.

In 1994, I was among a number of Members of Congress, including my colleague and fellow World War II veteran, the senior Senator from Hawaii, DAN INOUYE, who asked the Secretary of the Army to publish an official history of the Military Intelligence Service. Today, I am honored to announce the publication of Nisei Linguists, Japanese Americans in the Military Intelligence Service During World War II, by Dr. James McNaughton, Command Historian, U.S. European Command. Nisei Linguists chronicles the history of the Japanese in America, the events leading to the War, the creation of the MIS, and the Nisei involvement in the War.

For the soldiers of the Military Intelligence Service, and their brethren in the 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, their service was much more than an obligation to the land of their birth; it was an opportunity to prove themselves as loyal American citizens. As many friends, neighbors, and relatives were transported to concentration camps in various locations around the United States, Nisei soldiers enlisted and served with great distinction.

According to Chief of Military History Dr. Jeffrey Clarke, Nisei Linguists also reminds us that:

> the entire experience provides valuable lessons to U.S. Army officers both present and future. In fact, the Global War on Terrorism underlines the need for similar capabilities and programs as the Army girds itself for the sustained struggle ahead.

As chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am privileged to co-host an event marking the publication of Nisei Linguists on Tuesday, March 20th. Among those in attendance will be Dr. McNaughton, Dr. Clarke, and a number of World War II Nisei veterans, including those who served in the MIS.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

AGENTS RAMON NEVAREZ, JR., AND DAVID TOURSCHER

• Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today to remind the Senate that not only are brave men and women serving their countries overseas, but they are serving here at home, too. That service can end in tragedy, even on our own soil.

Such an incident occurred last Thursday, March 15, 2007, near Cotton City, NM. I am sad to report that on that day, two Border Patrol agents assigned to the Lordsburg, NM, border patrol station were killed in the line of duty in a vehicular accident. I extend my heartfelt condolences to the families of Agent Ramon Nevarez, Jr., and Agent David Tourscher for their loss.

Agent Nevarez is survived by his wife, Bonnie, his mother Juana, his sister Viridiana, and his brother Ryan. Agent Tourscher is survived by his father Gary and his mother Jeanne.

Border security is one of our first lines of defense in the United States. An important part of that security is the men and women who are willing to serve on the front lines of our borders as Border Patrol agents. Agent Nevarez and Agent Tourscher were two such brave men, and I know the Senate joins me in thanking their families for the service of those two men.•

BURLINGTON COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER

• Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, this spring, the new community health center in Burlington, IA, officially opened for business. Having secured funding for the center and attended the groundbreaking ceremony last June, I know how important this health care facility is to Burlington and the surrounding communities. At long last, Des Moines County has a permanent, unified medical and dental clinic something that has been sorely needed for many years.

This is a truly unique community health center. It is housed on the grounds of Southeastern Community College. And there is an agreement between the CHC board and the community college to allow nursing and health aide students to do some of their training in the center. This gives the center an edge in recruiting staff, and it gives students hands-on training opportunities right there on campus. Clearly, this is a win-win-win arrangement for the center, for the community college, and for the entire Burlington community.

I salute Ron Kemp and others who had the vision to create this new community health center, and the persistence to transform their vision into bricks and mortar. The facility is welcoming, modern, and well equipped. And the staff members are truly an inspiration. They have a special passion for their work, and take pride in the fact that they are providing first-rate health care to underserved communities.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., used to say that ''Life's most persistent and urgent question is: What are you doing for others?'' The staff members at the community health centers of southeast Iowa have answered that question in powerful ways. They have committed themselves to providing high-quality health care to all comers, regardless of ability to pay. All are welcomed equally. All are served with professionalism and excellence.

As chair of the Health and Human Services Appropriations Subcommittee, I am 100 percent committed to securing appropriate funding

for community health centers all across America. One thing I know for certain: Every dollar Congress appropriates for centers like the one in Burlington is a dollar spent wisely and frugally. It never ceases to amaze me how their staff members are able to do so much—and to serve so many people—with such limited resources.

I dare say that nobody in the health care profession faces greater challenges than those who choose to work in community health centers challenges including chronic illness, cultural and linguistic differences, geographical barriers, homelessness, and on and on. Nothing stops these superb professionals.

And one more thing: Community health centers have a well-deserved reputation for caring and kindness. In some ways, their physicians and nurses are a throwback to another era. They offer a direct and personal style of health care. They follow up. They care about prevention and wellness.

So I am deeply grateful to executive director Ron Kemp, to Dr. Beverly Simone, the president of Southeastern Community College, to the center's dedicated board members, to Ted Boesen, executive director of the Iowa/Nebraska Primary Care Association, and to all the other people who made this new facility possible. They work their hearts out to provide the very best health care to some of our most needy citizens. I deeply appreciate their passion, their compassion, and their dedication to public service.●

RETIREMENT OF BOB ROTHENBERG

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today we recognize a distinguished executive at the Social Security Administration, Bob Rothenberg. Bob is an Associate Commissioner and Director of the Social Security Budget Office. He is a dedicated public servant who has served his country at the Social Security Administration for nearly 37 years.

A native of New York, Bob began his career in the local Social Security Office in Brooklyn. In 1973 he moved to the Budget Office at Social Security Headquarters in Baltimore. Bob's intellect and resolve were quickly recognized and he rose to the position of Budget Director—a position he has held for nearly 20 years. During Bob's long and distinguished career with the agency he has received many awards, of special note, the Presidential Rank and Meritorious Executive Awards.

For many years I have had the privilege of relying on Bob's outstanding work on the Social Security Administration's budget. He has always been resourceful, insightful, and forthcoming.

Bob will retire from the Social Security Administration on March 31, 2007. He will be sorely missed by his fellow colleagues and his congressional contacts on the Hill. He will leave behind the numerous individuals he has mentored and encouraged over the years and who, because of his guidance, are now prepared to carry on his work.

It is important that we in Congress recognize the many men and women who devote their working lives to improve the lives of others. Career civil servants often do their work in quiet anonymity behind the scenes providing vital service to the American people. They are rarely recognized for their important contribution. Bob Rothenberg is one of those people. His record of leadership at the Social Security Administration and his commitment to providing the American people with effective and compassionate service is a record of which he can be justly proud.

I wish Bob all the best in his retirement from Federal service and thank him for his many years of dedicated service.●

HONORING JESSE L. BROWN

● Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to the life and service of Ensign Jesse LeRoy Brown, U.S. Navy. Ensign Brown was born in Hattiesburg, MS, on October 13, 1926. He enlisted in the Naval Reserve in 1946 and was appointed a midshipman, U.S. Navy, the following year. After attending Navy preflight indoctrination and flight training, he was designated a naval aviator in October 1948, the first African American to achieve this status. Midshipman Brown was then assigned to Fighter Squadron 32. He received his commission as an Ensign in April 1949.

During the Korean war, he operated from USS *Leyte*, flying F4U–4 Corsair fighter aircraft in support of United Nations forces. On December 4, 1950, while on a close air support mission near the Chosin Reservoir, Ensign Brown's plane was hit by enemy fire and crashed. Despite heroic efforts by other aviators, he could not be rescued and died in his aircraft. Ensign Jesse L. Brown was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for his Korean war combat service.

In honor of his service, the Secretary of the Navy named the 38th ship in the Knox-class of frigates the USS *Jesse L. Brown*.

I know my colleagues will join me in honoring Jesse's memory and celebrating, along with his friends, family, and fellow naval aviators, the addition of a plaque in his memory to the Naval Aviation Monument Park in Virginia Beach to be presented May 5, 2007. Ensign Brown was both a pioneer and a model of service to country, who gave his life that we might enjoy our freedom. Mr. President.●

HONORING TIMOTHY WILLIAMS

● Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Timothy Williams for his 35 years of service at the Department of Veterans Affairs. This month, he is retiring as director of the VA Puget Sound Healthcare System. I want to thank him for his many years of hard work and leadership.

Our country makes a solemn promise to our servicemembers and their families, and every day dedicated VA employees help keep that promise. Director Williams faced many challenges in providing care in the Puget Sound, from increasing caseloads to difficult budgets. Through it all, he approached those challenges with unparalleled respect, understanding, and compassion for our veterans.

Throughout the country, the VA is recognized as providing some of the best health care in the Nation. The VA has led the way in pioneering electronic medical records and critical health research, much of which has been done in Seattle and Tacoma under the direction of Director Williams. On behalf of the constituents I represent, I want to thank Director Williams and all of the dedicated VA employees who have worked so hard to reach those milestones.

Director Williams has been a tireless champion for veterans. Working closely with Veterans Service Organizations, individual veterans, and the congressional delegation, he was always willing to work with people, to listen to their needs, and to sit down and discuss what is possible.

From hosting the VA's Wheelchair Games in 1995, to establishing one of the Nation's best spinal cord injury centers, to renovating the cancer clinic and bringing a Fisher House to the Seattle campus of the VA Puget Sound, Director Williams leaves behind a great legacy of championing the needs of veterans.

Circumstances were never easy for the VA's Puget Sound health care system. Tight budgets forced Tim and his entire staff to do more and more with less and less. As demand for care increased, Director Williams expanded the ability for the VA to treat more veterans. In fact, he oversaw the doubling of the patient care area to meet the demands.

Tim and his staff worked to expand the VA's efforts to treat veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan through the Deployment Health Clinic. The clinic focuses on the care of veterans who are experiencing health concerns related to a specific deployment. At the clinic, veterans receive a comprehensive evaluation, benefits counseling, and assistance with compensation and pension claims. Deployment Health Clinic staff will continue to provide veterans with their primary medical care as well as their mental health follow-up.

Today, the VA is facing tremendous challenges. A whole new generation of veterans is entering the system, and many will need care and support for a lifetime. As the VA takes on these new challenges, I know Director Williams will be missed. I hope his legacy lives on throughout the VA's Puget Sound health care system and throughout the VA.

I have said many times that VA staff members are truly our unsung heroes. Director Williams is one of those heroes. Whether attending veterans' gatherings in Port Angeles about efforts to expand VA care on the Peninsula, or working with the difficult issues facing the Walla Walla VA Medical Center, Tim approached his job with integrity, honesty and a dedication to America's veterans.

Director Williams, I wish you all the best in the future, and thank you for your distinguished service.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1003. An act to amend the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 to reauthorize the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–992. A communication from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Aviation Into-Plane Reimbursement Card'' (DFARS Case 2006–D017) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–993. A communication from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security-Guard Services Contracts'' (DFARS Case 2006–D011) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–994. A communication from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Protests, Disputes, and Appeals'' (DFARS Case 2003–D010) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–995. A communication from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Berry Amendment Exceptions—Acquisition of Perishable Food, and Fish, Shellfish, or Seafood'' (DFARS Case 2006–D005) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–996. A communication from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Free Trade Agreement—El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua'' (DFARS Case 2006–D019) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–997. A communication from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Radio Frequency Identification'' (DFARS Case 2006–D002) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–998. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–999. A communication from the Attorney, Office of General Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Alternative Fuel Transportation Program; Replacement Fuel Goal Modification'' (RIN1094–AB67) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1000. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to energy conservation standards; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1001. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Assessment of Potential Impact of Concentrating Solar Power for Electricity Generation''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1002. A communication from the Under Secretary for Science, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a study conducted to assess management practices in the Department; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1003. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the implementation of the Quincy Library Group's forest management proposal; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1004. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf—Update of New and Reaffirmed Documents Incorporated by Reference'' (RIN1010–AD24) received on March 14, 2007; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1005. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Cook Composites and Polymers Company'' (FRL No. 8285–3) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1006. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Spinosad; Pesticide Tolerance'' (FRL No. 8114–4) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1007. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Thifensulfuron Methyl; Pesticide Tolerance'' (FRL No. 8117–1) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1008. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Tribenuron Methyl; Pesticide Tolerance'' (FRL No. 8117–2) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1009. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Vermont: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions'' (FRL No. 8287–8) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1010. A communication from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: Standardized NUHOMS System Revision 9'' (RIN3150–AI03) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1011. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, the report of several documents recently issued by the Agency that are related to its regulatory programs; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1012. A communication from the Regulations Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Surface Transportation Project Delivery Pilot Program'' (RIN2125–AF13) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1013. A communication from the Regulations Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Statewide Transportation Planning; Metropolitan Transportation Planning'' ((RIN2125–AF09) (RIN2132–AA82)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1014. A communication from the Regulations Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Size and Weight Enforcement Regulations'' (RIN2125–AF17) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1015. A communication from the Regulations Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Construction and Maintenance'' (RIN2125–AF18) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1016. A communication from the Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Commission's competitive sourcing efforts for fiscal year 2006; to the

Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1017. A communication from the Chair, Good Neighbor Environmental Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's annual report relative to environmental protection activities and homeland security activities along the U.S. border with Mexico; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1018. A communication from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to the Congress: Assessing Alternatives to the Sustainable Growth Rate System''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1019. A communication from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to the Congress: Medicare Payment Policy''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1020. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law , the report of a rule entitled ''Deaths and Estates'' (RIN1400–AC24) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1021. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office Of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, (5) reports relative to vacancy announcements within the Department, received on March 13, 2007; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1022. A communication from the Human Resources Specialist, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy and the designation of an acting officer for the position of Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1023. A communication from the Human Resources Specialist, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy and the designation of an acting officer for the position of Deputy Secretary of Labor, received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1024. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Innovation and Improvement, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Magnet Schools Assistance Program—Notice of Final Priority'' (FR Doc. E7–4272) received on March 14, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1025. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Institute on Disability Rehabilitation Research—Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program—Disability Rehabilitation Research Projects and Rehabilitation Engineering Research Centers'' (FR Doc. E7–2349) received on March 14, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1026. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Innovation and Improvement, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Magnet Schools Assistance Program—Final Regulations'' (FR Doc. E7–4270) received on March 14, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1027. A communication from the Director, Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medical Devices; Hematology and Pathology Devices; Classification of Cord Blood Processing Systems and Storage Container'' (Docket No. 2007N–0024) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1028. A communication from the Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's competitive sourcing efforts for fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1029. A communication from the Chairman, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2007–2012; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1030. A communication from the Chairman, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Practice of Merit: A Symposium''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1031. A communication from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the approved mileage reimbursement rate per mile for Federal employees; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1032. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the progress made according to section 5 of the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1033. A communication from the Director, Strategic Human Resources Policy, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''5 CPF Part 211: Veteran Preference'' (RIN3206–AL00) received on March 14, 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1034. A communication from the Director, Strategic Human Resources Policy, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Long Term Care Insurance Program: Miscellaneous Changes, Corrections, and Clarifications'' (RIN3206–AK99) received on March 14, 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1035. A communication from the Director, Division for Strategic Human Resources Policy, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Employment in the Senior Executive Service, Restoration to Duty from Uniformed Service or Compensable Injury, Prevailing Rate Systems, Pay Administration (General), and Pay Administration Under the Fair Labor Standards Act; Miscellaneous Changes to Pay and Leave Rules'' (RIN3206–AL21) received on March 14, 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1036. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy and the designation of an acting officer for the position of General Counsel, received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1037. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1038. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Environment), Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a planned streamlined competition of military personnel performing air and surface training support functions at the Fleet Composite Squadron Six in Norfolk, VA; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1039. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the status of female members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1040. A communication from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's annual report for fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1041. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Flood Elevation Determination'' (72 FR 5197) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1042. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility'' ((72 FR 5630) (FEMA–7961)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1043. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Addition of Entities to the Entity List'' (RIN0694–AD91) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1044. A communication from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Inflation Adjustment of Civil Money Penalty Amounts'' (RIN2501–AD30) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1045. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the financial statements of the Deposit Insurance Fund and the FSLIC Resolution Fund; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1046. A communication from the Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the apportionment of membership on the regional fishery management councils; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1047. A communication from the Vice President, Government Affairs and Communications, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the financial performance of train routes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1048. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Aviation Enforcement and Proceedings, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Domestic Baggage Liability'' (RIN2105–AD62) received on March 15, 2007; to

the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1049. A communication from the Secretary, Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Maintenance Repair Reimbursement Pilot Program'' (RIN2133–AB68) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1050. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Seaway Regulations and Rules: Periodic Update, Various Categories'' (RIN2135–AA24) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce , Science, and Transportation.

EC–1051. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Tariff of Tolls'' (RIN2135–AA25) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1052. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Model AB139 Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–SW–20)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1053. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–NM–029)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1054. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Columbia Aircraft Manufacturing Models LC41–550FG and LC42–550FG Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–CE–71)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1055. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2005–NM–176)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1056. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL–600–1A11, CL–600–2A12, and CL–600–2B16 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2005–NM–201)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1057. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC–8–400 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–NM–007)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1058. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Models C90A, B200, B200C, B300, and B300C Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–CE–34)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1059. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737–200, –300, –400, and –500 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2005–NM–089)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1060. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca Model Arrius 2B1, 2B1A, and 2B2 Turboshaft Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–NE–38)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1061. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330, A340–200, and A340–300 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–NM–059)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1062. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Models 1900, 1900C, and 1900D Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–CE–67)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1063. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines AG V2522–A5, V2524–A5, V2527–A5, V2526E–A5, V2527M–A5, V2530–A5, and V2533–A5 Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2003–NE–21)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1064. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Air Tractor, Inc. Models AT–501, AT–502, AT–502A, AT–502B, and AT–503A Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2004–CE–48)) received on March 15 , 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1065. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems Limited Model BAe 146 and Avro 146–RJ Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–NM–133)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1066. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Model 390 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–CE–47)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1067. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; PZL–Bielsko Model SZD–50–3 'Puchacz' Gliders'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No . 2006–CE–49)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1068. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 707–100 Long Body, –100B Long Body, –100B Short Body, –E3F, –300, –300B, and –300C Series Airplanes; Model 727–100 and –200 Series Airplanes; Model 737–200, –200C, –300, –400, and –500 Series Airplanes; Model 747–100B, 747–200B, 747–200C, 747–200F, 747–300, 747–400, 747–400D, 747SR, and 747SP Series Airplanes; Model 757–200 and 757–200 PF Series Airplanes; and Model 767–200 and –300 Series Airplanes; Equipped with Observer or Attendant Seats'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2005–NM–030)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1069. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Model S–61L, N, R, and NM Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2004–SW–23)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1070. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Stemme GmbH and Co. KG Model S10–VT Gliders'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–CE–84)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1071. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B2 and B4 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–NM–027)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1072. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD–11 and –11F Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–NM–0091)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1073. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Withdrawal; Establishment of Class E Airspace; Mineral Point, WI'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(Docket No. 06–AGL–02)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1074. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class E Airspace; Creston, IA'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(Docket No. 06–ACE–11)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1075. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Williamsburg, KY'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(Docket

No. 06–ASO–13)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1076. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules (21); Amdt. No. 466'' ((RIN2120–AA63)(Docket No. 30538)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1077. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (20); Amdt. No. 3200'' ((RIN2120–AA65)(Docket No. 30530)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1078. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (8); Amdt. No. 3201'' ((RIN2120–AA65)(Docket No. 30531)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1079. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (3); Amdt. No. 3203'' ((RIN2120–AA65)(Docket No. 30533)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1080. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (17); Amdt. No. 3207'' ((RIN2120–AA65)(Docket No. 30537)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1081. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (10); Amdt. No. 3205'' ((RIN2120–AA65)(Docket No. 30535)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1082. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; B–N Group Ltd. BN–2, BN–2A, BN–2B, BN–2T, and BN–2T–4R Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–CE–44)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1083. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777–200 and –300 Series Airplanes Equipped with Rolls-Royce Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–NM–203)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1084. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Alpha Aviation Design Limited, Model R2160 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–CE–77)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1085. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Canada PW535A Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–NE–35)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1086. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. Model EMB–145XR Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–NM–058)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1087. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Stemme GmbH and Co. KG Model S10, S10–V, and S10–VT Gliders'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–CE–85)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1088. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F27 Mark 100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600, and 700 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2005–NM–236)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1089. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Schempp-Hirth Flugzeugbau GmbH Model Duo Discus T Gliders'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–CE–73)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1090. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Correction: Rolls-Royce plc RB211–524 Series Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2004–NE–19)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1091. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; CFM International, S.A. CFM56 Series Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–NE–37)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1092. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Sicma Aero Seat; Third Occupant Seat Assemblies, 133 Series ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2005–NE–40)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1093. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Corporation AE 2100D3 Turboprop Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–NE–42)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1094. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. Model ERJ 170 and ERJ 190 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–NM–135)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1095. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Model F2000EX Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–NM–264)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1096. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Model 206A, B, L, L–1, L–3, and L–4 Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2005–SW–22)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1097. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. Model ERJ 170 and ERJ 190 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–NM–195)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1098. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL–600–2B19 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–CE–44)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1099. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747–100, 747–100B, 747–100B SUD, 747–200B, 747–200C, 747–200F, 747–300, 747SR, and 747SP Series Airplanes Equipped with General Electric CF6–45 or –50 Series Engines, or Equipped with Pratt and Whitney JT9D–3 and –7 Series Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–NM–262)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1100. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Trent 700 Series Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2004–NE–03)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1101. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA—Groupe Aerospatiale TB 20 and TB 21 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2006–CE–66)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1102. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd and Co. KG Dart 528,

529, 532, 535, 542, and 555 Series Turboprop Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. 2006–NE–17)) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1103. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Non-American Fisheries Act Crab Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (ID No. 021407D) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1104. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Offshore Component in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (ID No. 021407C) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1105. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Offshore Component in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (ID No. 021407B) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1106. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Decrease the Commercial Trip Limit for Atlantic Group Spanish Mackerel in the Southern Zone'' (ID No. 013107B) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1107. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 of the Gulf of Alaska'' (ID No. 013107A) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1108. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish Managed Under the Individual Fishing Quota Program'' (ID No. 021207I) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1109. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Processor Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (ID No. 021607K) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1110. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Chiniak Gully Research Area for Vessels Using Trawl Gear'' (ID No. 021207C) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1111. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Notification of 2007 No-Harvest Guideline for the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Crustaceans Fishery'' (ID No. 021207A) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1112. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 of the Gulf of Alaska'' (ID No. 022007A) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1113. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Rock Sole, Flathead Sole, and 'Other Flatfish' by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (ID No. 021607B) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1114. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Non-Community Development Quota Pollock with Trawl Gear in the Chinook Salmon Savings Areas of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (ID No. 020507D) received on March 15 , 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1115. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 of the Gulf of Alaska'' (ID No. 020207C) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1116. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (ID No. 020107F) received on March 15, 2007; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of March 15, 2007, the following reports of committees were submitted on March 16, 2007:

By Mr. CONRAD, from the Committee on the Budget, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 21. An original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 and 2009 through 2012.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

John Wood, of Missouri, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Missouri for the term of four years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. COLEMAN):

S. 911. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to advance medical research and treatments into pediatric cancers, ensure patients and families have access to the current treatments and information regarding pediatric cancers, establish a population-based national childhood cancer database, and promote public awareness of pediatric cancers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. KERRY):

S. 912. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the incentives for the construction and renovation of public schools; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 913. A bill to clarify that the revocation of an alien's visa or other documentation is not subject to judicial review; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOINOVICH (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BOND, Mr. BURR, and Mr. SMITH):

S. 914. A bill to authorize the States (and subdivisions thereof), the District of Columbia, territories, and possessions of the United States to provide certain tax incentives to any person for economic development purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. DOLE (for herself and Mr. NELSON of Nebraska):

S. 915. A bill to establish a pilot program to provide grants to encourage eligible institutions of higher education to establish and operate pregnant and parenting student services offices for pregnant students, parenting students, prospective parenting students who are anticipating a birth or adoption, and students who are placing or have placed a child for adoption; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CRAPO, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 916. A bill to modify the boundary of the Minidoka Internment National Monument, to establish the Minidoka National Historic Site, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and improvements of the Gooding Division of the Minidoka Project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ALLARD:

S. 917. A bill to clarify the authority of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to management of elk in Rocky Mountain National Park; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. SMITH) (by request):

S. 918. A bill to authorize appropriations for activities under the Federal railroad safety laws for fiscal years 2008 through 2011, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. COLEMAN (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LAUTENBERG,

Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Res. 111. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Citizen's Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that a commemorative stamp be issued honoring the life of Oskar Schindler; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 22

At the request of Mr. WEBB, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 22, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a program of educational assistance for members of the Armed Forces who serve in the Armed Forces after September 11, 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 43

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 43, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to preserve and protect Social Security benefits of American workers and to help ensure greater congressional oversight of the Social Security system by requiring that both Houses of Congress approve a totalization agreement before the agreement, giving foreign workers Social Security benefits, can go into effect.

S. 57

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 57, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to deem certain service in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the Philippine Scouts to have been active service for purposes of benefits under programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

S. 67

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 67, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit former members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability rated as total to travel on military aircraft in the same manner and to the same extent as retired members of the Armed Forces are entitled to travel on such aircraft.

S. 117

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 117, a bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to improve benefits and services for members of the Armed Forces, veterans of the Global War on Terrorism, and other veterans, to require reports on the effects of the Global War on Terrorism, and for other purposes.

S. 169

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 169, a bill to amend the National Trails System Act to clarify Federal authority relating to land acquisition from willing sellers for the majority of the trails in the System, and for other purposes.

S. 211

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 211, a bill to facilitate nationwide availability of 2-1-1 telephone service for information and referral on human services. volunteer services, and for other purposes.

S. 261

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 261, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen prohibitions against animal fighting, and for other purposes.

S. 321

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 321, a bill to establish pilot projects under the Medicare program to provide incentives for home health agencies to utilize home monitoring and communications technologies.

S. 326

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 326, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a special period of limitation when uniformed services retirement pay is reduced as result of award of disability compensation.

S. 340

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 340, a bill to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States and for other purposes.

S. 445

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 445, a bill to establish the position of Trade Enforcement Officer and a Trade Enforcement Division in the Office of the United States Trade Representative, to require identification of trade enforcement priorities, and for other purposes.

S. 453

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 453, a bill to prohibit deceptive practices in Federal elections.

S. 496

At the request of Mr. VOINOVICH, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 496, a bill to reauthorize and improve the program authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

S. 502

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 502, a bill to repeal the sunset on the reduction of capital gains rates for individuals and on the taxation of dividends of individuals at capital gains rates.

S. 543

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 543, a bill to improve Medicare beneficiary access by extending the 60 percent compliance threshold used to determine whether a hospital or unit of a hospital is an inpatient rehabilitation facility under the Medicare program.

