United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *110th* CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 2008 *No. 56*

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

Dr. Carey D. Froelich, First Baptist Church, Baytown, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Holy and Gracious God, we bow before You in wonder and gratitude that You care about the affairs of mankind. Thank You for offering divine counsel and wisdom to these men and women to whom You have granted the privilege of governing.

Loving Father, empower each Member of this noble body with a vision of the common good. May the dynamic of partisan debate unify them in their resolve to serve our Nation as a whole. Grant to each participant the capacity and the courage to discern truth, to feel compassion, to recognize justice, and to act with integrity.

Lord, I pray that every servant in this House will recognize Your presence in this great Hall, and that all will experience the full measure of Your blessing as they conduct the affairs of our great Nation.

I pray in the name of Jesus Christ, the Wonderful Counselor upon whose shoulders the burden of governance has always rested. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Mr. INGLIS 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

REPORT INDICATES POLITICAL OBSTACLES AND UNLIKELY FUTURE PROGRESS IN IRAQ

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, today House committees will hear from General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker about the supposed progress being made in Iraq and the need to keep 140,000 U.S. troops there indefinitely. As we listen to this testimony, it is important to remember what our Nation's true goals are and what true, lasting security actually means.

A new report out this week from the same experts who advised the nonpartisan Independent Iraq Study Group concludes that political progress in Iraq is at best ''slow, halting and superficial,'' and political fragmentation is ''so pronounced'' that we are no closer to leaving Iraq than we were a year ago. The experts predict that it could take at least 5 to 10 years to produce any real, measurable political reconciliation.

Madam Speaker, I would hope that President Bush would read this new report so that he could see how people outside his administration are viewing the situation in Iraq. Such sobering and nonpartisan assessment should serve as a wake-up call that we should not leave 140,000 troops in Iraq indefinitely while the Iraqis are doing virtually nothing to live up to their promises.

UNITED NATIONS SPEECH POLICE

(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, free speech is under attack again. This time the so-called U.N. Human Rights Council passed a resolution encouraging the criminalization of freedom of expression by the U.N. chief spokesman on speech. Egypt and Pakistan proposed the anti-speech resolution. What it does is promote specific criminal restrictions on individuals in the world who criticize or make negative comments about Islam.

According to the International World Tribune, ''Muslim countries have been demanding world limits on free speech ever since a Danish magazine published those not-so-flattering cartoons of Mohammad.'' So now the U.N. Human Rights Council wants to limit the human rights of free speech and religious discourse. Of course, this limit only applies to those who criticize one specific religion, Islam. Muslims are still permitted to bash Christians, Jews and Hindus.

Free speech cannot be limited because some group doesn't like what somebody says. That is what free speech means. The Human Rights Council was wrong when it surrendered to the Muslim speech police and passed this speech control resolution that advocates the criminalization of criticism of Islam.

And that's just the way it is.

CONGRESS MUST TAKE ACTION TO END THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the President's representative from the military is on Capitol Hill urging us to continue to stay in Iraq, telling us to wait, don't leave.

What are we waiting for, until the cost of the war reaches $6 trillion, so

Printed on recycled paper.

that our American economy goes totally bust, so that we don't have any more money for education or health care or housing?

What are we waiting for, for the casualties to get to 10,000 or 20,000 deaths of our service men and women?

What are we waiting for, for America to stand alone against the world?

It is time that we take a new direction. It is time that Congress regain its rightful role as a coequal branch of government. It is not appropriate for leaders in Congress to say, well, it is the administration's fault that the war continues, when in fact we have the authority to cut off funds.

Congress must take a strong stand and say no more funding; end the war, stop the occupation, close the bases, bring the troops home, set in motion an international peacekeeping and security force that comes in as our troops leave, work for a program of reconciliation between the Shiites, the Sunnis, and the Kurds, work for a program of repatriations, and stop trying to control the oil of Iraq.

BMW PROVIDING ECONOMIC SUCCESS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

(Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there are plenty of challenging news stories about the economy, and we in upstate South Carolina have had some of those experiences ourselves. It is worth celebrating some of the successes.

On March 10, BMW announced an additional $750 million expenditure at their Spartanburg, South Carolina, plant, bringing their total investment to $4.2 billion. They will add 500 employees to the 6,300 already there and 1,500 employee jobs will be added among the suppliers. Those suppliers, by the way, have invested $2.1 billion in South Carolina and have 12,000 employees.

It