S. 573

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 573, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Public Health Service Act to improve the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of heart disease, stroke, and other cardiovascular diseases in women.

S. 593

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 593, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a grant program to provide supportive services in permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 600

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 600, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the School-Based Health Clinic program, and for other purposes.

S. 602

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 602, a bill to develop the next generation of parental control technology.

S. 623

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 623, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the licensing of comparable and interchangeable biological products, and for other purposes.

S. 624

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 624, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide waivers relating to grants for preventive health measures with respect to breast and cervical cancers.

S. 627

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New York

(Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 627, a bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to improve the health and well-being of maltreated infants and toddlers through the creation of a National Court Teams Resource Center, to assist local Court Teams, and for other purposes.

S. 659

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 659, a bill to amend section 1477 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the payment of the death gratuity with respect to members of the Armed Forces without a surviving spouse who are survived by a minor child.

S. 671

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 671, a bill to exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas.

S. 692

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 692, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Hospital Quality Report Card Initiative to report on health care quality in Veterans Affairs hospitals.

S. 713

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 713, a bill to ensure dignity in care for members of the Armed Forces recovering from injuries.

S. 721

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 721, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 735

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 735, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve the terrorist hoax statute.

S. 829

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 829, a bill to reauthorize the HOPE VI program for revitalization of severely distressed public housing, and for other purposes.

S. 844

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 844, a bill to provide for the protection of unaccompanied alien children, and for other purposes.

S. 858

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 858, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the transportation fringe benefit to bicycle commuters.

S. 869

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 869, a bill to reform certain provisions of section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, to make compliance with that section more efficient, with the goal of maintaining United States capital market global competitiveness.

S. 882

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 882, a bill to require a pilot program on the facilitation of the transition of members of the Armed Forces to receipt of veterans health care benefits upon completion of military service, and for other purposes.

S. 890

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 890, a bill to provide for certain administrative and support services for the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 893

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 893, a bill to allow a State to combine certain funds and enter into a performance agreement with the Secretary of Education to improve the academic achievement of students.

S. 897

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 897, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide more help to Alzheimer's disease caregivers.

S. 902

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 902, a bill to provide support and assistance for families of members of the National Guard and Reserve who are undergoing deployment, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 14

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 14, a concurrent resolution commemorating the 85th anniversary of the founding of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, a leading association for the 1,300,000 United States citizens of Greek ancestry and Philhellenes in the United States.

S. RES. 106

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 106, a resolution calling on the President to ensure that the foreign policy of the United States reflects appropriate understanding and sensitivity concerning issues related to human rights, ethnic cleansing, and genocide documented in the United States record relating to the Armenian Genocide.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. COLEMAN):

S. 911. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to advance medical research and treatments into pediatric cancers, ensure patients and families have access to the current treatments and information regarding pediatric cancers, establish a population-based national childhood cancer database, and promote public awareness of pediatric cancers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleague, Senator Coleman, in introducing the Conquer Childhood Cancer Act.

This bipartisan legislation seeks to achieve several important goals in our battle against childhood cancer. Specifically, it will expand support for pediatric cancer research, foster the career development of more pediatric oncologists, establish a population-based national childhood database, and provide essential information and support to help families dealing with this devastating disease. Childhood cancer impacts thousands of children and their families each year. While we have made great strides in treating cancer, we have made relatively little progress in advancing our understanding of the most common forms of pediatric cancer. This legislation will provide the focus and resources to hopefully one day find a cure.

Each year, more than 12,500 children are diagnosed with cancer, and more than 2,300 of them lose their courageous battle with the disease. Pediatric cancer not only takes a toll on the child, it affects the entire family—the parents, siblings, friends, and extended family all suffer when a child has cancer. I have had the honor of meeting one such family from Warwick, RI who has taken the pain and devastation of losing their nine year old son to neuroblastoma, a very aggressive childhood cancer, and turned their tragedy into a message of hope. The Haight family is committed, in memory of their son Ben, to providing education, advocacy, and support to other families going through a similar struggle with pediatric cancer. I never had a chance to meet Ben Haight but his mother Nancy has told me of his passion for life and his tremendous sense of strength and courage. Ben fought every day during his four and a half year battle with this disease and his tragic story highlights the importance of this legislation.

It is my hope that the bill we are introducing today will help to step up our efforts with regard to childhood cancer so that one day Ben's story, and thousands of other children like him, will be one of survival. In Rhode Island alone, about eight children each year succumb to various forms of childhood cancer. Each of these children had hopes, dreams, and desires that will never be fulfilled and one cannot quantify the impact each of these children could have had on their communities and on society as a whole. We need to be doing more to give these children a chance to grow up and reach their full potential. It is expected that by 2010 one out of 350 adults will be a survivor of childhood cancer.

The Conquer Childhood Cancer Act will build the foundation necessary to enhance federal efforts in the fight against childhood cancer and will also complement the incredible work of the network of organizations around the country dedicated to the prevention and cure of pediatric cancer.

I look forward to working with my colleagues toward swift passage of this important legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this legislation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 911

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 ''Conquer Childhood Cancer Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Cancer kills more children than any other disease.

(2) Each year cancer kills more children between 1 and 20 years of age than asthma, diabetes, cystic fibrosis, and AIDS, combined.

(3) Every year, over 12,500 young people are diagnosed with cancer.

(4) Each year about 2,300 children and teenagers die from cancer.

(5) One in every 330 Americans develops cancer before age 20.

(6) Some forms of childhood cancer have proven to be so resistant that even in spite of the great research strides made, most of those children die. Up to 75 percent of the children with cancer can now be cured.

(7) The causes of most childhood cancers are not yet known.

(8) Childhood cancers are mostly those of the white blood cells (leukemias), brain, bone, the lymphatic system, and tumors of the muscles, kidneys, and nervous system. Each of these behaves differently, but all are characterized by an uncontrolled proliferation of abnormal cells.

(9) Eighty percent of the children who are diagnosed with cancer have disease which has already spread to distant sites in the body.

(10) Ninety percent of children with a form of pediatric cancer are treated at one of the more than 200 Children's Oncology Group member institutions throughout the United States.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

It is the purpose of this Act to authorize appropriations to—

(1) encourage and expand the support for biomedical research programs of the existing National Cancer Institute-designated multicenter national infrastructure for pediatric cancer research;

(2) establish a population-based national childhood cancer database (the Children's Cancer Research Network) to evaluate incidence trends of childhood cancers and to enable the investigations of genetic epidemiology in order to identify causes to aid in development of prevention strategies;

(3) provide informational services to patients and families affected by childhood cancer;

(4) support the development, construction, and operation of a comprehensive online public information system on childhood cancers and services available to families; and

(5) establish a fellowship program in pediatric cancer research to foster clinical and translational research career development in pediatric oncologists in the early stages of their career.

SEC. 4. PEDIATRIC CANCER RESEARCH AND AWARENESS.

Subpart 1 of part C of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 285 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 417E. PEDIATRIC CANCER RESEARCH AND AWARENESS.

''(a) PEDIATRIC CANCER RESEARCH.—

''(1) SPECIAL PROGRAMS OF RESEARCH EXCELLENCE IN PEDIATRIC CANCERS.—The Director of NIH, acting through the National Cancer Institute, shall establish special programs of research excellence in the area of pediatric cancers. Such programs shall demonstrate a balanced approach to research cause, prognosis, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of pediatric cancers that foster translation of basic research findings into innovative interventions applied to patients.

''(2) FELLOWSHIP OF EXCELLENCE IN PEDIATRIC CANCER RESEARCH.—The Secretary shall develop a grant mechanism for the establishment, in cooperation with the National Cancer Institute-supported pediatric cancer clinical trial groups, of Research Fellowships in Pediatric Cancer to support adequate numbers of pediatric focused clinical and translational investigators thereby facilitating continuous momentum of research excellence.

''(b) NATIONAL CHILDHOOD CANCER REGISTRY.—The Director of NIH shall award a grant for the operation of a population-based national childhood cancer database, the Childhood Cancer Research Network (CCRN), of the Children's Oncology Group, in cooperation with the National Cancer Institute.

''(c) PUBLIC AWARENESS OF PEDIATRIC CANCERS AND AVAILABLE TREATMENTS AND RESEARCH.—The Secretary shall award grants to recognized childhood cancer professional and advocacy organizations for the expansion and widespread implementation of activities to raise public awareness of currently available information, treatment, and research with the intent to ensure access to best available therapies for pediatric cancers.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012. Funds appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended.''.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. KERRY):

S. 912. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the incentives for the construction and renovation of public schools; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing America's Better Classroom Act, an essential initiative to respond to the overwhelming needs for school construction and renovations. I welcome the support of my colleagues, Senator HARKIN, and Senator KERRY, who have been strong leaders on school construction and education policy. This bill is a wise investment in education and economic development; it creates jobs while we build and renovate our schools.

The Department of Education reports that the average public school building is 42 years old. In 1995, GAO estimated that we needed $112 billion for school construction and renovations of the three-quarters of our schools that need funding to bring the buildings into good overall condition. A more recent survey in 2001 in the Journal of Education Finance indicates that the need is increasing, and the unmet need for school infrastructure over the next decade is over $200 billion. My State of West Virginia will need as much as $2 billion for school construction and renovations.

Combine these statistics with the fact that there is a proven relation between the condition of school buildings and the performance of students, and it is not difficult to see that the state of our schools is entirely unacceptable. It is our responsibility to do all we can to remedy this situation.

America's Better Classroom Act provides the financial tools to do this. It will continue the Qualified Zone Academy Bonding (QZAB) Program, which, in recent years, has provided $4.2 million for support of school construction and renovations in disadvantaged communities. This provision would provide $2.8 billion to continue and expand the successful QZAB Program. Effective programs deserve continued support.

But the truth is that many school districts need help with school construction and renovations, but cannot qualify for the QZAB program. This is why the America's Better Classroom Act creates a $22 billion Qualified School Bonding Program. Funding will be allocated to the States based on the Title 1 formula so it is targeted, but the States will have flexibility in allocating support among school districts.

When I visit schools in West Virginia, I am often stunned by the aging buildings and compelling needs. In our fast-growing Eastern Panhandle, new schools must be built or renovated to accommodate rapid population growth. In other parts of the State, older school buildings need renovations to be safe learning environments for our students. As technology plays an increasingly important role in education, classrooms need to be updated.

States and communities need the America's Better Classroom Act so that we can make needed investments. School construction can play a positive role in helping to stimulate our economy and create needed jobs and is also an important investment in our children's education.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CRAPO, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 916. A bill to modify the boundary of the Minidoka Internment National Monument, to establish the Minidoka National Historic Site, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and improvements of the Gooding Division of the Minidoka Project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise today with the support of my colleague Senator CANTWELL to introduce the Minidoka National Historic Site Act of 2007. This act will modify the boundary of the Minidoka Internment National Monument to establish the Minidoka National Historic Site.

Adjacent to the Minidoka Internment National Monument is Herrmann farm. Herrmann farm plays a historically significant role to the people of Idaho and the United States. During World War II, the Herrmann farm area was part of the Minidoka Relocation Center, one of the 10 city-like camps where Americans of Japanese descent were interned.

Herrmann farm is also an excellent example of how relocation center land was transformed after the war into small family farms suitable for irrigation and farming. Many of these farms were allotted to World War II veterans. These veteran settlers put forth the same stubborn American spirit and ingenuity with which they helped to win the war, to promote the farm area into a fruitful and prosperous agricultural section.

Herrmann farm became one of a few Farm-In-A-Day sites within the United States, where members of a community joined together in the creation of a farm site within one day.

The Minidoka Internment National Monument area is also a notable educational tool for residents of Idaho and the United States. Herrmann farm is an excellent location to inform the public about the post-camp homesteading era and agriculture in south-central Idaho as buildings, features, and artifacts from both the relocation center and the Farm-In-A-Day are present at the Minidoka site.

In addition to the historical and educational importance of Herrmann farm, the Minidoka Internment National Site honors the hardships and sacrifices of those Japanese Americans imprisoned during World War II. Many of the Japanese American's who lived at this site are reaching considerable age and want to see this area preserved for future generations.

The site will incorporate the Nidoto Nai Yoni, ''Let it not happen again'', memorial that commemorates those courageous Japanese Americans of Bainbridge Island, WA, who were the first to be forcibly removed from their homes and relocated to internment camps during World War II.

I ask the Senate to move swiftly on this bill, so the remaining few Japanese Americans who are still alive today can revisit this site that holds such meaningful memories. It is with pleasure and the support of the Senator from Washington, that I introduce this act which preserves areas of historical and educational importance for the people of Idaho, Washington and the United States.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS—DURING ADJOURNMENT MARCH 16, 2007

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21—SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008 AND INCLUDING THE APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2007 AND 2009 THROUGH 2012

Mr. CONRAD from the Committee on the Budget, submitted the following concurrent resolution, which was placed on the calendar:

S. CON. RES. 21

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 and 2009 through 2012 are set forth.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Social Security.
Sec. 103. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—BUDGET PROCESS

Sec. 201. Pay-as-you-go point of order in the Senate.
Sec. 202. Point of order against reconciliation legislation that would increase the deficit or reduce a surplus.
Sec. 203. Point of order against legislation increasing long-term deficits.
Sec. 204. Emergency legislation.
Sec. 205. Extension of enforcement of budgetary points of order.
Sec. 206. Point of order against advance appropriations.
Sec. 207. Discretionary spending limits.
Sec. 208. Application of previous allocations in Senate.
Sec. 209. Point of order to Save Social Security First.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND ADJUSTMENTS

Sec. 301. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for SCHIP legislation.
Sec. 302. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for care of wounded service members.
Sec. 303. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for tax relief.
Sec. 304. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for comparative effectiveness research.
Sec. 305. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for higher education.
Sec. 306. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the Farm Bill.
Sec. 307. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for energy legislation.
Sec. 308. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Medicare.
Sec. 309. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for small business health insurance.
Sec. 310. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for county payments for Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 reauthorization.
Sec. 311. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for terrorism risk insurance reauthorization.
Sec. 312. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for affordable housing.
Sec. 313. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for receipts from Bonneville Power Administration.
Sec. 314. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Indian claims settlement.
Sec. 315. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Food and Drug Administration.
Sec. 316. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for health care reform.
Sec. 317. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for enhancement of veterans' benefits.
Sec. 318. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for long-term care.
Sec. 319. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for health information technology.
Sec. 320. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for child care.
Sec. 321. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for comprehensive immigration reform.
Sec. 322. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for mental health parity.
Sec. 323. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 324. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
Sec. 325. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2012:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: $1,900,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,009,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,123,326,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,221,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,410,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,552,896,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: –$4,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: –$41,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $16,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $57,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $15,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: –$44,200,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: $2,364,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,490,185,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,506,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,550,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,664,262,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,691,285,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: $2,298,846,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,460,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,555,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,582,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,670,131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,677,372,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:
Fiscal year 2007: $398,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $451,155,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $432,249,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $360,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $259,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $124,476,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:
Fiscal year 2007: $8,960,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $9,529,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $10,078,585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $10,556,677,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $10,929,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $11,180,704,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:
Fiscal year 2007: $5,045,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $5,308,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $5,536,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $5,680,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $5,705,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $5,584,520,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—The amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:
Fiscal year 2007: $637,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $668,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $702,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $737,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $772,605,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $807,928,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—The amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:
Fiscal year 2007: $441,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $460,224,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $478,578,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $499,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $520,743,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $546,082,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $4,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $5,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,105,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $5,284,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $5,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,417,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $5,612,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $5,783,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,753,000,000.

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2007 through 2012 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $619,363,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $648,820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $617,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $584,775,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $626,962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $545,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $572,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $551,054,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $558,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $559,899,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $551,763,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $34,790,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $37,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $34,555,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $34,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $35,432,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,227,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $35,984,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,214,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $25,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,516,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $26,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,885,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $26,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $27,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $27,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $27,980,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,535,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $2,958,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $3,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $3,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $3,198,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,715,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $3,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $3,306,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,022,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $31,332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,905,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $32,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $33,331,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,240,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $33,999,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $34,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,337,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $35,098,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,624,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $26,207,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $20,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,497,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $20,984,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $21,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,118,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,390,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,288,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,763,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $5,515,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$3,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $8,797,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $8,602,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $8,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $173,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $8,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$28,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $8,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $507,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $81,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,739,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $83,709,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $75,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $76,253,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $76,887,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,307,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $77,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,721,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $19,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,281,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $14,634,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $13,511,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $13,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $13,871,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $14,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,006,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $92,780,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $92,224,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $93,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,397,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $97,592,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $99,366,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,866,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $99,650,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,463,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $100,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,307,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $268,340,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $288,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $287,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $310,058,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $308,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $328,209,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $328,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $351,047,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $350,346,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $374,804,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $374,141,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $365,152,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $389,969,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $390,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $414,779,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $439,862,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $440,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $484,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $484,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $481,008,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $480,632,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $360,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $364,204,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $379,046,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $383,072,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $390,791,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $392,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $400,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $401,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $415,851,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $415,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $401,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $400,684,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $19,089,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $23,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $27,009,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,009,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $29,898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,898,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $73,896,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $85,192,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $87,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,935,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $89,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $89,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $94,707,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $91,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,957,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $45,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $47,180,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,514,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $47,333,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,234,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $48,106,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,397,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $48,895,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $49,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,414,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $18,196,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $18,745,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $19,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $19,649,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,564,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $20,214,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $20,721,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,602,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $344,475,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $344,475,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $370,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $390,393,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $390,393,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $412,001,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $412,001,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $427,474,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $427,474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $438,452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $438,452,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, –$7,087,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$1,901,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, –$7,180,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$5,010,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, –$7,279,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$6,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, –$7,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$7,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, –$7,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$7,311,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, –$69,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$69,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, –$71,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$71,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, –$67,035,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$67,044,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, –$67,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$67,458,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, –$70,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$70,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, –$72,557,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$72,560,000,000.

TITLE II—BUDGET PROCESS

SEC. 201. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any 1 of 4 applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''applicable time period'' means any 1 of the 4 following periods:

(A) The current fiscal year.

(B) The budget year.

(C) The period of the 5 fiscal years following the current fiscal year.

(D) The period of the 5 fiscal years following the 5 fiscal years referred to in subparagraph (C).

(3) DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection and except as provided in paragraph (4), the term ''direct spending legislation'' means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(4) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms ''direct spending legislation'' and ''revenue legislation'' do not include—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(B) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on the date of enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

(5) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this subsection shall—

(A) use the baseline surplus or deficit used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(6) PRIOR SURPLUS.—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A), except that direct spending or revenue effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted in any bill pursuant to a reconciliation instruction since the beginning of that same calendar year shall never be made available on the pay-as-you-go ledger and shall be dedicated only for deficit reduction.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(c) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Senate Committee on the Budget.

(d) SUNSET.—This section shall expire on September 30, 2017.

(e) REPEAL.—In the Senate, section 505 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the fiscal year 2004 concurrent resolution on the budget, shall no longer apply.

SEC. 202. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION THAT WOULD INCREASE THE DEFICIT OR REDUCE A SURPLUS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any reconciliation bill, resolution, amendment, amendment between Houses, motion, or conference report pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 that would cause or increase a deficit or reduce a surplus in the current fiscal year, the budget year, the period of the first 5 fiscal years following the current fiscal year, or the period of the second 5 fiscal years following the current fiscal year.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SEC. 203. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION INCREASING LONG-TERM DEFICITS.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare for each bill and joint resolution reported from committee (except measures within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations), and amendments thereto and conference reports thereon, an estimate of whether the measure would cause, relative to current law, a net increase in deficits in excess of $5,000,000,000 in any of the four 10-year periods beginning in fiscal year 2018 through fiscal year 2057.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would cause a net increase in deficits in excess of $5,000,000,000 in any of the four 10-year periods beginning in 2018 through 2057.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) DETERMINATIONS OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of net deficit increases shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(e) REPEAL.—In the Senate, section 407 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006, shall no longer apply.

(f) SUNSET.—This section shall expire on September 30, 2017.

SEC. 204. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.—With respect to a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation or appropriations for discretionary accounts that the Congress designates as an emergency requirement in such measure, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be treated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this section.

(b) EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.—Any new budget authority, outlays, and receipts resulting from any provision designated as an emergency requirement, pursuant to this section, in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report shall not count for purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and sections 201 and 207 of this resolution (relating to pay-as-you-go in the Senate and discretionary spending limits).

(c) DESIGNATIONS.—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in subsection (f).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''direct spending'', ''receipts'', and ''appropriations for discretionary accounts'' means any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(3) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this subsection.

(4) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(5) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—If a point of order is sustained under paragraph (1) against a conference report, the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, any provision is an emergency requirement if the situation addressed by such provision is—

(A) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(B) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(C) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(D) subject to paragraph (2), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(E) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(2) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(g) REPEAL.—In the Senate, section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006, shall no longer apply.

SEC. 205. EXTENSION OF ENFORCEMENT OF BUDGETARY POINTS OF ORDER.

Notwithstanding any provision of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 403 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006, subsections (c)(2) and (d)(3) of section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 403 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress) shall remain in effect for purposes of Senate enforcement through September 30, 2017.

SEC. 206. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2008, or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2009, that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2009.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal years 2009 and 2010 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for

Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $25,158,000,000 in new budget authority in each year; and

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under paragraph (a).

(d) FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—If a point of order is sustained under subsection (a) against a conference report in the Senate, the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) REPEAL.—In the Senate, section 401 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006, shall no longer apply.

SEC. 207. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on that bill or joint resolution) that would cause the discretionary spending limits in this section to be exceeded.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—This subsection may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(b) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—In the Senate and as used in this section, the term ''discretionary spending limit'' means—

(1) for fiscal year 2007, $951,140,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,029,456,000,000 in outlays; and

(2) for fiscal year 2008, $942,312,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,021,407,000,000 in outlays;

as adjusted in conformance with the adjustment procedures in subsection (c).

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution relating to any matter described in paragraph (2), or the offering of an amendment thereto or the submission of a conference report thereon—

(A) the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may adjust the discretionary spending limits, budgetary aggregates, and allocations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, by the amount of new budget authority in that measure for that purpose and the outlays flowing therefrom; and

(B) following any adjustment under subparagraph (A), the Senate Committee on Appropriations may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this subsection.

(2) MATTERS DESCRIBED.—Matters referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) CONTINUING DISABILITY REVIEWS AND SSI REDETERMINATIONS.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that appropriates $264,000,000 for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, and provides an additional appropriation of up to $213,000,000 for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and aggregates may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, but not to exceed $213,000,000 in budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom for fiscal year 2008.

(B) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX ENFORCEMENT.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that appropriates $6,822,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service for enhanced tax enforcement to address the Federal tax gap (taxes owed but not paid) and provides an additional appropriation of up to $406,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service for enhanced tax enforcement to address the Federal tax gap, then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and aggregates may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, but not to exceed $406,000,000 in budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom for fiscal year 2008.

(C) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that appropriates up to $383,000,000 to the health care fraud and abuse control program at the Department of Health and Human Services, then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and aggregates may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, but not to exceed $383,000,000 in budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom for fiscal year 2008.

(D) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE IMPROPER PAYMENTS REVIEWS.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that appropriates $10,000,000 for unemployment insurance improper payments reviews for the Department of Labor, and provides an additional appropriation of up to $40,000,000 for unemployment insurance improper payments reviews for the Department of Labor, then the discretionary spending limits, allocation to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and aggregates may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, but not to exceed $40,000,000 in budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom for fiscal year 2008.

(E) WILDLAND FIRE SUPPRESSION.—

(i) DEFINITION.—For this subparagraph, the term ''base amount'' refers to the average of the obligations of the preceding 10 years for wildfire suppression in the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior, calculated as of the date of the applicable year's budget request is submitted by the President to Congress.

(ii) ADJUSTMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008.—If the amount appropriated for Wildland Fire Suppression in fiscal year 2008 is not less than the base amount, then the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate allocations, aggregates, discretionary spending limits, and other budgetary levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that provides additional funding for wildland fire suppression, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, but not to exceed the following amounts in budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom:

(I) for the Forest Service, for fiscal year 2008, $400,000,000 ; and

(II) for the Department of the Interior, for fiscal year 2008, $100,000,000.

(F) COSTS OF GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and discretionary spending limits for one or more bills, joint resolutions, motions, amendments, or conference reports that make discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2008 or 2009 in excess of the levels assumed in this resolution for expenses related to the global war on terror, but not to exceed the following amounts:

(i) For fiscal year 2008, $145,162,000,000 in budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom.

(ii) For fiscal year 2009, $50,000,000,000 in budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom.

(G) ADJUSTMENT FOR UNITED STATES FORCES IN THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and discretionary spending limits for one or more bills, joint resolutions, motions, amendments, or conference reports that make discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for an amount appropriated, but not to exceed $5,000,000,000 in budgetary authority and outlays flowing therefrom, to—

(i) address training, equipment, force protection, logistics, or other matters necessary for the protection of United States forces; or

(ii) address deficiencies at Walter Reed Army Medical Center and other facilities within the military medical system providing treatment to service members injured while performing their duties in the Global War on Terrorism.

SEC. 208. APPLICATION OF PREVIOUS ALLOCATIONS IN SENATE.

Section 7035 of Public Law 109–234 shall no longer apply in the Senate.

SEC. 209. POINT OF ORDER TO SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY FIRST.

(a) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit in any fiscal year until the President submits legislation to Congress and Congress enacts legislation which would restore 75-year solvency to the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Trust Funds as certified by the Social Security Administration actuaries.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND ADJUSTMENTS

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SCHIP LEGISLATION.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that provides up to $50,000,000,000 for reauthorization of the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), if such legislation maintains coverage for those currently enrolled in SCHIP, continues efforts to reach uninsured children who are already eligible for SCHIP or Medicaid but are not enrolled, and

supports States in their efforts to move forward in covering more children, by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes up to $35,000,000,000 over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 302. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR CARE OF WOUNDED SERVICE MEMBERS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report which improves the medical care of or disability benefits for wounded or disabled military personnel or improves the disability evaluations of military personnel or veterans to expedite the claims process, by the amounts provided in that legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 303. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TAX RELIEF.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would provide tax relief, including extensions of expiring tax relief and refundable tax relief, by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 304. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that establishes a new federal or public-private initiative for comparative effectiveness research, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 305. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, including tax legislation, that would make higher education more accessible and more affordable, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 306. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE FARM BILL.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that—

(1) reauthorizes the Food Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002;

(2) strengthens our agriculture and rural economies and critical nutrition programs;

(3) provides agriculture-related tax relief;

(4) improves our environment by reducing our Nation's dependence on foreign sources of energy through expanded production and use of alternative fuels; or

(5) combines any of the purposes provided in paragraphs (1) through (4);

by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes up to $15,000,000,000 over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 307. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ENERGY LEGISLATION.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports, including tax legislation, that would reduce our Nation's dependence on foreign sources of energy, expand production and use of alternative fuels and alternative fuel vehicles, promote renewable energy development, improve electricity transmission, encourage responsible development of domestic oil and natural gas resources, or reward conservation and efficiency, by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 308. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE.

(a) PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that repeals the prohibition in section 1860D–11(i)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–111(i)(1)) while preserving access to prescription drugs and price competition without requiring a particular formulary or instituting a price structure for reimbursement of covered Part D drugs, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and provided further that any savings from the measure are to be used either to improve the Medicare Part D benefit or for deficit reduction.

(b) PHYSICIAN PAYMENTS.—The Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that increases the reimbursement rate for physician services under section 1848(d) of the Social Security Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

(c) IMPROVEMENTS TO MEDICARE PART D.—The Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that makes improvements to the prescription drug benefit under Medicare Part D, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose up to $5,000,000,000, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 309. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SMALL BUSINESS HEALTH INSURANCE.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that makes health insurance coverage more affordable or available to small businesses and their employees without weakening rating rules or reducing covered benefits, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 310. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR COUNTY PAYMENTS FOR SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000 REAUTHORIZATION.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that provides for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–393), by the amounts provided by that legislation for that purpose, but not to exceed $440,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2008 and the outlays flowing from that budget authority and $2,240,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012 and the outlays flowing from that budget authority, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 311. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE REAUTHORIZATION.

The Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that provides for a continued Federal role in ensuring the availability of terrorism insurance after the expiration of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Extension Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation is deficit-neutral over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 312. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

The Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would establish an affordable housing fund financed by the housing government-sponsored enterprises, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that the legislation is deficit-neutral over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 313. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RECEIPTS FROM BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that prohibits the Bonneville Power Administration from making early payments on its Federal Bond Debt to the United States Treasury, by the amounts provided by that legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 314. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INDIAN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that—

(1) creates an Indian claims settlement fund for trust accounting and management deficiencies related to Individual Indian Moneys and assets; and

(2) extinguishes all claims arising before the date of enactment for losses resulting from accounting errors, mismanagement of assets, or interest owed in connection with Individual Indian Moneys accounts;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes up to $8,000,000,000, provided that such legislation does not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 315. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that authorizes the Food and Drug Administration to regulate tobacco products and assess user fees on tobacco manufacturers and importers to cover the cost of the Food and Drug Administration's regulatory activities, by the amounts provided in that legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation is deficit-neutral over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 316. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM.

If an SCHIP reauthorization bill is enacted, then the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report to improve health care, and provide quality health insurance for the uninsured and underinsured, and protect individuals with current health coverage, by the amounts provided in that legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 317. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ENHANCEMENT OF VETERANS' BENEFITS.

The Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would enhance benefits for veterans, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation is deficit-neutral over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 318. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LONG-TERM CARE.

The Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would improve long-term care, enhance the safety and dignity of patients, encourage appropriate use of institutional and non-institutional care, promote quality care, and provide for the cost-effective use of public resources, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 319. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) The Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that provides incentives or other support for adoption of modern information technology to improve quality and protect privacy in health care, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

(b) The Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that provides for payments that are based on adherence to accepted clinical protocols identified as best practices, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 320. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR CHILD CARE.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that provides up to $5,000,000,000 for the child care entitlement to States, by the amounts provided by such legislation for that purpose, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

SEC. 321. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report that—

(1) provides for comprehensive immigration reform;

(2) provides for increased interior enforcement, through an effective electronic employment verification system which accurately establishes the employment authorization of individuals; and

(3) provides for increased border security and enhanced information technology systems;

provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit for the fiscal year 2008 and for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

SEC. 322. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MENTAL HEALTH PARITY.

If the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment is offered thereto, or a conference report is submitted thereon, that provides parity between health insurance coverage of mental health benefits and benefits for medical and surgical services, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations and aggregates to the extent that such legislation would not increase the deficit for fiscal year 2008 and for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

SEC. 323. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Senate Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 324. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002).

SEC. 325. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules (so far as they relate to that house) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 111—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE CITIZEN'S STAMP ADVISORY COMMITTEE SHOULD RECOMMEND TO THE POSTMASTER GENERAL THAT A COMMEMORATIVE STAMP BE ISSUED HONORING THE LIFE OF OSKAR SCHINDLER

Mr. COLEMAN (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 111

Whereas Oskar Schindler acted as a hero during the Nazi occupation of Poland and selflessly rescued 1,200 Jewish men, women, and children by employing them in his factory, at risk to his own life and that of his wife;

Whereas Oskar Schindler also rescued approximately 100 Jewish men and women from the Goleszow concentration camp, who lay trapped and partly frozen in 2 sealed train cars stranded near Runlets;

Whereas Oskar Schindler embodied ideals of the United States, such as the pursuit of freedom, liberty, and opposition to tyranny, and many of the Jewish people who fled the Nazi occupation made the United States their home;

Whereas millions of people in the United States have been made aware of the story of Oskar Schindler's bravery;

Whereas, on July 18, 1967, Yad Vashem decided to recognize Oskar Schindler as one of the Righteous Among the Nations, or ''righteous Gentiles'', an honor awarded by Israel to non-Jews who saved Jews during the Holocaust at great personal risk;

Whereas the 100th anniversary of Oskar Schindler's birth is April 28, 2008; and

Whereas Oskar Schindler is a true humanitarian, deserving of honor by the United States Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that a commemorative stamp be issued honoring the life of Oskar Schindler.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS/MEETINGS

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration will meet on Wednesday, March 28, 2007, at 10

a.m., to conduct a markup of S. 223, the Senate Campaign Disclosure Parity Act.

For further information regarding this hearing, please contact Howard Gantman at the Rules and Administration Committee on 224–6352.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Seth Poldberg of Senator GRASSLEY's office be granted floor privileges during today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: calendar Nos. 45 and 46; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and that the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations were considered and confirmed, as follows:

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be admiral

Adm. Timothy J. Keating, 0000

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsiblity under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Victor E. Renuart, Jr., 0000

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

VITIATION OF ACTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate action of the amendment to the preamble to H. Con. Res. 20 be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROCLAIMING CASIMIR PULASKI TO BE AN HONORARY CITIZEN POSTHUMOUSLY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 78, S.J. Res. 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 5) proclaiming Casimir Pulaski to be an honorary citizen of the United States posthumously.

There being objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be read a third time and passed; that the preamble be agreed to; the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that any statements relating to the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD, without intervening action or debate.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 5) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S.J. RES. 5

Whereas Casimir Pulaski was a Polish military officer who fought on the side of the American colonists against the British in the American Revolutionary War;

Whereas Benjamin Franklin recommended that General George Washington accept Casimir Pulaski as a volunteer in the American Cavalry and said that Pulaski was ''renowned throughout Europe for the courage and bravery he displayed in defense of his country's freedom'';

Whereas after arriving in America, Casimir Pulaski wrote to General Washington, ''I came here, where freedom is being defended, to serve it, and to live or die for it.'';

Whereas the first military engagement of Casimir Pulaski with the British was on September 11, 1777, at the Battle of Brandywine, and his courageous charge in this engagement averted a disastrous defeat of the American Cavalry and saved the life of George Washington;

Whereas on September 15, 1777, George Washington elevated Casimir Pulaski to the rank of Brigadier General of the American Cavalry;

Whereas Casimir Pulaski formed the Pulaski Cavalry Legion, and in February 1779, this legion ejected the British occupiers from Charleston, South Carolina;

Whereas in October 1779, Casimir Pulaski mounted an assault against British forces in Savannah, Georgia;

Whereas on the morning of October 9, 1779, Casimir Pulaski was mortally wounded and was taken aboard the American ship USS Wasp, where he died at sea on October 11, 1779;

Whereas before the end of 1779, the Continental Congress resolved that a monument should be erected in honor of Casimir Pulaski;

Whereas in 1825, General Lafayette laid the cornerstone for the Casimir Pulaski monument in Savannah, Georgia; and

Whereas in 1929, Congress passed a resolution recognizing October 11 of each year as Pulaski Day in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Casimir Pulaski is proclaimed to be an honorary citizen of the United States posthumously.

COMMEMORATING THE 85TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE AMERICAN HELLENIC EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 79, S. Con. Res. 14.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) commemorating the 85th anniversary of the founding of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, a leading association for the 1,300,000 United States citizens of Greek ancestry and Philhellenes in the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to this matter be printed in the RECORD, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. CON. RES. 14

Whereas the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (AHEPA) was founded on July 26, 1922, in Atlanta, Georgia, by 8 visionary Greek immigrants to help unify, organize, and protect against the bigotry, discrimination, and defamation faced by people of all ethnic, racial, and religious backgrounds perpetrated predominantly by the Ku Klux Klan;

Whereas the mission of AHEPA is to promote the ideals of ancient Greece, which include philanthropy, education, civic responsibility, and family and individual excellence through community service and volunteerism;

Whereas, since its inception, AHEPA has instilled in its members an understanding of their Hellenic heritage and an awareness of the contributions made by Greece to the development of democratic principles and governance in the United States and throughout the world;

Whereas AHEPA has done much throughout its history to foster patriotism in the United States;

Whereas members of AHEPA have served in the Armed Forces to protect the freedom of the United States and to preserve the democratic ideals that are part of the Hellenic legacy;

Whereas, in World War II, members of AHEPA were parachuted behind enemy lines in Nazi-occupied Greece to help liberate the country;

Whereas AHEPA raised more than $253,000,000 for United States war bonds during World War II, for which AHEPA was named an official Issuing Agent for United States War Bonds by the Department of Treasury, an honor that no other civic organization was able to achieve at the time;

Whereas the members of AHEPA donated $612,000 for the restoration of the Statue of

Liberty and Ellis Island, New York, for which AHEPA received special recognition by the Department of the Interior;

Whereas the AHEPA National Housing Program was awarded $500,000,000 by the Department of Housing and Urban Development for its Section 202 Program, which has yielded 4,370 units in 80 properties across 21 States and 49 cities and has provided dignified, affordable housing to senior citizens;

Whereas AHEPA was recognized by the Department of State as an organization that has engaged in ''Track Two Diplomacy'' to foster reconciliation and rapprochement in the Eastern Mediterranean, which is in the best interest of the United States;

Whereas members of AHEPA raised $110,000 for the George C. Marshall Statue to be erected on the grounds of the United States Embassy in Athens, Greece, in celebration of the historic relationship between the United States and Greece, and in tribute to an outstanding statesman and Philhellene, General Marshall;

Whereas AHEPA financially supports scholarships, educational chairs, medical research, and countless other charitable and philanthropic causes by contributing more than $2,000,000 annually from its national, district, and local levels collectively;

Whereas, in the spirit of their Hellenic heritage and in commemoration of the Centennial Olympic Games held in Atlanta, Georgia, members of AHEPA raised $775,000 for the Tribute to Olympism Sculpture, the fanlike structure of which helped to save lives during the bombing at Centennial Olympic Park;

Whereas members of AHEPA have been Presidents and Vice Presidents of the United States, United States Senators and Representatives, and United States Ambassadors, and have served honorably as elected officials at the local and State levels throughout the United States; and

Whereas President George H.W. Bush cited AHEPA as one of the ''thousand points of light'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress—

(1) recognizes the significant contributions of United States citizens of Hellenic heritage to the United States;

(2) commemorates the 85th anniversary of the founding of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (AHEPA), applauds its mission, and commends the many charitable contributions of its members to communities around the world; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe the 85th anniversary of the founding of AHEPA and celebrate its many accomplishments.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 2007

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m., Tuesday, March 20; that on Tuesday, following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that the Senate then resume consideration of S. 214, as provided for under a previous order; I also ask unanimous consent that following the vote on passage of S. 214, the Senate then stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it was my intent to ask consent to proceed to the budget resolution at 2:15. I am informed that a vote may be required to proceed to the measure. I will not ask for consent tonight. Members are alerted it might be necessary to have a roll-call vote on the motion to proceed to the budget resolution at 2:15 tomorrow afternoon.

Today, we have had good debate on the pending U.S. attorneys bill. We will continue that debate tomorrow morning and then vote with respect to the two amendments and passage of the bill. The first vote will occur at about 11:30 tomorrow morning.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. If there is no further business at this time, and if the distinguished Republican leader has nothing further, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of Senator SPECTER, the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if I may, obviously I am not going to object. Let me say to all our colleagues on this side of the aisle, this will be a challenging week. Budget week always is, with numerous votes. Obviously, it would be to the advantage of the body to have a number of those votes before the so-called vote-arama, which occurs as the time expires late in the week.

So I encourage Republican Senators who have amendments to come on over, beginning tomorrow, lay them down, and let's try to proceed early in the week in order to minimize the inconvenience to everyone at the end of the week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would only add—and I appreciate very much the Senator's remarks—we have to finish the budget resolution this week. Next week we have to get to the supplemental. We have been told by the Secretary of Defense that all the work on the supplemental must be completed by the end of April. Even though there is a week or so that other arrangements can be made, we have found Secretary Gates to be extremely upfront, and so we have to get to the supplemental next week so we can complete it by the first of May.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if I may alert the majority leader, apparently Senator SPECTER is not coming to the floor tonight, so there is no impediment to the Senate going ahead and adjourning.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:46 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, March 20, 2007, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 19, 2007:

THE JUDICIARY

RAYMOND M. KETHLEDGE, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT, VICE JAMES L. RYAN, RETIRED.

STEPHEN JOSEPH MURPHY III, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT, VICE SUSAN BIEKE NEILSON, DECEASED.

ROBERT JAMES JONKER, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, VICE GORDON J. QUIST, RETIRED.

PAUL LEWIS MALONEY, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, VICE RICHARD ALAN ENSLEN, RETIRED.

JANET T. NEFF, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, VICE DAVID W. MCKEAGUE, ELEVATED.

SHARION AYCOCK, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI, VICE GLEN H. DAVIDSON, RETIRING.

DAVID R. DUGAS, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA, VICE FRANK J. POLOZOLA, RETIRED.

JAMES RANDAL HALL, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, VICE B. AVANT EDENFIELD, RETIRED.

RICHARD H. HONAKER, OF WYOMING, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF WYOMING, VICE CLARENCE A. BRIMMER, JR., RETIRED.

RICHARD A. JONES, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON, VICE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR, RETIRED.

JANIS LYNN SAMMARTINO, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE JUDITH NELSEN KEEP, DECEASED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. THADDEUS J. MARTIN, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM C. KIRKLAND, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. GREGORY E. COUCH, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. RICHARD S. KRAMLICH, 0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) GREGORY A. TIMBERLAKE, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ALBERT GARCIA III, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. ANTHONY L. WINNS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JEFFREY L. FOWLER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. SAMUEL J. LOCKLEAR III, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

ADM. ROBERT F. WILLARD, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

ADM. GARY ROUGHEAD, 0000

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 1211:

To be major

CHERYL A. UDENSI, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

KEITH A. DARLINGTON, 0000
RICHARD B. DUNN, 0000
JERRY D. LEWIS, 0000
STEVEN J. MERRILL, 0000
CONRADO E. NAVARRO, 0000
BRETT C. OXMAN, 0000
CLIFTON PERRY, 0000
FRANK A. YERKES, JR., 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

KENNETH A. ARNOLD, 0000
RENEE T. BENNETT, 0000
GUILLERMO R. CARRANZA, 0000
DAVID S. CASTRO, 0000
LOUIS J. CHERRY, 0000
DOUGLAS P. CORDOVA, 0000
THOMAS J. COUTURE, 0000
DAVID S. DALES, 0000
STEVEN J. EHLENBECK, 0000
THOMAS J. HELGET, 0000
GARY M. JACKSON, 0000
JOSEPH D. JACOBSON, 0000
CHARLIE M. JOHNSON, 0000
DAVID A. G. KENDRICK, 0000
PETER R. MARKSTEINER, 0000
CRAIG G. MILLER, 0000
JAY W. MOUNKES, 0000
JEFFREY S. PALMER, 0000
PERRY J. PELOQUIN, 0000
JEFFREY P. RUDE, 0000
JEFFREY J. SLAGLE, 0000
MARK S. TESKEY, 0000
KENNETH M. THEURER, 0000
DONNA M. VERCHIO, 0000
THOMAS F. ZIMMERMAN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MARIA M. ALSINA, 0000
CATHERINE M. FAHLING, 0000
ANDREW C. FOLTZ, 0000
MATTHEW R. GRANT, 0000
DAWN D. HANKINS, 0000
SCOTT E. HARDING, 0000
DANIEL J. HIGGINS, 0000
CYNTHIA A. HOLT, 0000
KEVIN J. HUYSER, 0000
PAUL E. JETER, 0000
DEIRDRE A. KOKORA, 0000
GRANT L. KRATZ, 0000
CHRISTOPHER F. LEAVEY, 0000
WON K. LEE, 0000
HEATHER E. LOBUE, 0000
LANCE E. MATHEWS, 0000
RICHARD J. MCDERMOTT, 0000
CHARLES L. PLUMMER, 0000
JONATHAN P. PORIER, 0000
TERRI A. SAUNDERS, 0000
WENDY L. SHERMAN, 0000
KENNETH R. SIBLEY, 0000
JENNIFER L. SMITH, 0000
MARK D. STOUP, 0000
MICHELLE P. TILFORD, 0000
DAVID A. WHITEFORD, 0000
LE THI ZIMMERMAN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

THOMAS M. ANGELO, 0000
JAMES L. BAILEY, 0000
GARY J. BERTSCH, 0000
TIMOTHY A. BUTLER, 0000
KENNETH E. HARP, 0000
DONALD J. HOFFMAN, 0000
FREDERICK MCFARLAND, 0000
DWAYNE R. PEOPLES, 0000
DAVID M. TERRINONI, 0000
LISA H. TICE, 0000
FREDERICK H. VICCELLIO, 0000
DANIEL S. ZULLI, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531(A):

To be lieutenant colonel

GLENN M. FREDERICK, 0000
DANIEL J. JUDGE, 0000

To be major

RAFAEL BURGOS, 0000
DANNY M. COLTON, 0000
ALAN FLOWER, 0000
NIRAJ GOVIL, 0000
JOHN T. JANOUSAK, 0000
MARLA R. MELENDEZ, 0000
JULIE L. STEELE, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531(A):

To be lieutenant colonel

PIO VAZQUEZDIAZ, 0000
JOHN ZIELINSKI, 0000

To be major

ANTONIO DELGADO, 0000
RODNEY C. JOHNS, 0000
SAMUEL T. OLATUNBOSUN, 0000
DREW D. SCHNYDER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531(A):

To be lieutenant colonel

KAREN D. DOHERTY, 0000
BILLY PRUETT, 0000
ALAN E. SHACKELFORD, 0000

To be major

IKRAMULLAH AHMADANI, 0000
PHIL M. AKE, 0000
FRANCES A. CARNEY, 0000
AURA M. CISNEROS, 0000
MEGAN GORDON, 0000
JACK A. HEMELSTRAND, 0000
LARRY C. JACKSON, 0000
GLORIA KING, 0000
ROBERT P. LOUIS, 0000
GINGER L. MANOS, 0000
GEORGE MATEWERE, 0000
THOMAS A. MORRIS, 0000
CAROL A. NORIEGA, 0000
EMMANUEL C. TANGLAO, 0000
MAUREEN G. TOOMEY, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

CHRISTOPHER R. ABRAMSON, 0000
JAMES R. ACKERMAN III, 0000
ORLANDO A. ACOSTA, 0000
ANDREW J. ADAMS, 0000
DAVID E. ADAMS, 0000
DENNIS P. ADAMS, 0000
SHAWN J. ADKINS, 0000
LATHEEF N. AHMED, 0000
MARK J. AHRENS, 0000
RICKY L. AINSWORTH, 0000
SUSAN M. AIROLASKULLY, 0000
ANTHONY J. AJELLO, JR., 0000
PATRICK L. ALDERMAN, 0000
JOSE M. ALEMAN, 0000
JENNIFER C. ALEXANDER, 0000
LEWIS E. ALFORD III, 0000
RONALD GENE ALLEN, JR., 0000
THADDEUS P. ALLEN, 0000
WALTER C. ALLEN II, 0000
NATHAN A. ALLERHEILIGEN, 0000
JOHN B. ALLISON, 0000
JOSEPH R. ALTHOFF III, 0000
CLIFFORD G. ALTIZER, 0000
RAYMOND ALVES II, 0000
MARK C. ANARUMO, 0000
DAVID J. ANASON, 0000
LEIGHTON T. ANDERSON, JR., 0000
MICHAEL A. ANDERSON, 0000
MONTE D. ANDERSON, 0000
ROBERT E. ANDERSON, JR., 0000
STEVEN E. ANDERSON, 0000
JOSE Z. L. ANDIN, 0000
MICHAEL S. ANGLE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER T. ANTHONY, 0000
HAROLD A. ARB, 0000
DANIEL F. ARCH, 0000
JOHN E. ARD, 0000
JOHN H. ARMSTRONG, JR., 0000
JONATHAN D. ARNETT, 0000
CHARLES F. ARNOLD, JR., 0000
JOSEPH E. ARTHUR, 0000
REGINALD E. G. ASH III, 0000
SCOTT J. BABBITT, 0000
LESLIE P. BABICH, 0000
MARK E. BAER, 0000
FRED P. BAIER, 0000
CHARLES P. BAILEY, JR., 0000
JAMES B. BAILEY, JR., 0000
RICHARD J. BAILEY, JR., 0000
WILLIAM C. BAILEY, 0000
BRANDON E. BAKER, 0000
GILBERT W. BAKER, 0000
JESSICA BAKER, 0000
JOHN P. BAKER, 0000
JONATHAN P. BAKONYI, 0000
RUSSELL L. BALL, 0000
THOMAS C. BALLARD, 0000
DAVID BALLEW, 0000
ANTHONY E. BAMSEY, 0000
ALEXANDER J. BARELKA, 0000
MATTHEW A. BARKER, 0000
GEOFFREY C. BARNES, 0000
BRADLEY W. BARNHART, 0000
MARK A. BARONI, 0000
FRANKLIN D. BARROW, 0000
STEPHEN P. BARROWS, 0000
DEREK S. BARTHOLOMEW, 0000
ROBERT A. BASKETTE, 0000
SAMUEL D. BASS, 0000
LOREN E. BATTELS, JR., 0000
ROBERT G. BATTEMA, 0000
JOSEPH T. BATTLE, JR., 0000
KURT P. BAUER II, 0000
JONATHAN M. BAUGHMAN, 0000
STEPHEN J. BAUMGARTE, 0000
JOSEPH G. BEAHM, JR., 0000
DAVID L. BEAVER, 0000
MATTHEW R. BECKLEY, 0000
JOHN D. BEDINGFIELD, 0000
ROBERT L. BEHNKEN, 0000
DEAN C. BELLAMY, 0000
KELLY S. BELLAMY, 0000
ALFRED P. BELLO III, 0000
KYLE G. BELLUE, 0000
ROBERT J. BEMENT, 0000
MICHAEL R. BENHAM, 0000
JAMES S. BENOIT, 0000
LYNN BENTLEY III, 0000
RICHARD F. BENZ, 0000
DANIELLE E. BERNARD, 0000
JERRY W. BISHOP, JR., 0000
FREDERICK C. BIVETTO, 0000
EDWARD P. BLACK, 0000
SHAWN L. BLACK, 0000
DOUGLAS F. BLACKLEDGE, 0000
PETER D. BLAKE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. BLANEY, 0000
THOMAS R. BLAZEK, 0000
JENNIFER A. BLOCK, 0000
THEODORE B. BLOOMER, 0000
GREGORY D. BLOUNT, 0000
TRACY A. BOBO, 0000
RON W. BODINE, 0000
LELAND B. BOHANNON, 0000
PETER J. BOLLINGER, 0000
ROBERT P. BONGIOVI, 0000
NICOLE A. BONTRAGER, 0000
BRENT M. BOOKER, 0000
EUGENE A. BOOTH, JR., 0000
DONALD J. BORCHELT, 0000
JAMES B. BORDERS, 0000
BRETT J. BORGHETTI, 0000
JOHN H. BORN, 0000
OLEG BORUKHIN, 0000
WILLIAM K. BOSCH, 0000
JAMES D. BOTTOMLEE, 0000
SCOTT L. BOUSHELL, 0000
DONNA M. BOYCE, 0000
LORENZO C. BRADLEY, 0000
ERIC D. BRADSHAW, 0000
DANIEL E. BRANT, 0000
JAMES A. BRAUNSCHNEIDER, 0000
PAUL D. BRAWLEY, JR., 0000
STEVEN J. BREEZE, 0000
JASON M. BRENNEMAN, 0000
JOSEPH D. BREWER, 0000
JOHN A. BREWSTER, 0000
YUSEF D. BRIDGES, 0000
LARA C. BRINSON, 0000
RICHARD S. BRISCOE, 0000
KERRY D. BRITT, 0000
JEFFREY S. BRITTIG, 0000
KEVIN W. BROOKS, 0000
CHARLES E. BROWN, JR., 0000
ERIC D. BROWN, 0000
HAL D. BROWN, 0000
JASON M. BROWN, 0000
NICOLE R. BROWN, 0000
ROBERT G. BROWN, 0000
SCOTT M. BROWN, 0000
DAVID F. BROWNING, 0000
DENISE M. BRUCE, 0000
NEAL W. BRUEGGER, 0000
MICHAEL A. BRUZZINI, 0000
JOHN N. BRYAN, 0000
ALBERT D. BRYSON, 0000
BRIAN G. BUCK, 0000
JOHN S. BULLDIS, 0000
RICHARD K. BULLOCK, 0000
JEFFREY S. BURDETT, 0000
CHRISTOPHER W. BURELLI, 0000
JOSHUA C. BURGESS, 0000
MICHAEL D. BURK, 0000
TIMOTHY J. BURKE, 0000
JOSEPH K. BURNHAM, 0000
ALVIN F. BURSE, 0000
ANGELA J. BURTH, 0000
THOMAS F. BURTSCHI, 0000
FREDERICK E. BUSH III, 0000

RICHARD D. BUTLER, 0000
STEVEN M. BUZON, 0000
CHRISTINE M. BYERS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER L. BYROM, 0000
DENNIS O. BYTHEWOOD, 0000
STEVEN R. CABOSKY, 0000
WILLIAM M. CAHILL, 0000
PAUL D. CAIRNEY, 0000
PHILIP M. CALI, 0000
KENNETH D. CALLAHAN, 0000
MICHAEL G. CANCELLIER, 0000
JIMMY R. CANLAS, 0000
BRYAN H. CANNADY, 0000
MONTE R. CANNON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER E. CANTRELL, 0000
HOUSTON R. CANTWELL, 0000
ANTHONY B. CAPOBIANCO II, 0000
MICHAEL R. CARDOZA, 0000
SCOTT H. CARDOZO, 0000
JOEL L. CAREY, 0000
LANCE A. CARMACK, 0000
STEVEN C. CARMICAL, 0000
DENNIS F. CARON, 0000
BRIAN L. CARR, 0000
STEPHEN T. CARSON, 0000
ALAN M. CARVER, 0000
KENNETH R. CARYER, 0000
GREGORY T. CATARRA, 0000
EUGENE M. CAUGHEY, 0000
TOBIN W. CAVALLARI, 0000
JOSEPH R. CDEBACA, 0000
BRYAN K. CESSNA, 0000
TIMOTHY P. CHAMERNIK, 0000
ROBERT L. CHARLESWORTH, 0000
ROBERT M. CHAVEZ, 0000
SAMUEL J. CHESNUT IV, 0000
JASON J. E. CHILDS, 0000
VINCENT J. CHIOMA, 0000
DAVID B. CHISENHALL, JR., 0000
SEAN M. CHOQUETTE, 0000
DAVID P. CHRISMAN, 0000
KEVIN L. CHRIST, 0000
CHAD L. CHRISTOPHERSON, 0000
MATTHEW C. CICCARELLO, 0000
ROBERT O. CIOPPA, 0000
ANNE L. CLARK, 0000
MICHAEL J. CLARK, 0000
JONATHAN B. CLAUNCH, 0000
CHRISTINA M. CLAUSNITZER, 0000
HERBERT L. CLAYTON, 0000
JOHN D. CLAYTON, 0000
JASON E. CLEMENTS, 0000
PHILIP A. CLINTON, 0000
NILES M. COCANOUR, 0000
STEPHEN B. COCKS, 0000
JED S. COHEN, 0000
PETER J. COHEN, 0000
MICHAEL D. COLBURN, 0000
BARRY W. COLE, 0000
DARREN R. COLE, 0000
HERMAN A. COLE III, 0000
JAMES E. COLEBANK, 0000
ANTHONY E. COLEMAN, 0000
BRIAN D. COLLINS, 0000
HEATH A. COLLINS, 0000
TODD A. COLLINS, 0000
JASON R. COMBS, 0000
KEITH A. C. COMPTON, JR., 0000
VERNON W. CONAWAY IV, 0000
CHAD L. CONERLY, 0000
WILLIAM J. CONLEY, 0000
JOHN P. CONMY, 0000
SIDNEY S. CONNER, 0000
MICHAEL A. CONNOLLY, 0000
DEREK T. CONTRERAS, 0000
JOEL O. COOK, 0000
ROBERT J. COOK, 0000
WANDA D. COOK, 0000
BERT COOL, 0000
BRYAN S. COON, 0000
CHARLES J. COOPER, 0000
THOMAS M. COOPER, 0000
JAMES A. COPHER, 0000
THOMAS COPPERSMITH, 0000
GREGORY B. CORKERN, 0000
SIMON D. CORLEY, 0000
DYLAN R. CORNWELL, 0000
ALEXANDER COS, 0000
DONALD J. COTHERN, 0000
JON E. COUNSELL, 0000
TERRY G. COURTNEY, 0000
STEVEN M. COX, 0000
ROBERT D. COXWELL, 0000
ANGERNETTE E. COY, 0000
CHRISTOPHER P. COZZI, 0000
ADRIANE B. CRAIG, 0000
TODD A. CRAIGIE, 0000
BRENT R. CRIDER, 0000
BRADLEY M. CRITES, 0000
ALBERTO E. CRUZ, 0000
BERNARD A. CRUZ, 0000
ENRIQUE A. CRUZ, 0000
WILLIAM C. CULVER, 0000
MICHAEL W. CUMMINGS, 0000
CASE A. CUNNINGHAM, 0000
FRANKLIN E. CUNNINGHAM, JR., 0000
LAVERN E. CURRY, JR., 0000
RUSSELL V. CUSTER, 0000
ROGER C. CUTSHAW, 0000
ALEXANDER J. CZERNECKI III, 0000
PATRICK W. DABROWSKI, 0000
MICHAEL P. DAHLSTROM, 0000
WILLIAM A. DAROSA, 0000
ARTHUR D. DAVIS, 0000
DONALD J. DAVIS, 0000
ERIC S. DAVIS, 0000
LEVERTIS DAVIS, JR., 0000
PATRICK W. DAVIS, 0000
MICHAEL J. DEAN, 0000
BRIAN J. DELAMATER, 0000
CHARLES J. DELAPP II, 0000
JAMES W. DELOACH, 0000
JAMES M. DELONG, 0000
SCOTT A. DELORENZI, 0000
CHRISTOPHER DELOSSANTOS, 0000
ELIZABETH A. DEMMONS, 0000
THOMAS E. DEMPSEY III, 0000
JEFFREY G. DEMUTH, 0000
GARY D. DENNEY, 0000
CHAD P. DERANGER, 0000
ABNER DEVALLON, JR., 0000
STEVEN N. DICKERSON, 0000
BRIAN C. DICKINSON, 0000
MICHAEL A. DICKINSON, 0000
TOR F. DIETRICHS, 0000
STEVE A. DINZART, 0000
JAMES E. DITTUS, 0000
BRANDON K. DOAN, 0000
FRANCIS T. DOIRON, 0000
MICHAEL P. DOMBROWSKI, 0000
MICHAEL R. DOMBROWSKI, 0000
THOMAS R. DORL, 0000
JOHN L. DORRIAN, 0000
PETER W. DOTY, 0000
ANNA M. DOUGLAS, 0000
CHARLES W. DOUGLASS, 0000
ROBERT A. DOWNEY, 0000
JAMES F. DOWNS, 0000
JEFFREY T. DOYLE, 0000
NORMAN A. DOZIER, 0000
ERIK A. DRAKE, 0000
KERRY A. DRAKE, 0000
THOMAS G. DRAPE, 0000
PAUL T. DRIESSEN, 0000
PERCY E. DUNAGIN III, 0000
DAVID E. DUTCHER, 0000
DAVID W. DYE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER A. EAGAN, 0000
DARREN A. EASTON, 0000
LEIF E. ECKHOLM, 0000
GILBERT B. EDDY, 0000
BRIAN J. EDE, 0000
EDIE L. EDMONDSON, 0000
CAREY D. EFFERSON, 0000
EDWARD J. EFSIC III, 0000
LEO J. EISBACH, 0000
RICHARD D. ELMORE, 0000
JOHN J. ELSHAW, 0000
MICHAEL B. ELTZ, 0000
MARK R. ELY, 0000
TODD M. EMMONS, 0000
BYRL R. ENGEL, 0000
CHRISTOPHER B. ERICKSON, 0000
JOHN W. ERICKSON, 0000
JOHN B. ESCH, 0000
ERIC A. ESPINO, 0000
EDWARD E. ESTERON, 0000
BRIAN L. EVANS, 0000
DAVID F. EVANS, JR., 0000
MARCIA D. EVANS, 0000
DARREN E. EWING, 0000
STACY P. EXUM, 0000
JOHN M. FAIR, 0000
JEFFREY K. FALLESEN, 0000
THOMAS G. FALZARANO, 0000
BLAKE C. FARLEY, 0000
RICHARD S. FARNSWORTH II, 0000
BRIAN M. FARRAR, 0000
MATTHEW O. FEASTER, 0000
ERIK S. FEGENBUSH, 0000
MICHAEL A. FELICE, 0000
ROSS O. FELKER, 0000
RICHARD A. FICKEN, 0000
MATTHEW C. FINNEGAN, 0000
THOMAS J. FINNERAN, 0000
PAUL R. FIORENZA, 0000
JON R. FISHER, 0000
ARMANDO E. FITERRE, 0000
RICHARD R. FLAKE, 0000
ROBERT L. FLETCHER, 0000
FRANK A. FLORES, 0000
MICHAEL R. FLORIO, 0000
DANIEL E. FLYNN, 0000
TODD A. FOGLE, 0000
MATTHEW J. FOLEY, 0000
CHARLES L. FORD, JR., 0000
MARK A. FORMICA, 0000
KYLE C. FORRER, 0000
ERIC N. FORSYTH, 0000
JOHN C. FRANKLIN, 0000
RONALD K. FRANTZ, 0000
ANTHONY L. FRANZ, 0000
DANIEL W. FRANZEN, 0000
JOHN H. FRASER, 0000
BRADLEY D. FRAZIER, 0000
ANDREW B. FREEBORN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER A. FREEMAN, 0000
KARL L. FRERKING, 0000
CHARLES B. FROEMKE, JR., 0000
JASON S. FROMM, 0000
RICHARD M. FULTON, 0000
SCOTT A. GAAB, 0000
GARY A. GABRIEL, JR., 0000
JUAN C. GACHARNA, 0000
GREGORY J. GAGNON, 0000
ALEXANDER G. GAINES, 0000
JOHN J. GALIK, 0000
MICHELANGELO GALLUCCI, 0000
ROBERT A. GALLUP, 0000
DANIEL D. GARBER, 0000
MIGUEL E. GARCIA, 0000
WILLIAM C. GARRE III, 0000
JEFFREY B. GARTMAN, 0000
JOHN M. GARVER, 0000
BRYAN T. GATES, 0000
JEFFRY E. GATES, 0000
MICHAEL J. GAYER, JR., 0000
MICHAEL A. GEER, 0000
GLEN M. GENOVE, 0000
HOWARD A. GENTRY, 0000
DAVID P. GERHARDT, 0000
KEVIN A. GIBBONS, 0000
KEITH P. GIBSON, 0000
ROBIN L. GIBSON, 0000
TODD G. GIEFER, 0000
JAMES M. GIFFORD, JR., 0000
JOHN W. GILES, JR., 0000
ROBERT J. GILL, 0000
BRENT M. GILLESPIE, 0000
BRYAN M. GILLESPIE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER W. GILMORE, 0000
CARMELO J. GIOVENCO, JR., 0000
TIMOTHY F. GIRAS, 0000
JOHN C. GLASS, 0000
MICHAEL P. GLEASON, 0000
ANDREW T. GOBER, 0000
EDWARD R. GOETZ, 0000
JOSEPH M. GOLOVACH, JR., 0000
ALEJANDRO GOMEZ, JR., 0000
JAIME GOMEZ, JR., 0000
HECTOR L. GONZALEZ, 0000
LONGINOS GONZALEZ, JR., 0000
PEDRO I. GONZALEZ, 0000
ROBERT A. GONZALEZ, 0000
KRISTIN E. GOODWIN, 0000
KEVIN J. GORDON, 0000
GLEN L. GOSS, 0000
DANIEL F. GOTTRICH, 0000
GEORGE V. GOVAN, 0000
DONALD R. GRANNAN, 0000
JARED W. GRANSTROM, 0000
DARREN P. GRAY, 0000
JAMES E. GRAY, 0000
RODNEY GRAY, 0000
RONALD M. GRAY, 0000
TREVOR E. GRAY II, 0000
GREGORY S. GREEN, 0000
JUSTIN W. GREEN, 0000
MICHELE A. GREEN, 0000
JAMES C. GREENE, 0000
KEVIN D. GREENE, 0000
MICHAELA A. GREENE, 0000
PAUL D. GREENLEE, 0000
BRIAN S. GREENROAD, 0000
STEVEN C. GREGG, 0000
MANUEL G. GRIEGO, 0000
ETHAN C. GRIFFIN, 0000
BRIAN D. GRIFFITH, 0000
ROBERT L. GRIFFITH, 0000
MICHAEL W. GRISMER, JR., 0000
MICHAEL A. GROGAN, 0000
DONALD B. GROVE, 0000
MICHAEL C. GRUB, 0000
KYLE E. GRUNDEN, 0000
LUIS M. GRUNEIRO, 0000
MARK A. GUERRERO, 0000
THEODORE G. GUETIG, 0000
RYAN E. GUIBERSON, 0000
SCOTT D. GUNDLACH, 0000
ENRIQUE J. GWIN, 0000
WILLIAM J. HAAG, 0000
ARLIE V. HADDIX, 0000
MICHAEL D. HADDOCK, 0000
KEVIN R. HAFF, 0000
DIANA L. HAJEK, 0000
CHARLES T. HALEY III, 0000
JOSEPH E. HALL, 0000
WILLIAM D. HALL, 0000
ERIC K. HALVERSON, 0000
ANDREW K. HAMANN, 0000
STEPHEN F. HAMLIN, 0000
FRANCISCO G. HAMM, 0000
STEWART A. HAMMONS, 0000
DEBORAH G. HAMRICK, 0000
TERRY J. HAMRICK, JR., 0000
TODD L. HANNING, 0000
CRAIG A. HANSEN, 0000
DAVID S. HANSON, 0000
WILLIAM B. HARE III, 0000
SHAWN L. HARING, 0000
FREDERICK G. HARMON, 0000
STEPHEN J. HARMON, 0000
STEPHEN R. HARMON, 0000
MATTHEW W. HARPER, 0000
MICHAEL S. HARPER, 0000
SEAN A. HARRINGTON, 0000
BRENDAN M. HARRIS, 0000
CHARLES W. HARRIS III, 0000
SUSANNA L. HARRIS, 0000
THOMAS M. HARRIS, 0000
ALAN T. HART, 0000
CARL R. HARTSFIELD, 0000
STEVEN C. M. HASSTEDT, 0000
JANET J. HAUG, 0000
JEAN E. HAVENS, 0000
JAMES A. HAWKINS, JR., 0000
RUSSELL A. HAYES, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. HAYS, 0000
ARTHUR J. HEAPHY III, 0000
DAVID HEDGER, 0000
TIMREK C. HEISLER, 0000
DARWIN L. HEMEYER, 0000
CHARLES R. HENDERSON, 0000
LANDON L. HENDERSON, 0000
PAUL E. HENDERSON, 0000
JEFFEREY T. HENNES, 0000
JOHN S. HENRY, 0000
DONALD M. HENSLEY, JR., 0000
ERICH D. HERNANDEZBAQUERO, 0000
ROBERT E. HERNDON, JR., 0000
MARK A. HERSANT, 0000

MARCUS W. HERVEY, 0000
SHAUN R. HICK, 0000
JAMES P. HICKMAN, 0000
LAWRENCE C. HICKS, 0000
TAMARA L. HIGGINS, 0000
STEVEN M. HILL, 0000
DWIGHT H. HINTZ, JR., 0000
DEAN T. HITCHCOCK, 0000
HAROLD T. HOANG, 0000
GEORGE K. HOBSON, 0000
STEPHEN G. HOFFMAN, 0000
MICHAEL L. A. HOLLAND, 0000
MICHELLE A. HOLLAND, 0000
MATTHEW H. HOLM, 0000
RONALD P. HOLST, JR., 0000
MICHAEL K. HONMA, 0000
SEAN M. HOYER, 0000
KEVIN R. HUBBARD, 0000
JEFFREY F. HUBER, 0000
THOMAS C. HUDNALL, 0000
ANDREW D. HUGG, 0000
RANDALL S. HUISS, 0000
JIMMY C. HUMPHREY, 0000
JEFFREY W. HUMPHRIES, 0000
ROMAN L. HUND, 0000
JAMES R. HUNTER, 0000
DERON L. HURST, 0000
BARRY A. HUTCHISON, 0000
GARY G. HUTFLES, 0000
JOHN P. HUTTON, 0000
KARL D. INGEMAN, 0000
COLLIN T. IRETON, 0000
GEORGE W. IRVING IV, 0000
LYNN M. IRWIN, 0000
SIMON A. IZAGUIRRE, JR., 0000
GARY L. JACKSON, 0000
JOHN W. JACKSON, 0000
RICHARD S. JACOBS, 0000
MICHAEL S. JANSEN, 0000
MICHAEL JASON, 0000
GARY D. JENKINS II, 0000
PETER J. JENNESS, 0000
JONATHAN A. JENSEN, 0000
LARS D. JENSEN, 0000
WALTER A. JIMENEZ, 0000
MICHAEL W. JIRU, JR., 0000
MICHAEL W. JOHANEK, 0000
CLARENCE A. JOHNSON, JR., 0000
CRAIG P. JOHNSON, 0000
DELBERT L. JOHNSON, 0000
DIRK J. JOHNSON, 0000
GEORGE C. JOHNSON, 0000
JESSE L. JOHNSON, JR., 0000
LAURA M. JOHNSON, 0000
PAUL M. JOHNSON, 0000
JAY P. JONES, JR., 0000
JOEL A. JONES, 0000
RAY A. JONES, 0000
SCOTT H. JONES, 0000
TERRI A. JONES, 0000
WILLIAM R. JONES, 0000
STEPHEN F. JOST, 0000
ELLIOTT G. JOURDAN, 0000
ROSE M. JOURDAN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER L. JUAREZ, 0000
DEAN R. JUDGE, 0000
DARRELL F. JUDY, 0000
TIMOTHY P. JUNG, 0000
JAY L. JUNKINS, 0000
DAVID M. JURK, 0000
DAVID A. KACMARYNSKI, 0000
JEFFREY P. KACZMARCZYK, 0000
ROBERT S. KAFKA, 0000
MICHAEL A. KANEMOTO, 0000
PAUL A. KANNING, 0000
MACE R. KANT, 0000
PATRICK J. KARG, 0000
CHRISTINE A. KARPEL, 0000
PHILIP J. KASE, 0000
AMANDA G. KATO, 0000
MICHELLE L. KAUFMANN, 0000
TONNEY T. KAWUH, 0000
BRYAN A. KEELING, 0000
REGAN T. KEENER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. KEETON, 0000
WERNER W. KEIDEL II, 0000
MATTHEW D. KEIHL, 0000
DAVID D. KELLEY, 0000
TODD C. KELLY, 0000
CHRISTOPHER N. KENNEDY, 0000
DEBORAH L. KENT, 0000
GREG A. KENT, 0000
KARL A. KENT, 0000
JOE D. KERR, 0000
KELLY C. KIMSEY, 0000
DAVID N. KINCAID, JR., 0000
MICHAEL O. KINSLOW, 0000
KELLY M. KIRBY, 0000
LEA T. KIRKWOOD, 0000
MICHAEL R. KITCHING, 0000
DONALD A. KLECKNER, 0000
JEFFREY S. KLEIN, 0000
JOHN M. KLEIN, JR., 0000
DOUGLAS W. KLINE, 0000
PATRICK L. KLINGLER, 0000
SCOTT A. KNIEP, 0000
THOMAS E. KOCHENDOERFER, 0000
ROBERT W. KOLB, 0000
THOMAS A. KONICKI, 0000
KURT D. KONOPATZKE, 0000
KEN W. KOPP, 0000
JAMES K. KOSSLER, 0000
VAN A. KRAILO, 0000
DANIEL J. KRALL, 0000
MARK T. KRAMIS, 0000
STEPHEN M. KRAVITSKY, 0000
DERIC V. KRAXBERGER, 0000
DAVID T. KREMPASKY, 0000
DAVID D. KRETZ, 0000
JASON R. KRINSKY, 0000
MOHAN S. KRISHNA, 0000
ERIC A. KRYSTKOWIAK, 0000
TANYA R. KUBINEC, 0000
DOUGLAS O. KUGLER, 0000
CHARLES D. KUHL, 0000
JERRY J. KUNG, 0000
JOSEPH D. KUNKEL, 0000
THOMAS E. KUNKEL, 0000
JOSEPH W. KURTZ, 0000
JOSHUA M. KUTRIEB, 0000
DWAYNE A. LAHAYE, 0000
MICHAEL F. LAMB, 0000
DAWN C. LANCASTER, 0000
PAUL J. LANDER, 0000
JOHN F. LANDOLT III, 0000
JARA N. LANG, 0000
DONALD L. LANGLEY II, 0000
ALLEN L. LARKINS, 0000
DANIEL T. LASICA, 0000
ROBERT N. LAWRENCE, 0000
ERICK J. LAWSON, 0000
MICHAEL D. LAY, 0000
DOUGLAS J. LEE, 0000
JEFFREY A. LEE, 0000
JEFFREY P. LEEDER, 0000
JAMES S. LEFFEL, 0000
JEFFREY A. LEISCHNER, 0000
CHAD E. LEMAIRE, 0000
AARON H. K. LEONG, 0000
SEAN P. LEROY, 0000
JONATHAN M. LETSINGER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER P. LEVY, 0000
TARA A. LEWELING, 0000
ANDREW J. LEWIN, 0000
GREGORY J. LEWIS, 0000
ROBERT H. LILKE, 0000
PHILIP D. LIMBACHER, 0000
THOMAS L. LIMBAUGH, 0000
DAVID C. LINDSAY, 0000
DOUGLAS R. LINDSAY, 0000
RICHARD J. LINEHAN III, 0000
MICHAEL J. LINGOR, 0000
GARY L. LIVINGSTON, 0000
CHRISTINE A. LOCKE, 0000
DARRELL LOCKHART, 0000
KEITH M. LOGEMAN, 0000
CHARLES E. LOMINAC II, 0000
SEAN F. LONDRIGAN, 0000
JILL A. LONG, 0000
PERRY M. LONG III, 0000
TODD E. LONG, 0000
THOMAS M. LOPRESTI, 0000
JAMES A. LOUTHAIN, 0000
STEPHEN A. LOVE, 0000
WALTER F. LOVINGS, 0000
JAMES C. LOWE, 0000
THOMAS J. LUCKRITZ, 0000
MATTHEW J. LUPONE, 0000
LOUISE J. LYLE, 0000
MARC A. LYNCH, 0000
JOHN W. LYONS, 0000
JOSEPH E. MACCAFFREY, 0000
JESSICA A. MACDONALD, 0000
ROBERT S. MACKENZIE, 0000
WILLIAM J. MACLEAN, 0000
MARK W. MADAUS, 0000
THOMAS M. MADDOCK, 0000
STEPHEN W. MAGNAN, 0000
MATTHEW T. MAGNESS, 0000
DOUGLAS L. MAGOFFIN, 0000
ANTHONY MAISONET, 0000
JOHN A. MAJEWSKI, JR., 0000
PAUL G. MALACHOWSKI, 0000
JASON MANTARO, 0000
RYAN D. MANTZ, 0000
MARIA C. MARION, 0000
PAUL K. MARKS, 0000
DAVID W. MARSH, 0000
CLAYTON R. MARSHALL, 0000
DANIEL N. MARTICELLO, JR., 0000
JOHN D. MARTIN, 0000
STEVEN L. MARTINEZ, 0000
DAVID J. MARTINSON, 0000
SCOTT P. MASKERY, 0000
ROBIN L. MASON, 0000
ANTHONY J. MASTALIR, 0000
RICHARD S. MATHEWS, 0000
SCOTT B. MATTHEWS, 0000
JOHN W. MATUS, 0000
ROBERT W. MAXWELL, 0000
RONALD L. MCAFEE, 0000
ROBERT A. MCBRIDE, 0000
EDWIN D. MCCAIN, 0000
SEAN M. MCCARTHY, 0000
DAVID L. MCCLANAHAN, 0000
RICHARD W. MCCLEARY, 0000
ANDREW S. MCCOY, 0000
PATRICK S. MCCULLOUGH, 0000
THOMAS M. MCCURLEY, 0000
GAYLORD E. MCFALLS, 0000
TIMOTHY D. MCGAVERN, 0000
WILLIAM A. MCGUFFEY, 0000
SEAN S. MCKENNA, 0000
RICHARD J. MCMULLAN, 0000
JOHN K. MCNULTY, 0000
THOMAS C. M. MCNURLIN, 0000
MIGUEL A. MEDRANO, 0000
ROBERT T. MEEKS III, 0000
THOMAS B. MEEKS, 0000
JAMES S. MEHTA, 0000
KELLY K. MENOZZI, 0000
JAMES S. MERCHANT, 0000
BRADY V. MERRILL, 0000
JACK W. MESSER, 0000
KIRSTEN R. MESSER, 0000
RICHARD J. MESSINA, 0000
DAVID O. METEYER, 0000
MICHAEL J. MEYER, 0000
JOSEPH K. MICHALEK, 0000
JONPAUL MICKLE, 0000
ZEBBY MILES, 0000
CAROLINE M. MILLER, 0000
HANS H. MILLER, 0000
KATHERINE K. MILLER, 0000
MATTHEW P. MILLER, 0000
MICHAEL A. MILLER, 0000
MICHAEL T. MILLER, 0000
RONALD M. MILLER, JR., 0000
TODD A. MILLER, 0000
WESLEY P. MILLER IV, 0000
WILLIAM P. MILLER, JR., 0000
DAVID A. MINEAU, 0000
STEVEN J. MINKIN, 0000
MICHAEL R. MITCHELL, 0000
ERIC N. MOLTZAU, 0000
VICTOR W. MONCRIEFFE II, 0000
JACQUELINE M. MONGEON, 0000
SEAN P. MONOGUE, 0000
DOUGLAS C. MONROE, 0000
SCOTT D. MOON, 0000
ERIC Y. MOORE, 0000
FREDERICK D. MOORE, 0000
SCOTT P. MOORE, 0000
STEVEN W. MOORE, 0000
JOHN E. MORAN, 0000
ERIC J. MORITZ, 0000
WILLIAM B. MOSLE, 0000
KENNETH E. MOSS, 0000
MICHAEL D. MOTE, 0000
HENRY L. MOTON, 0000
RICK G. MOXLEY, 0000
STEPHEN R. MOYES, 0000
JAMES F. MUELLER, 0000
WADE A. MUELLER, 0000
PAUL H. MULLIS, 0000
JOHN F. MURATORE, 0000
TODD A. MURPHEY, 0000
SEAN M. MURPHY, 0000
DANIEL P. MURRAY, 0000
PAUL J. MURRAY, 0000
JOSEPH W. MURRIETTA, 0000
LEILANI L. MUTH, 0000
AMANDA S. MYERS, 0000
PETER P. MYKYTYN III, 0000
STEPHEN J. NAFTANEL, 0000
JOHN P. NAGLE, 0000
GEORGE R. NAGY, 0000
ARNOLD W. NASH III, 0000
ANTHONY J. NATALE, 0000
ROBERT J. NEAL, JR., 0000
JEFFREY P. NEELY, 0000
JODI A. NEFF, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. NELSON, 0000
JOHN P. NELSON, 0000
RANDALL J. NELSON, 0000
KARA K. J. NEUSE, 0000
JOHN P. NEWBERRY, 0000
HARVEY F. NEWTON, 0000
HIEN T. NGUYEN, 0000
BRADLEY W. NICHOLS, 0000
DAVID M. NICHOLSON, 0000
THOMAS W. NICHOLSON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. NIEMI, 0000
ALLAN A. NILLES, 0000
ALAN R. NOLAN, 0000
ROBERT T. NOONAN, 0000
KENNETH D. NORGARD, 0000
WILLIAM J. NORTON, 0000
PAUL C. NOSEK, 0000
KENNETH J. NOTARI, 0000
JEREMY J. NOVAK, 0000
SCOTT R. NOWLIN, 0000
SHAN B. NUCKOLS, 0000
NEIL P. OAKDEN, 0000
EDWARD M. OCHOA, 0000
RUSSELL G. OCHS, 0000
JAMES R. OCONNOR, 0000
JOHN P. OCONNOR, 0000
MICHAEL A. OCONNOR, 0000
BRIAN D. OELRICH, 0000
KENNETH W. OHLSON, 0000
PETER P. OHOTNICKY, 0000
RALPH T. OKUBO, JR., 0000
JON M. OLEKSZYK, 0000
DEREK M. OLIVER, 0000
PHILLIP S. OPELA, 0000
RONNI M. OREZZOLI, 0000
DEAN P. ORFIELD, 0000
CHARLES D. ORMSBY, 0000
JAMES D. OSTERHOUT, 0000
MITCHEL T. OSTROW, 0000
BRIAN A. PAETH, 0000
AMMON H. PALMER, 0000
DONALD D. PALMER, 0000
JEFFERY M. PARKS, 0000
TAMARA L. PARSONS, 0000
JOHN D. PASSMORE, 0000
CHAD A. PATTON, 0000
TRACY G. PATTON, 0000
LUDWIG K. PAULSEN, 0000
DAVID L. PAVIK, 0000
JEFFREY P. PEARSON, 0000
MARK E. PEARSON, 0000
TROY D. PEARSON, 0000
DAVID L. PEELER, JR., 0000
KENNETH V. PEIFER, 0000
LYNN P. PEITZ, 0000
DANA C. PELLETIER, 0000
TOMAS A. PENA, 0000
DANIEL K. PENCE, 0000
DOUGLAS W. PENTECOST, 0000

KEITH A. PERKINS, 0000
LEON J. PERKOWSKI, 0000
KRISTOPHER E. PERRY, 0000
MARSHALL C. PERRY, 0000
BRIAN C. PETERS, 0000
KENDALL D. PETERS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER R. PETERSEN, 0000
SCOTT T. PETERSEN, 0000
TY W. PETERSON, 0000
JAMES D. PETRICK, 0000
MICHAEL S. PETROCCO, 0000
MICHAEL R. PETTIT, 0000
EVAN L. PETTUS, 0000
GEORGE E. PETTY, 0000
THOMAS E. PHILIPP, 0000
RICHARD J. PIAZZA, 0000
JAMES W. PIEL, 0000
STEPHEN M. PIEPER, 0000
SAMMY T. PIERCE, 0000
RONALD L. PIERI, 0000
DAVID A. PIFFARERIO, 0000
DONNA M. G. PIKE, 0000
LEONARD C. PILHOFER, 0000
JOSE A. PINEDO, 0000
CHAD E. A. PITOG, 0000
ROBERT N. PITTMAN, 0000
GARY T. PLASTER, 0000
RAYMOND M. PLATT, 0000
WILLIAM C. PLEASANTS, 0000
WILLIAM H. POE, 0000
STEPHEN A. POLOMSKY, 0000
JAMES S. POMPANO, 0000
BRIAN H. PORTER, 0000
GLORIA L. PORTER, 0000
TERI L. POULTONCONSOLDANE, 0000
DAVID M. POWELL, 0000
MATTHEW J. POWELL, 0000
ROBERT R. POWELL, 0000
DANIEL T. POWERS, 0000
MELANIE Y. PREISSER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER T. PREJEAN, 0000
SKIP C. J. PRIBYL, 0000
MICHAEL J. PRICE, 0000
ARTHUR W. PRIMAS, JR., 0000
DENNIS L. PRIMOLI II, 0000
MATTHEW S. PRUITT, 0000
SHAWN C. PURVIS, 0000
RICHARD D. QUARBERG, 0000
ROBERT J. QUIGG IV, 0000
MICHAEL R. QUINTINI, JR., 0000
ALESIA A. QUITON, 0000
CHAD D. RADUEGE, 0000
KEVIN L. RAINEY, 0000
CHRISTIAN E. RANDELL, 0000
CLINT L. RASIC, 0000
DAVID W. RAWLINS, 0000
MICHAEL T. RAWLS, 0000
BRIAN J. RAY, 0000
THOMAS P. REARDON, 0000
KEITH W. REEVES, 0000
BRAXTON D. REHM, 0000
RHONDA K. REICHEL, 0000
CHRISTOPHER S. REIFEL, 0000
MICHAEL C. REINERS, 0000
SCOTT W. REINHARD, 0000
STEPHEN L. RENNER, 0000
MICHAEL A. RESCHKE, 0000
OMAR REYESLATTOUF, 0000
JONATHAN C. RICE IV, 0000
JUSTIN M. RICE, 0000
JOSEPH P. RICHARDS, 0000
CHRIS A. RICHARDSON, 0000
THOMAS E. RICHARDSON, 0000
ROBERT A. RICKER, 0000
GEORGE J. RIEDEL, 0000
ROBERT T. RIEDELL, 0000
DARREN S. ROACH, 0000
ROBERT L. ROANE, 0000
BILLY G. ROBERSON, JR., 0000
CHRISTIAN D. ROBERT, 0000
ALLEN R. ROBERTS, 0000
GARREN B. ROBERTS, 0000
GLEN A. ROBERTS, 0000
GLEN F. ROBERTS, 0000
AMY R. ROBINSON, 0000
DWAYNE M. ROBISON, 0000
MICHELLE R. ROCCO, 0000
SCOTTLAND L. RODDY, 0000
SHELLEY A. RODRIGUEZ, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. ROGERS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER T. ROGERS, 0000
RICHARD D. ROGERS, 0000
RYAN C. ROGERS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER S. ROGOWSKI, JR., 0000
MICHAEL K. ROKAW, 0000
RICHARD B. ROLLER, 0000
SCOTT A. ROMBERGER, 0000
ROBERT T. ROMER, 0000
MARGARET M. ROMERO, 0000
LARRY D. ROOF, 0000
RICHARD M. ROSA, 0000
DOUGLAS W. ROTH, 0000
KRISTINA L. ROTH, 0000
TARA K. ROUTSIS, 0000
ROBERT J. ROWELL, 0000
WILLIAM J. ROWELL, 0000
LEERNEST M. B. RUFFIN, 0000
JAMES R. RUFFING, 0000
FRANK G. RUGGERI, 0000
BRYAN T. RUNKLE, 0000
CHAD W. RUSSELL, 0000
STEPHEN M. RUSSELL, 0000
MARK A. RUSSO, 0000
SUNCHLAR M. RUST, 0000
ALLEN C. RUTH, 0000
ANDREW J. RYAN, 0000
PATRICK S. RYDER, 0000
JOHN D. RYE, 0000
MATTHEW B. RYTTING, 0000
MANUEL F. SAENZ, 0000
CHRISTOPHER S. SAGE, 0000
FRANK D. SAMUELSON, 0000
TROY L. SANDERS, 0000
BRIAN S. SANDLIN, 0000
DORAL E. SANDLIN, 0000
TIMOTHY A. SANDS, 0000
MATTHEW D. SANFORD, 0000
MICHAEL G. SANJUME, 0000
JOE H. SANTOS, 0000
JOSEPH C. SANTUCCI, 0000
REX E. SAUKKONEN, 0000
TODD A. SAULS, 0000
MICHAEL E. SAYLOR, 0000
DAVID R. SCANLON, 0000
JERRY B. SCARBOROUGH, 0000
JEFFREY S. SCARBROUGH, 0000
DAVID C. SCHARF, 0000
JAY F. SCHATZ, 0000
JEFFREY A. SCHAVLAND, 0000
ANTHONY W. SCHENK, 0000
SCOTT J. SCHENO, 0000
KEVIN E. SCHILLER, 0000
HERMAN D. SCHIRG, 0000
STEVEN P. SCHLONSKI, 0000
BRIAN K. SCHOOLEY, 0000
FRANK D. SCHORZMAN, 0000
BRYAN J. SCHRASS, 0000
SCOTT M. SCHROFF, 0000
ADRIAN C. SCHUETTKE, 0000
THERESE A. SCHULER, 0000
TIMOTHY M. SCHULTEIS, 0000
SARAH J. SCHULTZ, 0000
DEREK M. SCOTT, 0000
PAUL J. SCOTT, 0000
DAVID A. SEARLE, 0000
PATRICIA K. SEINWILL, 0000
DAVID J. SELNICK, 0000
TRISHA M. SEXTON, 0000
THOMAS B. SHANK, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. SHEARER, 0000
ROBERT K. SHEEHAN, 0000
MARC A. SHEIE, 0000
JAMES R. SHELL II, 0000
SCOTT A. SHEPARD, 0000
RYAN C. SHERWOOD, 0000
JOHN W. SHIRLEY, 0000
JOHN F. SHIRTZ, 0000
LISA C. SHOEMAKER, 0000
KENNETH A. SHUGART, JR., 0000
DAVID K. SIEVE, 0000
GUILLERMO E. SILVA, 0000
CHARLES T. SIMMONS, 0000
ERIK L. SIMONSEN, 0000
ANTHONY G. SIMPSON, 0000
RAY L. SIMPSON, 0000
DAVID S. SINGER, 0000
RODNEY SINGLETON, 0000
TERRY C. SISSON, 0000
BEVERLY S. SLOAN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. SMITH, 0000
DAVID C. SMITH, 0000
KENNETH A. SMITH, 0000
KEVIN D. SMITH, 0000
MARK D. SMITH, 0000
MATTHEW D. SMITH, 0000
MICHAEL R. SMITH, 0000
RANDALL E. SMITH, 0000
RICHARD L. SMITH, 0000
STEPHEN F. SMITH, JR., 0000
WILLIAM G. SMITH, 0000
DAVID B. SMUCK, 0000
ROBERT D. SNODGRASS, 0000
LISA M. SNOW, 0000
MATTHEW O. SNYDER, 0000
JULIE M. SOLBERG, 0000
FREDRICK L. SONNEFELD, 0000
STEPHEN T. SORENSEN, 0000
SEAN K. SORENSON, 0000
JEFFREY A. SORRELL, 0000
GREGORY J. SOUKUP, 0000
JENNIFER P. SOVADA, 0000
ADRIAN L. SPAIN, 0000
JEFFERY B. SPANN, 0000
ALAN N. SPARKS, 0000
KENNETH S. SPEIDEL, 0000
KIMBERLY C. ST JOHN KEYS, 0000
AARON W. STEFFENS, 0000
RONALD D. STENGER, 0000
MARK A. STEPHENS, 0000
MICHAEL J. STETINA, 0000
TODD A. STEVENS, 0000
LISA Y. STEVENSON, 0000
EARL W. STOLZ II, 0000
TIMOTHY M. STONG, 0000
STEVEN J. STORCH, 0000
WILLIAM M. STOWE III, 0000
MARK E. STRATTON, 0000
SUZANNE M. STREETER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER R. STRICKLIN, 0000
BRIAN R. STUART, 0000
GENA R. STUCHBERY, 0000
STEVE S. SUGIYAMA, 0000
CHERRYL B. SULLIVAN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER P. SULLIVAN, 0000
SHANE T. SULLIVAN, 0000
TIMOTHY J. SUNDVALL, 0000
DAVID K. SUTTON, 0000
JASON K. SUTTON, 0000
RICHARD C. SUTTON, 0000
THOMAS T. SWAIM, 0000
DAVID J. SWANKE, 0000
DOUGLAS H. SWIFT, 0000
RANDALL A. TABOR, 0000
DAVID A. TAYLOR, 0000
JAMES M. TAYLOR, 0000
JOHN D. TAYLOR, 0000
ROBERT M. TAYLOR II, 0000
MARK A. TEDROW, 0000
ERNEST J. TEICHERT III, 0000
RAYMUND M. TEMBREULL, 0000
MICHAEL P. TERNUS, 0000
RONALD J. TEWKSBURY II, 0000
CRAIG G. THEISEN, 0000
ALLAN P. THILMANY, 0000
ANTHONY L. THOMAS, 0000
JOHN J. THOMAS, 0000
SPENCER S. THOMAS, 0000
PHILLIP J. THOMPSON, 0000
DANIEL M. THORN, 0000
DENNIS R. THORNE, 0000
BRIAN C. TICHENOR, 0000
MICHAEL E. TIEDE, 0000
KENT J. TIFFANY, 0000
DARREN W. TILLMAN, 0000
JASON A. TIMM, 0000
ROBERT M. TOBLER, 0000
JOHN T. TODD, 0000
PAUL A. TOMBARGE, 0000
JEFFREY L. TOMLINSON, 0000
STEPHON J. TONKO, 0000
THOMAS D. TORKELSON, 0000
BRIAN E. TOTH, 0000
KELVIN J. TOWNSEND, 0000
EDWARD D. V. TREANOR, 0000
JOSEPH M. TRECHTER, 0000
ROBERT B. TREPTON, 0000
ROBERT W. TRIPLETT, 0000
GEORGE E. TROMBA, 0000
ROBERT B. TRSEK, 0000
DAVID C. TRUCKSA, 0000
PETER A. TSCHOHL, 0000
DONNA L. TURNER, 0000
ERIC S. TURNER, 0000
JEFFERSON E. TURNER, 0000
JOHN N. TURNIPSEED, 0000
JAMES R. TWIFORD, 0000
MICHAEL D. TYYNISMAA, 0000
AARON L. ULLMAN, 0000
SHAWN C. UNDERWOOD, 0000
DAVID A. VALENTINE, 0000
ANTHONY E. VALERIO, 0000
JAMES P. VALLEY, 0000
JEFFREY VANSANFORD, 0000
CARLOS A. VECINO, 0000
ROBERT A. VICKERS, 0000
MARK W. VISCONI, 0000
JEFFREY A. VISH, 0000
RUSSELL S. VOCE, 0000
JOHN C. VOORHEES, 0000
ROGER R. VROOMAN, 0000
WILLIAM E. WADE, JR., 0000
MICHAEL V. WAGGLE, 0000
SAMUEL D. WAGNER, 0000
RALPH J. WAITE IV, 0000
TODD S. WALDVOGEL, 0000
ALEXANDER W. WALFORD, 0000
BRIAN P. WALKER, 0000
CHARLES J. WALLACE II, 0000
MARK M. WALLACE, 0000
MATTHEW V. WALLACE, 0000
HOWARD T. WALLER, 0000
KARL C. WALLI, 0000
JOERG D. WALTER, 0000
ROBERT W. WANNER, 0000
DAVID J. WAPELHORST, 0000
BRADLEY J. WARD, 0000
SCOTT C. WARD, 0000
SCOTT L. WARD, 0000
JEFFREY S. WARDELL, 0000
JEFFREY E. WARMKA, 0000
AARON C. WATSON, 0000
ERIK D. WEAVER, 0000
GAIL M. WEAVER, 0000
TERI J. WEAVER, 0000
MICHAEL D. WEBB, 0000
BRYAN A. WEEKS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. WEGNER, 0000
THEODORE G. WEIBEL, 0000
TROY B. WEINGART, 0000
GEOFFREY F. WEISS, 0000
MICHAEL T. WEISS, 0000
MICHAEL R. WELBORN, 0000
KEITH A. WELCH, 0000
BRADLEY R. WENSEL, 0000
DAVID S. WERLING, 0000
EDWARD J. WERNER, 0000
KEVIN G. WESTBURG, 0000
DANIEL J. WHANNELL, 0000
MICHAEL D. WHEELER, 0000
TERENCE D. WHEELER, 0000
VICTOR B. WHEELER, 0000
WESLEY L. WHITAKER, 0000
GARY L. WHITE, 0000
SAMUEL G. WHITE III, 0000
SHELDON G. WHITE, 0000
STEVEN D. WHITE, 0000
TED N. WHITE, 0000
TODD A. WHITE, 0000
JAMES T. WICKTOM, 0000
SCOTT D. WIERZBANOWSKI, 0000
MARA C. WIGHT, 0000
LANCE R. WIKOFF, 0000
DAVID P. WILDER, 0000
VICTOR D. WILEY, 0000
RICHARD WILGOS, 0000
SHANE C. WILKERSON, 0000
BRETT D. WILKINSON, 0000
JON C. WILKINSON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER S. WILKOWSKI, 0000
CHARLES L. WILLIAMS, 0000
KENT A. WILLIAMS, 0000

PAUL N. WILLIAMS, 0000
DANIEL L. WILSON, 0000
JACQUELINE R. WILSON, 0000
JOEL B. WILSON, 0000
KEVIN A. WILSON, 0000
SHAWN A. WILSON, 0000
STANLEY G. WILSON III, 0000
WILLIAM V. WINANS, 0000
RANDOLPH L. WINGE, 0000
LYNN H. WINWARD, 0000
MARK D. WITZEL, 0000
JASON D. WOLF, 0000
PATRICK F. WOLFE, 0000
TIMOTHY A. WOLIVER, 0000
ANN WONGJIRU, 0000
CAROLYN L. WOOD, 0000
MARK A. WOODARD, 0000
BOBBY C. WOODS, JR., 0000
JAMES J. WOODS, JR., 0000
DALE W. WRIGHT, 0000
TINA M. WYANT, 0000
HERBERT D. WYMS, 0000
DIANA J. WYRTKI, 0000
SCOTT D. YANCY, 0000
CULLA L. YARBOROUGH, 0000
WALTER K. YAZZIE, 0000
MATTHEW H. YETISHEFSKY, 0000
YOUNGKUN S. YU, 0000
KENNETH J. YUNEVICH, 0000
TIMOTHY A. ZACHARIAS, 0000
DENNIS K. ZAHN, 0000
SCOTTIE L. ZAMZOW, 0000
JAMES C. ZEGEL, 0000
MATTHEW S. ZICKAFOOSE, 0000
DUSTIN P. ZIEGLER, 0000
MATTHEW E. ZUBER, 0000
PAUL M. ZULUAGA, 0000
ANNAMARIE ZURLINDEN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JENNIFER S. AARON, 0000
LANCE A. AIUMOPAS, 0000
WILLIAM J. ANNEXSTAD, 0000
OMAR S. ASHMAWY, 0000
ANTHONY W. BELL, 0000
RON M. BLAZE, 0000
DANIEL J. BREEN, 0000
ALLAN S. BROCK, 0000
ADRIAN L. BROWN, 0000
ANTHONY C. CAMILLI, 0000
KRISTIN M. CASTIGLIA, 0000
DAVID H. CAZIER, 0000
BRADLEY A. CLEVELAND, 0000
KHARMA S. CLIFFORDALLMON, 0000
SHAWN M. CLINE, 0000
THOMAS F. COLLICK, 0000
PAUL A. DAWSON, 0000
VERONIQUE N. DEROUSELLE, 0000
MICHAEL P. DILLINGER, 0000
JOSHUA P. FALK, 0000
CHRISTOPHER L. FERRETTI, 0000
EVELYN R. FRASURE, 0000
JOHN S. FREDLAND, 0000
LORI M. GILL, 0000
MELINDA L. GREENE, 0000
TOBIN C. GRIFFETH, 0000
ANTHONY S. GUNN, 0000
MICHAEL A. HATTON, 0000
CRYSTAL D. HAYNES, 0000
FRANCIS D. HOLLIFIELD III, 0000
CANDACE L. HUNSTIGER, 0000
KEVIN C. INGRAM, 0000
ROBERT W. JARMAN, 0000
CHAD M. JESPERSEN, 0000
JENNY L. JOHNSON, 0000
AMY M. JORDAN, 0000
ANDREW KALAVANOS, 0000
AARON G. LAKE, 0000
SEAN P. LARDNER, 0000
HEATHER A. LENGEL, 0000
KYLE W. LITTLE, 0000
MARK B. MCKIERNAN, 0000
TYLER E. MERKEL, 0000
JOHN E. OWEN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER S. PEIFER, 0000
JOY L. PRIMOLI, 0000
LARRY E. PRUITT, 0000
TARA L. SHAMHART, 0000
TAMMIE L. SLEDGE, 0000
GLENN A. SPENCER, 0000
ANTHONY SPRATLEY, 0000
JON B. STANLEY, 0000
MICHAEL J. TABER, 0000
BRIAN M. THOMPSON, 0000
BRENDON K. TUKEY, 0000
JEFFERSON H. WEST, 0000
JOHN C. WIGGLESWORTH, 0000
DANIELLE M. WILKERSON, 0000
JOSHUA D. YANOV, 0000
FRANK YOON, 0000
ROBERT S. ZAUNER, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

KATHLEEN S. LOPER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL A. WHITE, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ANTHONY T. ROPER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ERIC A. HANSEN, 0000
PASCAL O. UDEKWU, 0000
PETER J. VARLJEN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

STEVEN S. GELBERT, 0000

To be major

PATRICK R. MCBREARTY, 0000

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 19, 2007:

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be Admiral

ADM. TIMOTHY J. KEATING, 0000

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be General

LT. GEN. VICTOR E. RENUART, JR., 0000

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO MARY K. PODESTA

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mary K. Podesta, and those who loved her especially her sons John and Tony.

Known affectionately as ''Mama Podesta'' to friends, neighbors, and many of us here in Congress, Mary was a fixture in the Washington political scene for more than two decades.

Mary was born in Chicago to Greek immigrant parents. Upon marrying John Podesta Sr., she devoted herself to raising her two sons, John and Tony, and instilling in them a love of country and a commitment to public service which they both demonstrate today.

With the death of her husband nearly 30 years ago, she moved to Washington to be close to John and Tony. Her sons had a history of hosting prominent fundraisers and socials, but it was Mary who turned them into truly family affairs.

Raised Greek, and married to an Italian, Mary was a tremendous cook. Her meatball recipe was as delicious as it was secret. When I visited, she always made sure she had an order for me ''to go.''

Her astute political advice and encouragement provided even more nourishment than the food she prepared. And though she counted a President, and numerous congressional leaders among her close friends, it was her close relationships with her own family of which she was most proud.

As we pay tribute to Mary, we take comfort in our fond memories of her. I extend my deepest condolences to the many who loved Mary, especially her sons John and Tony, her sister Evelyn, and her three grandchildren and two great-grandchildren. I hope it is a comfort to them that so many people are praying for them and mourning their loss at this sad time.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARK R. BOHN

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mark R. Bohn for his dedication to his colleges and for his 32 years of federal service to his country.

Mark began his federal career back in 1974, where he served in the U.S. Air Force for 3 years. In 1978, he joined the Federal Aviation Administration as an Air Traffic Control Specialist. He worked in various facilities, including Cleveland Hopkins Air Traffic Control Tower, where he ably served for 15 years.

Mark has, throughout the years, shown a strong commitment to and care for his colleagues. He was a founding and charter member of the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, and has been elected the union facility representative at three different facilities. Additionally, Mark has offered his service on national, regional, and local committees for both the Federal Aviation Administration and the National Air Traffic Controllers Association.

Throughout his career, Mark has received numerous performance awards, letters of commendation, and incentive awards for his great work and effort.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Mark R. Bohn, whose 32 years of federal service for this country, as well as tremendous commitment to and care for his colleagues, is a shining example for all of us.

RECOGNIZING TRAVIS WEAVER FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Travis Weaver, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America Troop 249 and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Travis has been very active with his troop, participating in many Scout activities. Over the years Travis has been involved with Scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Travis's dedication to his school work at West Platte High School has been excellent. Travis has also contributed significantly to the community, through his planning and organization of a project for the Platte City Parks and Recreation department, which included the addition of a brand new picnic and playground area.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Travis Weaver for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL KEVIN P. MASTIN

HON. THOMAS M. REYNOLDS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, with great pride and delight I rise today to honor a highly talented and dedicated airman who has entertained thousands with his skill and continues to serve his country with expertise, commitment, and leadership.

Lieutenant Colonel Kevin P. Mastin is a supremely skilled and decorated command pilot who has spent thousands of hours in the air, many of them twisting, turning and barrel rolling as a United States Air Force Thunderbird. Displaying absolute command over his aircraft, Colonel Mastin has flown several Thunderbird air shows as the Lead Solo, delighting countless onlookers with his precise maneuvers and daring routines. His peerless ability and perfect unison with his fellow Thunderbirds combine for one powerful, awe-inspiring show in the sky.

But Colonel Mastin is much more than a showman. Born in my district in Dansville, NY, Colonel Mastin has led a life of service and deep commitment to his country. After graduating from Dansville Central School in 1981, Colonel Mastin enlisted in the Air Force. He would eventually head off to the West Coast after being assigned to the 92nd Munitions Maintenance Squadron at Fairchild Air Force Base in Washington State. From there, Colonel Mastin attended Washington State University, entering the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps and graduating in 1988 as a commissioned officer. He received his wings a year later and, after more pilot training, left to fly over the skies of Texas at Laughlin Air Force Base as an Instructor Pilot and Flight Examiner.

After honing and developing his aircraft skills further, Colonel Mastin became an F–15C Flight Commander at Mountain Home Air Force Base in Idaho, flying 46 combat missions in Operations Provide Comfort and Southern Watch. Then following an assignment at Tyndall Air Force Base in Florida, Colonel Mastin began his run as a Thunderbird, flying in the 2000 and 2001 air show seasons. As a Thunderbird stationed at Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada, he flew as the Opposing Solo and then the Lead Solo, showcasing his supreme and expanding aircraft talents.

Moving on from his Thunderbird tour, Colonel Mastin became Director of Operations of the 557th Flying Squadron at the United States Air Force Academy in 2002. In July 2004, Colonel Mastin then assumed duties as Commander of the 479th Operations Support Squadron at Moody Air Force Base in Georgia. Two years later, Colonel Mastin would become Deputy Chief of Air Combat Command's Flight Operations Division at Langley Air Force Base in Virginia, the position he holds today.

Devoted to his country, Colonel Mastin is also a devoted family man. Together with his wife Joni, Colonel Mastin has two beautiful children, daughter Ashley and son Travis.

Thus, Madam Speaker, in recognition of his tremendous military career, his more than 4,200 flying hours, his esteemed military decorations, his sense of family and his service to the United States of America, I ask that this Honorable Body join me in honoring Thunderbird Pilot and Dansville, New York native, Lieutenant Colonel Kevin P. Mastin.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF GEORGE BECKER

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of George Becker, a man who was an activist, a respected union organizer and a tireless champion that protected worker's rights.

George Becker was the sixth international president of the United Steelworkers. For 7 years George provided a booming voice that expressed the frustrations and concerns of the steelworkers, while demanding that they be treated with dignity and decency. He sought to unite the workers by educating them, and launched a program aimed at involving the workers in addressing their interests to politicians.

When his brothers and sisters faced job insecurity, George courageously fought for their rights. The campaign by George and the union workers was victorious, and showed Americans that a union still had the ability to protect the rights of members. He believed that only a union could protect the working class, a sentiment he expressed after visiting the workers of many non-unionized corporations.

George's concern for the mental and physical well-being of union workers led to the proposal of Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) safety standards for those exposed to lead and arsenic. Because of his endless work on implementing OSHA safety standards, workers whose health was affected by their job would not suffer loss of pay when taking time off.

George died February 3rd, 2007 after a long battle with cancer. He is survived by his loving wife, Jane; his wonderful sons, George, Greg and Matthew; his ten grandchildren; his great grandchildren and his sister Jacqueline Straus.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring the memory of George Becker, a major proponent for worker's rights in the industrial workforce.

RECOGNIZING TYLER R. RUOFF FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Tyler Ruoff, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 60, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Tyler has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Tyler has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Tyler R. Ruoff for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM L. ROSS

HON. THOMAS M. REYNOLDS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, with great appreciation and delight I rise today to honor a respected and dedicated legislator, educator and community member who for more than 50 years continues to serve his hometown of Wheatfield, New York.

Niagara County Legislator William L. Ross has led a life deeply connected and committed to Niagara; the place where he was born and raised, where he became an educator and a mentor, and where he is now a respected and effective leader.

Through his distinguished professional career, his athletic talent and his spirit to make his community a better place, Bill Ross has left a lasting mark since graduating from the Niagara Falls School System. After graduation, Mr. Ross took a football scholarship to Michigan State University where he went on to win a National Championship in 1952 and play in the esteemed Rose Bowl game in 1954.

After serving as an R.O.T.C. Officer after college, Bill would take his football prowess, military discipline and love of education back to Niagara County. In 1956, Bill began a career in education that would span 47 years and shape a countless number of young lives in Wheatfield. Bill became the first football coach at Niagara Wheatfield in 1958, and in 1977 became the Director of Physical Education, athletics and recreation of the Niagara Wheatfield School District. Both in the classroom and on the field, Bill was devoted to teaching and improving the youth of Niagara County, believing in the importance of a well-rounded education and the duty of schools to not only help produce good students, but good citizens.

That sense of dedication and service culminated when Bill Ross was elected to represent his Town of Wheatfield in the Niagara County Legislature. Twice elected Chairman, first in 1989 and again in 2004, Bill, through it all, has been an insightful and vital leader for Niagara County. In times of tremendous challenges for his town and his region, Bill has been strong and steady, making his home a better place. To this day, Bill serves his constituents and his neighbors with skill and tremendous care, earning respect as he has moved his community forward.

Thus, Madam Speaker, in recognition of his more than 50 years of serving the Niagara region, as an educator, an administrator, a legislator, a leader and a neighbor, I ask that this Honorable Body join me in honoring Mr. William L. Ross.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE OHIO ARMY NATIONAL GUARD'S 112TH ENGINEER BATTALION

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Ohio Army National Guard's 112th Engineer Battalion, and to celebrate the commitment of this patriotic group of individuals that has defended our country valiantly.

The Ohio Army National Guard's 112th Engineer Battalion is one of the oldest regiments in the Nation. It is also the most decorated military organization in the State of Ohio. During the American Civil War, the Ohio National Guard played a crucial role in the watershed defeat of Morgan and his Confederate cavalry. During World War I and World War II the 112th Engineer Battalion was deployed overseas and was later regarded as being one of the ''most well disciplined and highly competent'' engineer units.

Ever humble about their job, the 112th, when deployed to support an Air Force unit, sent tokens of appreciation to those that offered assistance during the Battalion's deployment. The 112th Engineer Battalion unit exemplifies the honor that comes to mind when looking toward the past, present, and future of the Ohio Army National Guard.

The courage of the Ohio Army National Guard's 112th Engineer Battalion does not merely extend to matters abroad. When disaster shook the South, the 112th Engineer's Battalion swiftly acted to help the victims of Hurricane Rita. This unit was and is always ready to help when needed. When called to help their brothers and sisters fight the war on terrorism, the 112th Engineer Battalion exemplified the National Guard mantra to ''Respond when called and be ready. '' The never waning support and readiness to help has made the 112th Engineer Unit the pride of their community.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring the Ohio National Guard's 112th Engineer Battalion.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, March 15, 2007, I was unable to attend votes due to illness.

Were I present, I would have voted in the following manner: (1) H. Res. 242—providing for the consideration of H.R. 1362, Accountability in Contracting Act—''yea''; (2) On motion to recommit H.R. 1362 with instructions—''nay''; (3) H.R. 1362—The Accountability in Contracting Act—''aye.''

HONORING JUDGE ROBERT M. STEPTOE

HON. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to respectfully request that my colleagues here in the House of Representatives join me in congratulating Robert M. Steptoe for being named the 2007 Distinguished Citizen by the Shenandoah Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America.

Born on May 15, 1920 in Clarksburg, WV, Robert M. Steptoe has spent his entire life in

service to his family, community, and country. He and his wife, Sarah, will soon celebrate 65 years of marriage and are the proud parents of 4 children, Robert, Philip, Sally, and James. They also have 9 grandchildren and 5 great-grandchildren with one on the way.

He served his country faithfully during World War II in the United States Navy in both Europe and the Pacific, attaining the rank of lieutenant commander. His long list of public service also includes a stint as assistant prosecuting attorney for Berkeley County, four terms in the West Virginia House of Delegates, and two terms in the West Virginia State Senate. The Honorable Judge Robert M. Steptoe also served on the West Virginia Court of Claims from 1989 to 2001. In addition, Mr. Steptoe served as chairman of the board for Peoples National Bank for several decades and has been an active member of Trinity Episcopal Church since 1949.

Throughout his life, Robert Steptoe has been an active supporter of the Boy Scouts of America. As a youngster, he was a Boy Scout and all four of his children followed in his footsteps as Scouts with his wife, Sarah, serving as den mother. His contribution to Scouting will always be appreciated and I am pleased to see that he is being recognized for his lifelong service to his community.

In closing, I want to thank my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives for joining me in recognizing Mr. Robert M. Steptoe as the 2007 Distinguished Citizen of the Shenandoah Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF JAMES BROWN

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the lifelong achievements of the Godfather of Soul, James Joseph Brown, who changed American music forever. Over his more than five-decade-long career, Mr. Brown affected and evolved countless music genres while leaving his enduring signature style and grace for everyone to admire.

Born in rural South Carolina during the Great Depression, Mr. Brown learned very quickly the value of hard work and dedication, from picking cotton to shining shoes to washing dishes. A self-taught musician and performer, Mr. Brown arrived on the music scene in 1955 and soon started releasing hit records. Mr. Brown's influence was not isolated to merely music, but extended into local communities by sponsoring youth programs, investing in African American businesses, and speaking at high schools across the country. Throughout the 1960's, Mr. Brown was not only a frequent name atop the music charts by releasing singles like ''Papa's Got a Brand New Bag'' and ''I Got You (I Feel Good),'' but also an outspoken advocate for the Civil Rights movement.

Mr. Brown's trendsetting stage performances and groundbreaking musical innovations are just a few of the many legacies he has left behind. From his Rock and Roll Hall of Fame induction in 1968 to being a 2003 Kennedy Center Honoree, Mr. Brown not only has paved the way for numerous artists, but also has left a lasting impact on music that is still being felt today.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring the Hardest Working Man in Show Business, James Brown, whose inspiration and genius will continue to touch the lives of generations to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF WINNIE DOSS

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a very special occasion today—Mrs. Winnie Martha Doss's 100th birthday. Mrs. Doss will gather with her friends and family to mark the occasion on March 17, 2007.

Mrs. Doss currently resides in the Jacksonville Health and Rehabilitation Center in Jacksonville, Alabama. Mrs. Doss spent 30 years working at Avondale Textile Mills. She has four children, 12 grandchildren, 29 great-grandchildren and 22 great-great-grandchildren. Mrs. Doss spends her time working on word search puzzles and crocheting. She enjoys receiving cards and uses them to decorate the walls of her room.

I salute this remarkable woman for her long life, and dedication to family.

MARKING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, marking Women's History Month, I would like to commemorate the life of a woman in our district, Joyce Snow Feather Mahaney. Though she passed away last year, her memory and her spirit continue. She is truly a woman who made a difference, and whose efforts echo beyond her lifetime.

The great-great-granddaughter to Chief Kaishpa Gourneau, great-great-granddaughter to Chief Sasswain, Henry Poitra and great-great-great-great-granddaughter to Chief Gaytay Manomin (Old Wild Rice), a member of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians, Joyce Mahaney grew up on the Turtle Mount Reservation in Belcourt, North Dakota. Her Indian name Snow Feather (Koonea Meguen) was given to her by her great-grandmother, Cecelia Malaterre. A Naming Ceremony was done by her adopted father, Francis Eagle Heart Cree of Turtle Mountain, who is also the local spiritual leader and medicine man in the area.

She attended the Ojibwe Indian School, Turtle Mountain Community High School, and Minot State University where she received a degree in Education. She also attended the American Indian Training Institute in Albuquerque, New Mexico and the University of Toledo. She came to Ohio in the 1970s following her marriage to Toledo native, Russell Mahaney. They raised two children.

In 1988, Joyce Snow Feather Mahaney founded the Toledo-based American Indian Intertribal Association. The purpose of the organization is to preserve and showcase American Indian culture through community activities. Her incredible leadership has developed the Association as a premiere showcase of Native American culture, language, and spirit. Several hundred Native Americans participate in the organization's ongoing activities such as: The Toledo Pow Wow, cultural programs, and the annual summer solstice ceremony at the site of the Battle of Fallen Timbers of 1794.

An adult education teacher, she was also Executive Secretary at the Toledo Museum of Art, served as executive director of the Cleveland Drug and Alcohol Prevention Program, and director of the Eagle Wing Program in Toledo and other Native American programs in northern Ohio.

Although she spent the last three decades of her life in Ohio, Joyce Snow Feather Mahaney has maintained her deep roots in the Turtle Mountain area, visiting family and friends and offering presentations in the community which captured the spirit of the indigenous people, the sacred land of her ancestors and the rich cultural heritage of the Plains Ojibwe.

An award-winning poet, she has written and self-published poetry books, Prairie Winds and Spirit of Dakota. In fact, the threads of this Ojibwe Prayer were woven deep into the fabric of the life of Joyce Snow Feather Mahaney, and describe her legacy most eloquently.

OJIBWE PRAYER

Oh Great Spirit, whose voice I hear in the winds And whose breath gives life to everyone, Hear me.
I come to you as one of your many children; I am weak .... I am small... I need your wisdom and your strength.
Let me walk in beauty, and make my eyes ever behold the red and purple sunsets Make my hands respect the things you have made.
And make my ears sharp so I may hear your voice.
Make me wise, so that I may understand what you have taught my people and The lessons you have hidden in each leaf and each rock.
I ask for wisdom and strength Not to be superior to my brothers, but to be able to fight my greatest enemy, myself.
Make me ever ready to come before you with clean hands and a straight eye.
So as life fades away as a fading sunset.
My spirit may come to you without shame.

IN RECOGNITION OF SERBIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY ''VUK STEFANOVIC KARADZICH''

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 20th Anniversary of the Serbian National University ''Vuk Stefanovic Karadzich'', which is affiliated with the Saint Sava Serbian Orthodox Cathedral in Parma, Ohio. Founded in 1987, this prestigious university has dedicated itself to promoting and educating the public on Serbian culture and history.

Among its many achievements, Serbian National University established an endowment fund at The Ohio State University's Hilander Room, which provides an environment for students to advance the language, heritage, and traditions of the Serbian people. In addition, the University supports the Serbian Orthodox Church, Cleveland Institute of Music and similar schools in Serbia.

The Serbian National University is dedicated to and inspired by the works and achievements of Vuk Stefanovic Karadzich. During the 18th and 19th Century, Vuk Karadzich founded the modern Serbian language and developed the Serbian Cyrillic alphabet. Vuk Karadzich received a degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the University of Jena, Germany and was knighted by the country of Russia. One of the many legacies of Vuk Karadzich that the Serbian National University carries on today is the mission of bridging the gap between Serbian and American cultures.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring the Serbian National University "Vuk Stefanovic Karadzich" for all the amazing contributions they have made to the advancement of Serbian and American culture. May the good work that they have done endure into the future.

TRIBUTE TO MERV GRIFFIN

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a truly outstanding gentleman, Merv Griffin. Merv is a distinguished entertainer and business entrepreneur, as well as a man who is deeply committed to helping others.

Merv is a special friend of the Louis Warschaw Prostate Cancer Center and gives generously of his time and energy to fight this disease. As a prostate cancer survivor, he is deeply aware of the importance of medical research being done by the Center which was established by the Warschaw Family at Cedar Sinai Medical Center in memory of Louis, their beloved husband and father.

Merv is one of the world's great performers. He began his distinguished career as a singer at 19, and shortly thereafter formed his own record label, Panda Records. His self-released album "Songs by Merv Griffin" was the first American album recorded on magnetic tape. Freddy Martin, impressed with Merv's talent, asked him to tour with his orchestra. Four years later, Merv started as a solo performer, scoring a number one hit with "I've Got a Lovely Bunch of Coconuts."

In 1958 Merv launched his brilliant television career as host of the game shows "Play your Hunch" and "Keep Talking. "In 1963, he hosted and produced "Word for Word. " The following year, he produced the incredibly successful "Jeopardy" and followed that with "Wheel of Fortune." These two shows established Merv as a television legend.

Merv was also much admired and respected as a television talk show host. Among his most interesting and controversial guests were journalists Adele Rogers St. John, futurist Buckminster Fuller, writer Norman Mailer, and philosopher Bertrand Russell.

In addition to his show business success, Merv is a real estate magnate with prestigious properties in Beverly Hills, Palm Springs, Atlantic City and Scottsdale. He raises thoroughbred racehorses on his ranch in Carmel, CA and owns St. Clerans Manor, an 18th century estate, near Galway, Ireland.

In 2001, Merv returned to singing with the release of the album "It's Like a Dream," and this year his production company began preproduction on a new syndicated game show, "Let's Play Crossword," which is expected to air in September.

I am proud to ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Merv Griffin for his lifetime of extraordinary accomplishments, and in expressing our appreciation for his support of the Louis Warschaw Prostate Cancer Center.

HONORING MICHAEL HOWE

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary career of Michael Howe. Mike served as the president of the East Bay Community Foundation (EBCF) in Oakland from 1993 until 2006. Throughout his career, Mike has been known for his tireless work on behalf of the East Bay community. This year Mike, who currently serves as the EBCF president emeritus, celebrates his retirement after more than a decade of unparalleled service to that organization, and many more to the 9th Congressional District.

Mike holds a B.A. in sociology from the University of San Francisco, as well as an M.A. and an ABD in sociology from the University of California, Davis. Before joining the EBCF, Mike was the senior planning and evaluation officer for the Marin Community Foundation from 1986 until 1993. Prior to that, he was a professor of Sociology and founding dean of the College of Professional Studies at the University of San Francisco, where he was also tenured as an associate professor.

Mike came to the East Bay Community Foundation in 1993. Under his leadership, the EBCF evolved from a small grant-making organization into one of the top 50 community foundations in the country. Mike's work was central to the EBCF's transformation into an organization that is known for leading change-making initiatives that successfully solve community problems. Working with government agencies, non-profit organizations, business leaders an civic groups, Mike has sought to improve after-school programs for youth; prevent street crime and violence; provide arts education; enhance land-use planning to incorporate features for sustainable communities; and expand community philanthropy. Mike has attracted new expertise and funding to the EBCF, which now makes grants to more than 1,000 non-profit organizations, primarily in the East Bay. His efforts have made the EBCF a world-class institution for community leadership and social change, and have touched countless lives here in the 9th congressional District and beyond.

In addition to his stellar work leading the EBCF, Mike has been and continues to be heavily involved in a number of other boards and organizations here in the Bay Area. He serves on the boards of organizations such as the Institute for Community Peace; Northern California Grantmakers; the John Gardener Center at Stanford University, the Coalition of Community Foundations for Youth; and the Richmond Children's Foundation.

Today the friends, family and colleagues of Mike Howe have come together to celebrate not only his retirement, but also his legacy of service, and his permanent and positive impact on our community. On this very special day, I join all of them in thanking and saluting Mike for his profound contributions to California's 9th Congressional district, our country and our world.

IN HONOR OF THE ARC OF WARREN COUNTY'S NEWEST SERVICE TO NORTHWEST NEW JERSEY'S DISABLED COMMUNITY

HON. SCOTT GARRETT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, today, the Arc of Warren County, New Jersey will break ground on their newest group home at Camp Warren. The Arc has long presented a wide array of services to individuals with developmental disabilities throughout this corner of Northwest New Jersey. They are now expanding into residential services with this barrier-free home for six adults, which they hope to have open by the end of the year.

The Arc of Warren County was founded more than 50 years ago by parents, educators, and others who wanted to meet the needs of children with developmental disabilities in a comprehensive way. It is part of a national network that serves more than 3 million people across the country every year. The more than 1,000 people that the Warren County chapter serves each year receive quality services ranging from residential to recreation to advocacy.

Arc staff and volunteers not only help the disabled individuals, but also their families. And, in the process, they provide a great service to the community at large. The Arc helps these individuals live more self-sufficiently and blend seamlessly into the community around them. And, the tremendous support they get from people of all walks of life throughout Warren County speaks volumes as to their success.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding achievement of the University of North Texas basketball team on defeating Arkansas State University, by a score of 83–75, to win the school's first ever Sunbelt Conference title.

The Mean Green's 23 wins this season are the most in team history. Furthermore, this most recent win clinched North Texas a spot in the prestigious NCAA Tournament for the first time since the 1987–88 season.

Senior Calvin Watson, who had 24 points and six 3-pointers, was named the Sunbelt Conference Tournament's Most Outstanding Player. Guard Ben Bell was also named to the all-tournament team.

This victory was a combined effort and would not have been possible if it was not for the incredible work ethic demonstrated by these athletes and coaches. I extend my sincere congratulations to Head Coach Johnny Jones, University of North Texas President Gretchen M. Bataille, as well as the members of the UNT Men's Basketball Team.

I am proud of these young men—their victory in Sunbelt Conference and their efforts during the NCAA tournament. Not only am I honored to serve as their U.S. Representative, but I am proud to be a University of North Texas alumnus.

THE UNFORTUNATE TWO-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF CHINA'S ANTI-SECESSION LAW

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, two years ago, China passed its anti-secession law, codifying its use of force against Taiwan. Despite Taiwan's pleas for friendship and worldwide condemnation of the legislation, China has continued its military buildup along the coast of Taiwan and heightened its rhetoric against the people of Taiwan. The 23 million people of Taiwan feel insecure and worry about present or future military confrontations in the Taiwan Strait.

Even more ominously, China recently successfully tested an anti-satellite missile, threatening the surveillance satellites of India, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, the United States, Europe and Russia. China's development of space-based technology will seriously threaten U.S. military operations and world peace. This action, when combined with other actions by the PRC, should raise serious concerns among my colleagues about future moves that China may conduct.

For the sake of world peace, I urge my colleagues to continue to speak out against the Chinese military buildup. China's military intimidations against Taiwan pose a serious threat to the well-being of the peaceful 23 million people that reside in Democratic Taiwan. It is in our best interests for people on both sides of the Taiwan Strait to live in peace and any military action against Taiwan will lead to chaos and destruction for many countries in the region. As a start to maintaining this critical peace on both sides of the Taiwan Strait, China should rescind its anti-secession legislation now. This legislation should have never been adopted by the Chinese, and therefore I ask for its immediate repeal.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HATCH ACT REFORM ACT OF 2007

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce the District of Columbia Hatch Act Reform Act of 2007 to eliminate discriminatory treatment of the District of Columbia which still falls under the federal Hatch Act, as it did before the Congress made the District an independent jurisdiction that today enacts its own local laws. This bill would retain federal Hatch Act authority concerning prohibited partisan and political activity that applies to every state upon receipt of federal funds or functions, and importantly, would require the District to enact its own local version of the Hatch Act barring similar local violations, to become effective. This bill, of course, would automatically be held over for congressional review as required by the Home Rule Act. In any case, local Hatch Act violations in the District are rare, but the District needs its own Hatch Act to fully account and be responsible for local violations, with which only a local, objective body would be most familiar.

This bill will leave in place the federal Hatch Act restrictions that apply to other jurisdictions on the use of official authority, specifically as it relates to elections; the solicitation, acceptance, or receiving of political campaign contributions; the prohibitions on running for public office in partisan elections; and the use of on-duty time and resources to engage in partisan campaign activity where federal funds or responsibilities are involved. My bill would remove only the federal Hatch Act jurisdiction that applies solely to the District of Columbia and would require the District to have its own local Hatch Act, like every other jurisdiction, instead of requiring the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and its Special Counsel to devote staff time and other resources on investigation, fact-finding and judgment of unfamiliar local matters.

Indeed, the OPM has asked for the federal guidance my bill offers. In recent cases, OPM cited an ANC commissioner (Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner) for violations of the Hatch Act when he ran for higher office, even though ANC commissioners are "elected officials" under local laws. The application of the Hatch Act to ANC commissioners has been selectively enforced by OPM. For example, recently OPM filed cases charging Hatch Act violations against an ANC commissioner running for the D.C. Council but did not file when several members of the current City Council ran for the Council from positions as ANC commissioners. The present law results in possible violation of the federal Hatch Act while leaving OPM with local responsibility that does not implicate its federal jurisdiction.

The House recognized that the present federal Hatch Act jurisdiction over the District was inappropriate and obsolete by removing this federal responsibility several years ago, but the Senate failed to act. The District should bear this local responsibility. My bill will eliminate the double indignity of placing a local burden on the federal government and depriving the District of a responsibility, which only local jurisdictions familiar with local laws can be expected to handle responsibly.

The Hatch Reform Act is the third in the "Free and Equal D.C." series of bills that I have introduced to eliminate anti-Home Rule or redundant bills that deprive the city of equal treatment and recognition as an independent self-governing jurisdiction.

HONORING BRONZE STAR RECIPIENT PAUL BAKER

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in tribute to Mr. Paul Baker, recipient of the prestigious Bronze Star Medal with Combat Distinguishing Device in recognition of his actions on February 19, 1945 at Iwo Jima.

The Battle of Iwo Jima was a crucial victory in World War II against the Japanese. On the morning of February 19th, 1945, the first of 70,000 Marines and Sailors, including Pharmacist's Mate First Class Paul Baker, U.S. Navy, landed on Iwo Jima. By the end of the battle 35 days later, the Allies were victorious, but suffered over 25,000 casualties, including over 5,000 deaths.

On that initial morning of the invasion, Petty Officer Paul Baker, was among the first infantry troops to land on the island. Baker was rendered unconscious by a Japanese artillery shell that struck his ship. Upon regaining consciousness, despite his injuries and without regard for his own safety, Baker began treating multiple injured Marines, refusing medical treatment for his own injuries to save the lives of his fallen comrades. Only after all of the wounded Marines had been transferred to the medical personnel on the USS *Sanborn*, did Petty Officer Baker allow himself to be treated.

Petty Officer Baker displayed the highest level of dedication and selflessness by his courageous actions that day. He is a shining example of the heroism and valor that was displayed by so many of our troops during World War II. On Friday, March 23rd Secretary of the Navy Donald Winter will personally present Mr. Baker with this Bronze Star with Combat "V" at a ceremony in Irondequoit, New York. I am proud to use this opportunity to publicly recognize Mr. Baker and to congratulate him and his family on this long overdue recognition.

A TRIBUTE TO LILIAN KAWARATANI

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Lilian Kawaratani, of Monterey Park, California. Each year in March, in recognition of Women's History Month, we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women.

Lilian was born in Honolulu, Hawaii where she was raised. She enrolled at the University of Hawaii. After completing the Fifth Year Program for Teachers, Lilian left Hawaii for New York where she attended Columbia University Teachers College and received her M.A. in

Education. In 1980, Mrs. Kawaratani received her Adult Education Designated Subjects Credential from the University of California State College.

Mrs. Kawaratani began her career teaching at Barber's Point Elementary School in Hawaii. Upon graduation from Columbia Teacher's College, Lilian moved to Monterey Park and began teaching at Euclid Ave. Elementary School in East Los Angeles. After taking time off to raise her children, Lilian returned to teaching for the Alhambra School District's Adult Education ESL program until she retired in 1999.

Lilian has demonstrated a strong commitment to community service. Lilian was a Board Member and Coordinator for the United Methodist Pre-School's Mother Helpers Program. She has held various positions for the PTA, served on the GATE Advisory Board, and volunteered as a Brownie and Girl Scout Leader. Mrs. Kawaratani has also held various offices at the California Council of Adult Education, where in 1988 she was awarded the CALCO Award for Excellence in Teaching. Lilian also serves as the Membership Chair for the Friends of Monterey Park Library Board.

Most notably, Lilian is admired for her volunteer work with the Monterey Park Library's LAMP (Literacy for All of Monterey Park) Citizenship Classes. Following her retirement, Lilian was invited to help teach Citizenship Classes for the library for two hours per week. Lilian's passion for teaching was made apparent as she spent up to eight hours a day at the library and often met one-on-one with adult learners to further prepare them for their citizenship tests and interviews. Her efforts have directly helped 50 to 100 students annually become proud new American citizens. As Lilian enters her eighth year of teaching for LAMP, she has seen over 700 students attain U.S. Citizenship and has devoted thousands of hours of service.

In addition to her many professional and personal accomplishments, Mrs. Kawaratani is a wife and mother of four children and enjoys spending time with her grandchildren.

Mrs. Kawaratani's devotion to her career and her long-time commitment to the prosperity of our community serves as a true inspiration to us all. I ask all Members of Congress to join me today in honoring an extraordinary woman of California's 29th Congressional District, Lilian Kawaratani.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN CHACON, SR.

HON. JOE BACA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. BACA. Madam Speaker, I stand here today to honor and remember a great community activist, role model, loving father, husband, and grandfather, John Chacon, Sr.

John was born in El Paso, Texas, on July 6, 1935, but he called California home, as he resided in Ventura County for over 63 years.

John graduated from Oxnard High School in 1955. In 1957, John married the love of his life, Frances "Pancha" Castro, with whom he shared 50 years of happy marriage.

Professionally, John worked over 25 years for W.B. Post and Nick Wargo Construction Companies. He was a lead paving foreman for 19 of those 25 years. At the age of 52 John retired, but he remained active in the community, particularly with his labor union. He was an active member of Laborers Local 585 for 46 years.

John's accomplishments in the community are too many to list here, but some of his most notable include: membership in Los Compadres del Rio, membership in the Rio Mesa High School Boosters Club, and a founding, charter membership in the Mexican-American Golf Association.

John's passions included golfing, gardening, camping at Lake Cachuma, backyard barbecues with family and friends, and listening to mariachi music.

John was well-known throughout the community for cooking his famous "tripas" and his secret salsa recipe. He made friends everywhere he went, and could never go anywhere in the community without someone recognizing him.

On March 4, 2007, John passed away from a sudden illness. He will be greatly missed by his wife, Frances; son, John Jr.; daughters, Rosemary and Barbara; grandchildren, Jennifer, Vincent, Francesca and Analisa; and his four sisters.

Let us pay tribute to John for the man he was and the example he set for all of us to follow. His dedication to family and friends, and his love for his community was evidenced in all that he did.

Although he is no longer with us, John's legacy and spirit will continue to live on through the lives of everyone he has touched.

Madam Speaker, let us pay our respects to John Chacon, Sr. He will always have a place in our hearts for everything he gave to his loved ones and community.

HONORING THE OUTSTANDING COMMUNITY SERVICE OF WENDY MILLER

HON. PATRICK J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Wendy Miller of Jamison, Pennsylvania for her dedication to our soldiers overseas. Her efforts have brought hope to many soldiers serving in Afghanistan and Iraq, as well as here at home.

For the past three years, Ms. Miller, working through the program Anysoldier, has collected various supplies, clothes, and treats from family, friends, and neighbors. Each year she collects a thousand homemade valentines and hundreds of homemade cards and letters from area children. She then ships the packages to the units requesting supplies on anysoldier.com.

Ms. Miller has shipped 130 boxes already, and plans to ship another 100 in the next month. She has taken the initiative to organize volunteers in four other neighborhoods to help collect the donations. The project has been so successful that she plans to send at least 500 boxes by the end of the year.

Her hard work has not gone unappreciated. In fact, Madam Speaker, Ms. Miller has received letters from soldiers, thanking her for the supplies, for the hope each shipment gives them, and for the reminder that they are not forgotten. The generosity of the hundreds of residents who participate in this project is overwhelming, and the devotion of Ms. Miller is incredible.

One letter of thanks from a soldier serving in Afghanistan reads "Your care package got our soldiers smiling after a long day." Madam Speaker, as a veteran of the Iraq war, I rise today on behalf of American soldiers to thank Wendy Miller and her neighbors for their unending dedication and generosity.

IN THE GAME OF LIFE

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, in tribute of slain Marine Jimmy Regan, Albert Carey Caswell, United States Capitol Tour Guide, penned the following poem:

"In the game of life,
There's only what's wrong or right!
For there are only the very few, who shall so shine there so who . . . are so very bright!

"For only one thing so counts,
For only one score so adds up, that which so amounts . . .
For it's all about what we've so said and done, and what is really true . . . as so to be won!

"For there are no second chances!
In these our short minutes, upon this earth . . . as our time here so advances . . .
Our goal! All in what we've said and done, for whom we've so bled . . . to take our valiant stances!

"Whether, upon fields of green . . .
Or on oh so heroic battlefields of honor seen . . .
Jimmy, was always the one! A brave heart! As a leader of men, time and time again!

"A Marine's Marine,
A brave heart who once so lived, who so gallantly chose to give . . .
Facing death, with only his magnificent courage left . . . his heart of a lion seen could not be checked!

"Fast breaking in the game of life, writing his book of sacrifice . . .
To this our world he so gave, but never took . . . no mistaking around him the earth so shook!
Strength in Honor . . . was his great life's measure, in each and every step he ever took!

"For so few of us shall ever be such a treasure,
For so few of us such magnificence, as a hero to their Country shall be so measured!
Such Splendid Splendor, was Jimmy . . . who to our Lord's heart brought such pleasure!

"For in the minutes and the hours,
Of our lives upon this earth we give now, upon all others which so shower!
Are our gifts of Freedom and Peace, in our Lord's eye's hold such power!

"To Make a Difference With It All,
To be a champion in life! As what Jimmy so lived for and died, as for what he saw!
Could we, would we . . . ever such the strength so find, to stand as tall as him in time?

"In the game of life,

Every moment is important, and so sacred until our final nights!
For such valor and sacrifice . . . our Lord God, Jimmy you up to Heaven has called!

''For life is not a game,
As each day and night, are so precious the moments we're alive to claim.
And Freedom is not free, only bought and paid for by America's greatest of all names!''

In honor of a Real American Hero, Jimmy Regan . . . God Bless you, my Son, and may your family find peace!

INTRODUCING THE STOP TUBERCULOSIS NOW ACT OF 2007

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction of the Stop Tuberculosis Now Act of 2007.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I know all too well how necessary comprehensive international tuberculosis control is. It is remarkable in this day and age, with treatment available, that TB is the biggest infectious killer of young women in the world. In fact, TB kills more women than all causes of maternal mortality. As you know, TB is also the leading killer of people with AIDS. TB accounts for more than one quarter of all preventable adult deaths in developing countries.

I strongly believe that the global community, with the United States in the lead, must do more to adequately address this disease by investing in quality TB control programs, using the groundbreaking Global Plan to Stop TB as a guide. It is for that reason that I am introducing the Stop TB Now Act which will make the appropriate investments towards achieving the goals of the Global Plan. My bill calls for a U.S. investment of $400 million for international TB control in FY08 and $550 million in FY09.

I believe that if we don't make bold—and wise—investments in international TB control, not only will we fail to save millions of lives and miss out on the many accompanying benefits of controlling this killer, but also that this disease will become far more difficult and costly to treat.

Extremely Drug Resistant TB highlights this danger. It has been found on six continents, is a growing epidemic in southern Africa, and is already reported to be here in the United States. Regular (non drug-resistant) TB is curable with drugs that cost just $16 in most developing countries. Cases of drug-resistant TB, however, can cost thousands of dollars to cure, with treatment that is far more difficult for patients and practitioners. Drug-resistant TB is a manmade problem and is caused by poor TB treatment. We have the power to prevent drug-resistant TB and the power to treat and control regular TB, and yet we have not chosen to do so.

Madam Speaker, the adoption of the Stop TB Now Act of 2007 would have a profound effect on our efforts to improve global tuberculosis control. I ask my colleagues to cosponsor this bill today.

HONORING WAYNE HALE

HON. NICK LAMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Speaker, it is my distinct honor to recognize Mr. Wayne Hale, Manager of the Space Shuttle Program at the NASA Johnson Space Center in Texas's 22nd Congressional District, for winning the 2007 National Air and Space Museum Trophy for Current Achievement. Wayne was honored on March 7, 2007 for the Shuttle's STS–121 mission, which along with subsequent Shuttle flights got the Shuttle program back on track after the tragic *Columbia* loss.

For decades, America's space program has represented our greatest advances in science and technological innovation. Individuals like Wayne Hale are why NASA remains the global leader in expanding space exploration. Such ambitions are essential to growing our economy. They are essential to the technology used in all facets of everyday life. They are essential to inspiring our Nation's youth to go into math and science fields. And they are essential to fulfill the American spirit that our forbears passed on to us, to seek out and explore new frontiers.

The National Air and Space Museum trophy recognizes such achievements involving the management or execution of a scientific or technological project, a distinguished career of service in air and space technology, or a significant contribution in chronicling the history of air and space technology. Wayne Hale certainly fits this bill and brings great distinction to this award.

My congratulations to Wayne and his fine team of colleagues and professionals at NASA. Wayne's dedication to furthering our reach and exploration into space inspires our best and brightest to continue the most exciting endeavors in human history.

HONORING THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE DEMOCRATS

HON. PATRICK J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Pennsylvania Democrats for being named the "2006 Chapter of the Year" by the Pennsylvania Federation of College Democrats.

For those who say all young people are apathetic, I say, look at the Penn Democrats. They are inspiring proof to the contrary. Their hard work and dedication make them admirable examples—models not just to their fellow students or to other Democrats, but to all of us who seek to improve our communities through civic engagement and public service.

The Penn Democrats are to be commended for their continued outward focus. Not content to exist merely as a self-contained committee of like-minded people, they maintain an active presence on the University of Pennsylvania campus and work to encourage other students to become politically active. When voter turnout on campus grew by 280 percent between the 2000 and 2004 elections, the increase was due in large part to the efforts of the Penn Democrats, who ran a nonpartisan voter registration drive and successfully lobbied the City of Philadelphia to create six additional polling places convenient to the Penn campus. They ran a strong Get-Out-The-Vote effort in 2006 as well, and election day turnout among Penn students more than tripled that of the previous midterm elections, in 2002.

Their involvement in the larger community beyond the University is as laudable as their on-campus involvement, and is perhaps more extraordinary among college organizations. The Penn Democrats have worked hard to place students in local political offices. Through the organization's efforts in 2005, nine Penn students joined Philadelphia's 27th Ward Democratic Committee, and 20 more served as Inspectors or Judges of Elections.

The passion, energy, and focus of these students have made the Penn Democrats a respected institution on campus, in the local community, and in state and national politics. Politicians and candidates value invitations to speak at their events, not because they simply want good "photo ops," but because they know that the Penn Democrats play a meaningful role in politics and in the community.

I applaud the University of Pennsylvania College Democrats for their well-deserved recognition as Chapter of the Year.

IN OUR SEARCH FOR THE TRUTH

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, in tribute of slain reporter David Bloom, Albert Carey Caswell, United States Tour Guide, penned the following poem:

''In our search for the truth, in a reporters quest
Running on that edge, which so separates the greats . . . which so leads us to the best
With precious life on the line, all within these their most heroic moments there in time . . . while, courageously facing death
''For in these their greatest gifts they give
Here within these, our shortest of all lifetimes we live
As shall so here upon this earth, shall so surely show our worth . . . as shall so surely carry on, and forever with us live
''David Bloom
A man for so whom, within this his short lifetime . . . in our hearts, now so largely looms
As a true and great lesson to us all, of when greatness comes to call . . . of when, within these our short lives a heart so blooms
''Such a man of class, such a man of style
Such a man as a friend, you'd but wished you'd known all the while . . . as why, within our hearts we now carry him the while
'Ah . . . and through that camera's eye, as we could so see . . . his wonderful warmth, his great humanity . . . that he carried with him the miles
''For he was such a man of integrity, one of such splendid grace

A man for all seasons, who but within his short lifetime . . . so surely made our world a far better place
And these are but the reasons why, we shall never forget his beautiful smile . . . his debonair, and 'oh so very handsome face
''For so surely, he was headed down that very same path
In all those magnificent footsteps, that which Edward R. Murrow once so left . . . in his aftermath
For few have so traveled, such this hallowed path . . . as why to heaven this day, we pray to our Lord to so bless David we ask
''A reporter's reporter, a real fine man's man
And yet, this man for all seasons greatest assets . . . were his great warmth, and his oh so caring hand
As you could feel it, radiating through your TV set . . . as you so watched this superstar your heart he would catch, time and time again
''Oh what an innovator, oh what a truly marvelous communicator
While, in his magnificent Bloom mobile . . . we so watched his genius, courageously communicating
As he brought the light of day, and the truth into our world . . . as he so brought the proof of a heroes courage, in the darkness of a war unfurled
''But, just so too
As all of our those fine heroes too, who so gave their fine lives for us true . . . as he so did for you
Just, as each brave soldier . . . he so too . . . so heroically went into battle . . . as into hell was so sent, to bring back the truth . . . for all to view
''Yet, for all of his accomplishments
His greatest gifts, his fondest wish . . . his everything . . . was his magnificent wife & beautiful daughters to him from heaven sent
For on the day that he died, in Washington . . . The cherry blossoms bloomed high . . . as they too cried . . . knowing what his fine life had meant
''For here within our short lives, when such greatness so arrives . . . and brightly blooms
As one so surely finds, as one so surely assumes . . . is but where the greatest of all heart's so looms
For to this our world, these their most sacred gifts of which they've unfurled . . . that so ever bless our world, as we live when blossom's bloom
''For in this, Our Search For The Truth
In this a reporter's quest, To Be The Best . . . Do we dare and never second guess? And go forth with hearts full of youth
For in putting it all on the line, for in risking our most precious of all moments with our loved ones therein time . . . we so find, where lies the proof.''

To David's lovely wife Melanie and his beautiful daughters Christine, Ava, and Nicole, in memory of your magnificent husband and wonderful father.

And to all reporters who have lived and died for the truth, men like Daniel Pearl.

HONORING JACOBO AND MARY KAPILIVSKY ON THEIR 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Jacobo and Mary Kapilivsky on their 50th wedding anniversary. Jacobo and Mary will celebrate this wonderful milestone on April 14th, 2007, after spending half a century in love with the shared experiences of family life.

The life of Jacobo and Mary is a wonderful example of the American Dream.

The son of poor Jewish immigrants, Jacobo Kapilivsky was born on June 25th, 1932 in Trujillo, Peru. Despite his humble beginnings, Jacobo graduated from medical school in his native country before marrying Mary Rosco, herself a daughter of Jewish immigrants.

Jacobo and Mary started the adventure of their life together by immigrating to the U.S., where Jacobo completed his medical residency in Johnson City, NY and later in the Bronx. Over the years, Jacobo became a surgeon as well as a medical entrepreneur both in the U.S. and in Peru, where he has founded and led several private hospitals and medical centers. Currently, they live in McAllen, Texas.

The Kapilivskys are parents to Allan and his wife Lillian, Sam and his wife Noemi, and Sara and her husband Mark. They are proud grandparents to seven grandchildren including their newest addition and first granddaughter, Leora Paz Vogel. Their children and grandchildren live in McAllen, Texas, Rochester, New York, and South Florida.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring Jacobo and Mary Kapilivsky on their 50 golden years of love and dedication to each other.

HONORING THE WEBSTER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. NICK LAMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Speaker, a golden anniversary is indeed a special milestone, and today I am proud to recognize the Webster Fire Department's 50th Anniversary. This exemplary and dedicated group of firefighters continues a proud, 50-year long tradition of excellence.

As the first response team for the City of Webster, Texas, the Webster Fire Department exudes professionalism and dedication by all its firefighters in providing fire and emergency services for the community. The Webster Fire Department is responsible for fire prevention, fire suppression, and emergency medical services to the City of Webster. The Department also offers such special services as a Smoke Detector Program, Fire Extinguisher Training, and Fire Safety Training. The Webster Fire Department operates three engines, one ladder, and one rescue from two fire stations. They also operate special units such as a Wild Land Firefighting Booster Truck, a High Water Rescue 6x6, and a Water Rescue Boat.

Chief Jamie Galloway and his department will be celebrating the November anniversary all year long. In honor of the occasion, a special patch has been designed to be featured on the firefighter's uniforms and on all department vehicles.

I am honored to represent the City of Webster and its outstanding Fire Department. Their hard work and commitment brings pride to their entire community. It is truly a privilege to stand here today in observation of the golden anniversary of the Webster Fire Department, and I ask that we submit congratulations from the 110th Congress into the RECORD.

HONORING MARGARET ''PEGGY'' DATOR

HON. PATRICK J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Margaret Dator for her leadership and guidance as Executive Director of the Free Clinic of Doylestown. Margaret—known to everyone as Peggy—is a tremendous community leader. This year, in recognition of her years of volunteer service, she will be honored with the Bucks County Women's History Month Award.

Peggy has worked with young people in Girl Scouts, her church, schools, and Doylestown Hospital. It is through her efforts with these organizations that she was prepared to serve on the board of A Woman's Place, the Bucks County Children and Youth Advisory Board and the Foundations Behavioral Health Board. Peggy has also worked with the League of Women Voters in the production of a series of videos for local cable television programs addressing problems such as teen alcohol use, pregnancy and health care. She continues to serve as a consultant for the League of Women Voters on health and children's services.

Madam Speaker, there are countless stories that show Peggy's limitless spirit for helping those in need. One time, when faced with a request for equipment for a dental mission in Kenya, Peggy—as always—went above and beyond, joining the mission as a volunteer to provide a needs assessment for the community and work as a dental assistant. She is now financing an education for a Kenyan orphan.

While involved with the Warminster Collaborative, Peggy seized the opportunity to use a community gardening project to bring nutritional food to low-income homes. She has fulfilled a Spanish immersion course in order to improve bilingual assistance at the Free Clinic, and has recruited bilingual volunteers. Through her efforts, the clinic now also provides treatment for dental and mental health issues, and she has reinvigorated the help provided by A Woman's Place.

Madam Speaker, Peggy is admired for her unfailing generosity, strong leadership and advocacy for women, children, and vulnerable members of society. Peggy's efforts have improved many organizations and even more lives. Along the way, she has never failed to lose her vision of equality and justice. Her work, both in the community and around the world, is inspiring, and I am honored to recognize her for her many accomplishments.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF JACK SMITH FRIEND OF THE FIRST DISTRICT

HON. DAVID DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory and life of Jack Smith, a friend of the First Congressional District of Tennessee, who passed away March 15, 2007.

Jack Smith lived a life of service, entrepreneurship, and was known by all for his compassion to all those around him.

He was married to Jewell ''Judy'' Garland for 56 years, who preceded him in death in 2003. They had one son, two daughters, and six grand children.

Jack graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1942, with a degree in electrical engineering. He served this great nation for seven years of active duty in the U.S. Navy.

In 1954, Jack Smith started his first ''Piggly Wiggly'' grocery store, which would grow into a modern-day grocery store empire of 95 ''Food City'' stores throughout Southwest Virginia, Tennessee and Kentucky. He served as Chief Executive Officer until passing the torch to his son, Steven C. Smith, in 2001.

He received numerous community involvement awards through his prestigious career. Jack Smith received: 1996 Grocer of the Year, Junior Achievement Tri-Cities TN/VA Business Hall of Fame Laureate in 1999 and ''The 2002 Clarence G. Adamy ''Great America'' Award.

The ''Food City'' Stores engage in community enhancing programs like ''Apples for the Students'', which provides much needed resources to schools throughout across the First District and beyond.

Madam Speaker, I ask that the House join me this evening in offering our sympathies to the family and friends of Jack Smith. He was a dedicated family man, a true friend of the First District, and entrepreneur.

His service is greatly treasured, and he will be deeply missed.

HONORING GAIL RIDENHOUR

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing Ms. Gail Ridenhour for her public service to the Germantown community.

Ms. Ridenhour has been very involved in community arts programs. Serving as president of the nonprofit Germantown Fine Arts Foundation for two years and holding other officer positions, she has been indispensable to the efforts of the Foundation to build financial support for arts programs in the local school system.

Ms. Ridenhour has been a leader in her church community as well. As a member of Kingsway Christian Church, she directed, organized, and launched a preschool program. Begun in 1987, the program continues to thrive and grow today.

In addition to her community efforts, Gail Ridenhour has been recognized by the Germantown Lions Club as their Citizen of the Year for 2006. Her experience and leadership make her an invaluable member of the Germantown community.

Madam Speaker, please join me in honoring Gail Ridenhour and congratulating her for this well-deserved award.

TRIBUTE TO BOY SCOUT TROOP 4

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Boy Scout Troop 4, which celebrated its 90th anniversary this past Saturday, March 17, 2007.

Troop 4 was formed on March 17, 1917 at the Methodist Episcopal Church, now known as First United Methodist Church, in Ann Arbor, MI. This first group of scouts consisted of nine scouts, three Assistant Scout Masters and was led briefly by the direction of Scoutmaster Don Perkins, who was called in to service with U.S. involvement in WWI shortly after Troop 4's founding, and leadership of the troop then passed to Edward F. Metz. Starting with this small group, Troop 4 would go on to include over 1,700 members in its history, including 111 scouts to date, who have gone on to attain the rank of Eagle Scout. This 6.5 percent rate of Eagle Scout rank achievement is three times the national average.

Troop 4 serves as a wonderful testimonial to the leadership of the Ann Arbor community. This troop has shown tremendous community involvement in the Ann Arbor area and throughout the state of Michigan. These efforts have not been overlooked, as Troop 4 has been awarded several ''Take Pride in America'' awards; multiple ''Keep Michigan Beautiful'' awards; and was named one of President George H.W. Bush's ''1000 Points of Light,'' for its record of volunteer community service.

Community service has long played a critical role in Troop 4's activities. As part of its community service, Troop 4 makes a monthly visit to Glacier Hills Nursing Home during the school year and Chelsea United Methodist Nursing Home during the summer. During these visits troop members play bingo and visit with residents. Each year Troop 4 participates in the ''Scouting for Food'' program that collects food that is then donated to local food banks. Troop 4 is a community troop with its members coming from all over the Ann Arbor area and from all religious and ethnic backgrounds; a troop where new scouts are always welcome.

Troop 4, ''The Lighthouse Troop,'' is known throughout Michigan for its volunteer activities in the restoration of the St. Helena Island Lighthouse. For over 19 years Troop 4 members have traveled each summer to St. Helena Island where they spend a week restoring the lighthouse while camping on the island. In 2006, Grand Rapids television channel 14 highlighted their St. Helena Island service in a documentary entitled ''Great Lakes Treasures.'' In 1991 a documentary titled ''Keepers of the Light'' displayed the troop's efforts to restore the lighthouse and was shown on PBS stations in Michigan. The History Channel has also broadcast their story nationally. Additionally, ''Scouting'' and ''Boy's Life'' magazines among others have also featured the troop's efforts at the lighthouse.

I grew up a Boy Scout, became a Scoutmaster, and watched proudly as both my sons became Scouts. The Boy Scouts are an American institution and one of America's most patriotic organizations; they are a shining example to the world of what is good about America. I am proud to pay tribute to Troop 4 for their service, dedication and commitment to the Ann Arbor community and the state of Michigan.

THE FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INVASION OF IRAQ

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, on November 7, 2006, the American people sent a clear message to Congress and the President: we must end the war in Iraq. In response, the administration announced it would escalate the conflict. Today we mark the fourth anniversary of President Bush's war of choice, and later this week, the House of Representatives will have to make a choice of its own: either endorse the President's open-ended commitment to the Iraq war or demand accountability and set a timeline for the phased redeployment of our troops. I am hopeful that Congress will pass a supplemental appropriations bill that will chart a new direction toward de-escalation, with a definitive date for disengagement.

The occasion of this anniversary is an appropriate time to examine the impact of these last four years of war. As we begin the fifth year of the war, the price we have paid is high—with more than 3,000 U.S. troops dead, more than 20,000 U.S. troops wounded, and more than $400 billion of taxpayer dollars appropriated. The Iraq war is already longer than U.S. participation in World War II, World War I, the Korean War, or the Civil War.

What do we have to show for these sacrifices? Contrary to the rosy scenario depicted by the administration, this war has not made us safer; on the contrary, it has made us more vulnerable than ever. A sizeable majority of foreign policy and military experts agree that the world is a more dangerous place for Americans now than it was before we invaded Iraq. The war has become the number one recruiting tool of terrorists, and our continuing occupation of Iraq has provided them with the best training camp they could ever hope to have—a place where they can practice and refine their methods while taking American lives. The war increasingly strains our military—now creating a genuine crisis in U.S. troop readiness and our ability to respond to new threats. Should disaster strike here at home or elsewhere in the world, we will be left virtually defenseless while our troops and equipment are bogged down in a bloody quagmire that threatens to drag on for many more years.

House Democrats are bringing forward a plan that provides for a change in course on Iraq. Our plan will protect our troops on the battlefield and at home, require accountability from the Bush Administration and the Iraqi government, and set a responsible timeline for

a phased redeployment of U.S. troops—with a date certain, by August 2008 at the latest, for U.S. combat troops to be redeployed from Iraq. While I would have preferred a plan that brought the troops home even sooner, I believe that this compromise proposal is the best approach Congress can take at this time.

Adoption of the Democrats' plan would begin to answer the pleas of the American people—to turn away from the President's open-ended commitment to U.S. participation in this Iraqi civil war and instead provide a responsible, phased plan for requiring the Iraqis to take responsibility for their own future. Redeploying our armed forces does not mean "cutting and running." On the contrary, we suggest continued and extensive involvement in the region through renewed diplomacy and reconstruction that is free from fraud and abuse. This sensible path is the only one that can truly lead us to victory.

TRIBUTE TO WEBER STATE UNIVERSITY THEATRE ARTS

HON. ROB BISHOP

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, the Weber State University theatre arts program in the Department of Performing Arts is known regionally and nationally for providing exceptionally high quality theatre productions. Faculty and students are serious, committed to theatre, and devoted to making theatre accessible to a diverse audience. Weber State Theatre Arts area produces a full season of plays in the remodeled and state-of-the-art Val A. Browning Center for the Performing Arts.

In recognition of Weber State University's consistently outstanding theatre program, it was invited to participate in "Shakespeare in Washington," a festival featuring a vast array of events including: theatre, music and dance, as well as films and art exhibits hosted by the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts from January to June 2007.

Weber State's production of "Macbeth" was performed on March 14 and 15 in the Family Theatre at the Kennedy Center. "Macbeth" is one of the world's most well known tragedies and has been interpreted in many styles and cultures. Macbeth and his wife conspire to murder their way to the throne of Scotland, but their success is spoiled by guilt, paranoia and madness.

Because of the unique presentation, the production was edited to run close to an hour in length, requiring the director, Tracy Callahan, to spend a great deal of time editing the script without losing any of its high-voltage substance. Many know the story, but thanks to the skills of the playwright, director, cast, designers and crew, nothing is lost in the abbreviated retelling.

Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to honor Theatre Arts at Weber State University, those who had a part in this stellar production, those who have traveled far to support Weber State University as well as the Weber State University Alumni in the Washington, D.C. area.

THE AUSTIN FAMILY—AMERICANS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, each year, people enter the United States to pursue the American dream. The members of the Austin family were determined to live here and become citizens of our great Nation. On March 21, 2007, the community of Kingwood, Texas, will celebrate the fact that the Austin family—Tony, Cheryl, Ryan, and Laura—are now officially citizens of the United States of America.

Cheryl was born in Luanshya, a copper mining town in Zambia in 1951. Tony moved to Luanshya with his parents in 1953. The two met in 1968 at a Lions Club Gala Dance and were married in March 1970.

In 1973, they had two children, Ryan and Lauren. Tony had the opportunity to move his family to the United States because of the company he worked for in South Africa.

Tony was interested in coming to the United States because he often traveled to Houston for business and had the opportunity to spend time in the suburbs. Tony was awestruck by the freedom that American families enjoy as opposed to the situation his family encountered in South Africa with the deteriorating security system. Although they had a great house in a good area, they were imprisoned by the fear of robbery either at home or out on the streets.

The family arrived in Houston in January 1998. They all settled in and again it became clearer how much Ryan and Lauren had been affected by the security situation of South Africa. They were amazed at the freedom they had here.

The family obtained legal permanent resident status in May 2001, by which time they had decided that this was to be their permanent home. They then applied for citizenship in August 2006.

The Austin family is active in the community and each member is a valuable asset to our country. Cheryl has been with Continental Airlines since October 2000 and is now a Senior Recruiter. Tony is a Regional Sales Director with a national training software company. Ryan has his own business, GameForce, in Kingwood Town Center, and Lauren is a junior at the University of Houston Business School.

Although the family has had to make some adjustments, they know it is worth it because of everything they have gained by becoming U.S. citizens. Not only are they model citizens, they are incredibly patriotic and cherish the United States.

I commend the Austin family on their great achievement, congratulate them on being citizens of the great United States, and wish them the best of luck in all their future endeavors.

And that's just the way it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. McCOTTER. Madam Speaker, on March 14, 2007, I would have voted "yea" on Rollcall No. 153, the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2007 (H.R. 985).

IN MEMORY OF STAFF SERGEANT JUSTIN M. ESTES

HON. MIKE ROSS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Staff Sergeant Justin M. Estes of Sims, Arkansas; who died on March 5, 2007, fighting for our country in Iraq while supporting Operation Iraqi Freedom. Staff Sergeant Justin Estes was 25 years old when he selflessly gave his life for his country during combat operations.

After graduating from Oden High School where he played basketball and baseball, Staff Sergeant Estes joined the Army where he would serve in South Korea, Germany, Iraq and Macedonia. Staff Sergeant Estes was a member of the 82nd Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, N.C., where he was assigned to C Company, 2nd Battalion, 505th Parachute Infantry Regiment. He was serving his second tour of duty in Iraq.

Staff Sergeant Justin Estes gave his life to serve our country and will forever be remembered as a hero, a son and a friend. My deepest condolences go out to his mother and stepfather, Diane and John Salyers of Sims; his father and stepmother, Don and Cathy Estes of Harrodsburg, Kentucky; his two sisters, Norma and Kelli Estes; his grandparents, John and Clazina Visser and Joe Barry; and to his aunts, uncles and cousins. He will be missed by his family, his community and all those who knew him and called him a friend. I will continue to keep Staff Sergeant Justin Estes and his family in my deepest thoughts and prayers.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK NEELY

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Patrick Neely. Mr. Neely, of Neely's Bar-B-Que, located in both Memphis and in Nashville, was recently named Restauranteur of the Year by the Memphis Restaurant Association. Mr. Neely and his brothers Gaelin, Tony, and Mark have turned what was once a fledgling downtown Memphis operation into one of the most successful restaurants in the entire American South. After first opening its doors in 1988, Neely's Bar-B-Que has opened doors in two new locations and been featured nationwide in magazines and on nationally televised news and cable programs.

The Neelys have continually worked hard to ensure quality in both their food and their people, and have not forgotten about their community. Giving time, money and support to a host of charitable and not-for-profit organizations, Neely's Bar-B-Que has turned itself into a profitable, charitable, and local source of pride. It is for the hard-work, determination, and ultimate successes of Mr. Neely and his entire family that I rise, Madam Speaker, to

honor Neely's Bar-B-Que. Approaching 20 years of excellence, may Neely's continue to thrive and prosper along with the City of Memphis.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GREGORY DUENAS FEJERAN

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 2007

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I rise with great sorrow today to mourn the death of Guam Army National Guardsman Specialist Gregory Duenas Fejeran with the community in Guam. Greg was a 28-year-old father of two who was killed serving with a National Guard deployment in support of the Combined Joint Task Force in the Horn of Africa on March 5, 2007.

Greg Fejeran was the son of the late Gregorio P. Fejeran and Rosa D. Cruz Fejeran of the ''Golo'' and ''Cupa'' clans. He was a devoted and loving husband to Deborah Ann Cepeda Fejeran, and a protective and nurturing father of Shira and Keleko Fejeran, who knew most intimately how much he loved being in the military and who understood his duty as a serviceman. They supported him as faithfully as he supported Deborah's endeavors, Shira's dancing activities, and Keleko's sports activities.

Greg was the brother of Elizabeth T., Elizabeth U., Gregorio Jr., Barbara, Pauline, Richard, Rosalind, and Agnes. He was a son-in-law, a brother-in-law, a godson, a nephew, an uncle, a cousin; in short, Madam Speaker, he was a member of a large, extended family that deeply mourns his passing today.

According to his family, Greg loved working on cars, and enjoyed a variety of sports, with baseball being his favorite.

Madam Speaker, Sergeant Fejeran died in the service of his country and his island, and was posthumously promoted from Specialist to Sergeant for his patriotism. Servicemen and women from Guam have always been willing and ready to answer the call to arms to defend this great Nation, and we—their families, friends and neighbors—have always supported them, knowing the risk. As people of a small island community, the ties among us are very deep.

Gregory Duenas Fejeran lost his life in the noble effort to rebuild a nation in freedom so that others might some day know the joys of liberty and justice. With heavy but proud hearts, I extend heartfelt condolences and profound sympathy to Greg's family on behalf of the People of Guam and a grateful Nation. Greg was a caring son, a loving brother and friend, a devoted father, and a proud American patriot.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, March 20, 2007 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 21

9 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine assessing the effectiveness of the current United States sanctions on Iran relating to minimizing potential threats from Iran.
SD–538

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine the performance of the United States trade and food aid programs for the 2007 Farm Bill.
SR–328A

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine an overview of the Government Accountability Office assistance to Congressional oversight, focusing on past work and future challenges and opportunities.
SD–342

10 a.m.
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine a review of treatment, diagnosis, and monitoring efforts, focusing on the long-term health impacts from September 11.
SH–216

Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine the Inspector General's findings of the improper use of the National Security Letters by the Federal Bureau of Investigation relating to the misuse of the Patriot Act powers.
SD–226

10:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Affairs, Insurance, and Automotive Safety Subcommittee
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Consumer Product Safety Commission.
SR–253

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2007 for the United States Air Force.
SD–192

Armed Services
Strategic Forces Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine nuclear and strategic policy options.
SR–222

2 p.m.
Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2008 for the Department of Energy.
SD–138

2:30 p.m.
Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine Vice President Al Gore's perspective on global warming.
SD–106

Judiciary
Terrorism, Technology and Homeland Security Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine recent developments involving the security of sensitive consumer information relating to identity theft and solutions for an evolving problem.
SD–226

3 p.m.
Appropriations
Financial Services and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2008 for the federal judiciary.
SD–192

5 p.m.
Foreign Relations
To receive a closed briefing relative to Gulf security.
S–407, Capitol

MARCH 22

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the United States Southern command, Northern command, and Joint Forces command in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2008 and the future years defense program.
SH–216

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) modernization.
SR–253

9:45 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine Indian housing.
SR–485

10 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine causes and consequences relating to mortgage market turmoil.
SD–538

Finance
To receive testimony on ''Keeping America's Promise'' relating to health care and child welfare services for Native Americans.
SD–215

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine ensuring safe medicines and medical devices for children.
SD–430

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine deconstructing reconstruction, focusing on problems, challenges, and the way forward in Iraq and Afghanistan.
SD–342

Judiciary
Business meeting to consider S. 236, to require reports to Congress on Federal agency use of data mining, S. 376, to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve the provisions relating to the carrying of concealed weapons by law enforcement officers, and S. 849, to promote accessibility, accountability, and openness in Government by strengthening section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act) and to discuss the possibility of the issuance of certain subpoenas in the connection with investigation into the replacement of U.S. attorneys.
SD–226

Appropriations
Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2008 for military construction.
SD–124

10:30 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Ford M. Fraker, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.
SD–419

2 p.m.
Appropriations
Business meeting to markup the Supplemental Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2007.
SD–106

Armed Services
To receive a closed briefing on the detention and judicial capacity in Iraq.
S–407, Capitol

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the ''Future of Coal'' report recently published by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
SD–366

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine a review of the Merit Systems Protection Board and the Office of the Special Counsel, focusing on the safeguarding of the merit systems principles in preparation for the consideration of the reauthorization of the two agencies.
SD–342

Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.
SH–219

MARCH 26

2 p.m.
Armed Services
Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee
To receive a briefing on the reorganization of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for policy.
SR–232A

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the progress of the European Union's Emissions Trading Scheme and to receive information on lessons learned for policymakers who want to better understand how a market-based trading program could operate efficiently and effectively in the United States.
SD–G50

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2008 for mind, brain and behavioral research at the National Institutes of Health.
SD–116

2:30 p.m.
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine a review of the Real ID Act of 2005 and the proposed regulations released by the Department of Homeland Security on March 1, 2006, implementing Act, focusing on efforts to secure drivers' licenses and identification cards.
SD–342

3 p.m.
Judiciary
Human Rights and the Law Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the problem of human trafficking and the legal options to stop the problem.
SD–226

MARCH 27

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Claude M. Kicklighter, of Georgia, to be Inspector General, Department of Defense, James R. Clapper, Jr., of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, and S. Ward Casscells, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.
SH–216

Judiciary
To hold oversight hearings to examine the Federal Bureau of Investigation.
SD–106

Veterans' Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense cooperation and collaboration, focusing on health care issues.
SR–418

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine competition and consumer choice relating to exclusive sports programming.
SR–253

MARCH 28

9:45 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2008 for the Department of Labor.
SD–124

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the future of the Coast Guard Dive Program.
SR–253

Rules and Administration
Business meeting to consider S. 223, to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.
SR–301

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2008 for United States Forest Service.
SD–124

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Space, Aeronautics, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine transitioning to a next generation Human Space Flight System.
SR–253

MARCH 29

9:15 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine Indian trust fund litigation.
SR–485

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of AMVETS, American Ex-Prisoners of War, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Gold Star Wives of America, Fleet Reserve Association, the Retired Enlisted Association, Military Officers Association of America, and the National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs.
SD–106

APRIL 10

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Trade Commission (FTC).
SR–253

APRIL 11

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine issues relative to Filipino veterans.
SR–418

10 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the availability and affordability of property and casualty insurance in the Gulf Coast and other coastal regions.
SD–538

APRIL 17

10 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Justice.
SD–106

APRIL 25

2 p.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Veterans Affairs, focusing on mental health issues.
SR–418

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3239–S3289

Measures Introduced: Eight bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 911–918, and S. Res. 111. **Pages S3272–73**

Measures Passed:

Casimir Pulaski: Senate passed S.J. Res. 5, proclaiming Casimir Pulaski to be an honorary citizen of the United States posthumously. **Page S3283**

Commemorating Founding of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 14, commemorating the 85th anniversary of the founding of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, a leading association for the 1,300,000 United States citizens of Greek ancestry and Philhellenes in the United States. **Pages S3283–84**

Preserving United States Attorney Independence Act: Senate began consideration of S. 214, to amend chapter 35 of title 28, United States Code, to preserve the independence of United States attorneys, agreeing to the committee amendment, which will be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment, and taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S3240–66**

Pending:

Kyl Amendment No. 459, to ensure that United States attorneys are promptly nominated by the President, and are appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. **Pages S3251–53**

Sessions Amendment No. 460, to require appropriate qualifications for interim United States attorneys. **Pages S3153–66**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, March 20, 2007; that there be 90 minutes of debate on the bill and the pending amendments to run concurrently with the time equally divided and controlled by the Majority and Republican Leaders, or their designees; that upon the use, or yielding back of time, but not later than 11:30 a.m., Senate vote on, or in relation to, Kyl Amendment No. 459 (listed above), to be followed by a vote on, or relation to, Sessions Amendment No. 460 (listed above); provided further, that upon disposition of all amendments, the bill be read a third time, and Senate vote on final passage of the bill. **Page S3284**

Calling on the Government of the United Kingdom—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate action on the amendment (Reid for Biden) Amendment No. 463, of a technical nature, to the preamble to H. Con. Res. 20, calling on the Government of the United Kingdom to immediately establish a full, independent, and public judicial inquiry into the murder of Northern Ireland defense attorney Patrick Finucane, as recommended by Judge Peter Cory as part of the Weston Park Agreement, in order to move forward on the Northern Ireland peace process, be vitiated. **Page S3283**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.

Pages S3283, S3289

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Raymond M. Kethledge, of Michigan, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

Stephen Joseph Murphy III, of Michigan, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

Robert James Jonker, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan.

Paul Lewis Maloney, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan.

Janet T. Neff, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan.

Sharion Aycock, of Mississippi, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Mississippi.

David R. Dugas, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Louisiana.

James Randal Hall, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Georgia.

Richard H. Honaker, of Wyoming, to be United States District Judge for the District of Wyoming.

Richard A. Jones, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington.

Janis Lynn Sammartino, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

2 Army nominations in the rank of general.

1 Marine Corps nomination in the rank of general.

7 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army.

Pages S3284–89

Measures Referred: **Page S3268**

Executive Communications: **Pages S3268–72**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S3872**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S3273–74**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S3274–82**

Additional Statements: **Pages S3266–68**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Pages S3282–83**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S3283**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 2 p.m., and adjourned at 6:46 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, March 20, 2007. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3284.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2008 for the National Institutes of Health, after receiving testimony from Elias A. Zerhouni, Director, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services; Joan S. Brugge, Harvard Medical School Department of Cell Biology, Boston, Massachusetts; Brent Iverson, University of Texas at Austin; Robert Siliciano, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Baltimore, Maryland; and Stephen M. Strittmatter, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 18 public bills, H.R. 1559–1576; and 2 resolutions, H. Res. 253 and 255, were introduced. **Pages H2670–71**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2671–72**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 1433, to provide for the treatment of the District of Columbia as a Congressional district for purposes of representation in the House of Representatives, with an amendment (H. Rept. 110–52, Pt. 1) and

H. Res. 254, providing for consideration of H.R. 1227, to assist in the provision of affordable housing to low-income families affected by Hurricane Katrina (H. Rept. 110–53). **Page H2670**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Corrine Brown to act as Speaker Pro Tempore for today. **Page H2625**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:45 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H2626**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Recognizing the importance of Hot Springs National Park on its 175th anniversary: H. Res. 138, to recognize the importance of Hot Springs National Park on its 175th anniversary, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 399 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 157; **Pages H2627–28, H2637–38**

More Water and More Energy Act of 2007: H.R. 902, to facilitate the use for irrigation and other purposes of water produced in connection with development of energy resources; **Pages H2628–31**

Taunton, Massachusetts Special Resources Study Act: H.R. 1021, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resources study regarding the suitability and feasibility of designating certain historic buildings and areas in Taunton, Massachusetts, as a unit of the National Park System; **Page H2631**

Natural Resource Protection Cooperative Agreement Act: H.R. 658, to authorize the Secretary of

the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements to protect natural resources of units of the National Park System through collaborative efforts on land inside and outside of units of the National Park System, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 390 yeas to 10 nays, Roll No. 158; **Pages H2631–33, H2638–39**

Providing for the conveyance of the Bureau of Land Management parcels known as the White Acre and Gambel Oak properties and related real property to Park City, Utah: H.R. 838, to provide for the conveyance of the Bureau of Land Management parcels known as the White Acre and Gambel Oak properties and related real property to Park City, Utah; **Pages H2633–34**

Arthur V. Watkins Dam Enlargement Act: H.R. 839, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility of enlarging the Arthur V. Watkins Dam Weber Basin Project, Utah, to provide additional water for the Weber Basin Project to fulfill the purposes for which that project was authorized, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 394 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 159; and **Pages H2634, S2639**

Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Amendments of 2007: H.R. 1006, to amend the provisions of law relating to the John H. Prescott Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Grant Program. **Page H2634–35**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:01 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. **Page H2637**

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed:

Redesignating the Ellis Island Library on the third floor of the Ellis Island Immigration Museum, located on Ellis Island in New York Harbor, as the "Bob Hope Memorial Library": H.R. 759, to redesignate the Ellis Island Library on the third floor of the Ellis Island Immigration Museum, located on Ellis Island in New York Harbor, as the "Bob Hope Memorial Library". **Pages H2636–37**

Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in honor of the lives of United States Armed Services members lost in Iraq. **Page H2638**

Committee Election: The House agreed to H. Res. 253, electing Representative Moore (WI) to the Committee on the Budget. **Page H2639**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H2643.

Senate Referrals: S.J. Res. 5 was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and S. Con. Res. 14 was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. **Page H2670**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2637–38, H2638, and H2639. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 11:15 p.m.

Committee Meetings

FINANCIAL SERVICES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions held a hearing on OMB. Testimony was heard from Robert J. Portman, Director, OMB.

LABOR, HHS, EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, HHS, Education, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Employment and Training Administration/Office of Job Corps/Veterans Training/Vocational and Adult Education. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Education: Emily Stover DeRocco, Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training Administration; Esther R. Johnson, Director, Office of Job Corps; and Troy Justesen, Assistant Secretary, Vocational and Adult Education; and Charles S. Ciccolella, Assistant Secretary, Veterans' Training Administration, Department of Labor.

SELECT INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Intelligence Oversight met in executive session to hold a hearing on National Reconnaissance Office Budget. Testimony was heard from Donald Kerr, Director, National Reconnaissance Office, Department of Defense.

CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE INTERFERENCE

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Held a hearing on Allegations of Political Interference with Government Climate Change Science. Testimony was heard from James Connaughton, Chairman, Council on Environmental Quality; James Hansen, Director, Goddard Institute for Space Studies, NASA; Philip Cooney, former Chief of Staff, Council on Environmental Quality; George Deutsch, former Public Affairs Officer, NASA; and a public witness.

GULF COAST HURRICANE HOUSING RECOVERY ACT OF 2007

Committee on Rules, Granted, by voice vote, a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 1227, Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act of 2007. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on Financial

Services. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except for clauses 9 and 10 of Rule XXI. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services, modified by the amendment printed in Part A of the Rules Committee report, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill as amended shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment and shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill as amended, and no further amendments shall be in order except those amendments printed in Part B of the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution.

The rule provides that the further amendments made in order in Part B may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report except for clauses 9 and 10 of Rule XXI. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Frank of Massachusetts, Representatives Corrine Brown of Florida, Biggert and Neugebauer.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 2007

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2008 for the Department of the Interior, 10 a.m., SD–124.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the United States Air Force in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2008 and the future years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SR–325.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Interstate Commerce, Trade, and Tourism, to continue hearings to examine economic and safety concerns relating to promoting travel to America (Part II), 10 a.m., SR–253.

Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Innovation, to hold hearings to examine energy innovation, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Stephen Jeffrey Isakowitz, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Energy, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Subcommittee on National Parks, to hold hearings to examine S. 126, to modify the boundary of Mesa Verde National Park, S. 257, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of establishing the Columbia-Pacific National Heritage Area in the States of Washington and Oregon, S. 289, to establish the Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Heritage Area, S. 443, to establish the Sangre de Cristo National Heritage Area in the State of Colorado, S. 444, to establish the South Park National Heritage Area in the State of Colorado, S. 500, to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of the National Museum of the American Latino to develop a plan of action for the establishment and maintenance of a National Museum of the American Latino in Washington, D.C., H.R. 512, to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of the National Museum of the American Latino to develop a plan of action for the establishment and maintenance of a National Museum of the American Latino in Washington, D.C., S. 637, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of establishing the Chattahoochee Trace National Heritage Corridor in Alabama and Georgia, S. 817, to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to provide additional authorizations for certain National Heritage Areas, and for other proposes; and S. Con. Res. 6, expressing the sense of Congress that the National Museum of Wildlife Art, located in Jackson, Wyoming, should be designated as the "National Museum of Wildlife Art of the United States", 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: to receive testimony on identifying needs, partnerships, and resources relating to a competitive education, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on African Affairs, to hold hearings to examine Chad and the Central African Republic, focusing on the regional impact of the Darfur crisis, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Retirement and Aging, to hold hearings to examine the state of Alzheimer's disease research 100 years later, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, to continue hearings to examine Medicare doctors who cheat on their taxes and efforts to address the problem, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine combating war profiteering, focusing on investigating and prosecuting contracting fraud and abuse in Iraq, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights, to hold hearings to examine monopoly or competition from new technologies relating to the XM-Sirius merger, 2:15 p.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, on Research and Economics, 1 p.m., 2362A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies, on Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, 10 a.m., and on International Trade Administration/Bureau of Industry and Security, 2 p.m., H–310 Capital.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies, on Department of Energy: Energy Supply and Conservation/Fossil Energy/Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, 10 a.m., 2362B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Homeland Security, on Determining Critical Infrastructure and How To Protect It, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior and Environment, and Related Agencies, on National Endowment for the Humanities/National Endowment for the Arts, 9:30 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, on Worker Protection Agencies, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, on Library of Congress: Future of Digital Libraries, 1:30 p.m., H–144 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans' Affairs, and Related Agencies, on Base Realignment and Closure, 9:30 a.m., and on VA Long-Term Health/Nursing Home Care, 1:30 p.m., H–143 Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services, to mark up the Wounded Warrior Assistance Act of 2007, 4:30 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2008 National Defense Authorization Budget Requests for military construction, family housing, base closures and facilities' operations and maintenance, 1 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces, hearing on U.S. shipyard modernization initiatives and ship cost reduction, 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2008 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for the Department of Energy's atomic energy defense activities, 10 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality, hearing on Climate Change: Perspectives of Utility CEOs, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Environment and Hazardous Materials, to mark up H.R. 518, International Solid Waste Importation and Management Act of 2007, 2:30 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, Trade and Technology, hearing on H.R. 180, Darfur Accountability and Divestment Act of 2007, 1 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, hearing on Proposed Legislation on Iraq, 9:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight, hearing on Welcome to America? 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, hearing entitled "Organizational and Policy Proposals for the Fiscal Year 2008 Department of Homeland Security Authorization: Positioning US–VISIT for Success and Establishing a Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Process," 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Border, Maritime, and Global Counterterrorism, to continue hearings entitled "Crossing the Border: Immigrants in Detention and Victims of Trafficking," 3 p.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on House Administration, Subcommittee on Elections, to continue hearings on Election Reform: Auditing Federal Elections, 2 p.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, hearing on the Inspector General's Independent Report on the FBI's Use of National Security Letters, 9:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, hearing on the Second Chance Act of 2007, 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, oversight hearing on the effect of global climate change on public lands and resources as a result of federal energy policies and actions, 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Lands, oversight hearing on Yellowstone National Park Bison, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Management, Organization, and Procurement, hearing on Federal Financial Statements for Fiscal Year 2006: Fiscal Outlook, Management Weaknesses and Consequences, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science and Technology, Subcommittee on Research and Science Education, hearing on National Science Foundation Reauthorization, Part I, 10:30 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, oversight hearing on Post-Katrina Temporary Housing: Dilemmas and Solutions, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, hearing on Motorcoach Safety, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing on IRS Operations and the Tax Gap, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Trade, hearing on the U.S. Korea Free Trade Agreement Negotiations, 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, hearing on Signals Intelligence, 1 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the Senate

10 a.m., Tuesday, March 20

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 214, Preserving United States Attorney Independence Act, and during a period of debate, vote on, or in relation to, Kyl Amendment No. 459, and Sessions Amendment No. 460, following which, Senate will vote on final passage of the bill.

(Senate will recess following the vote on final passage of S. 214 until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10:30 a.m., Tuesday, March 20

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of the following suspension: H. Con. Res. 42—Honoring the heroic service and sacrifice of the 6,500 glider pilots of the United States Army Air Forces during World War II. Consideration of H.R. 1227—Gulf Coast Hurricane Housing Recovery Act of 2007 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Baca, Joe, Calif., E578
Berman, Howard L., Calif., E576
Bishop, Rob, Utah, E582
Blackburn, Marsha, Tenn., E581
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E583
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E576
Capito, Shelley Moore, W.Va., E574
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E582
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E581
Davis, David, Tenn., E581
Dingell, John D., Mich., E581
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E579, E580
Garrett, Scott, N.J., E576
Graves, Sam, Mo., E573, E574
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E575
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E573, E574, E574, E575, E575
Lampson, Nick, Tex., E579, E580
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E576
McCotter, Thaddeus G., Mich., E582
Miller, George, Calif., E574
Murphy, Patrick J., Pa., E578, E579, E580
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E577
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E573
Poe, Ted, Tex., E582
Reynolds, Thomas M., N.Y., E573, E574
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E575
Ross, Mike, Ark., E582
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E577
Sessions, Pete, Tex., E577
Walsh, James T., N.Y., E577
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E578, E579

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record,* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.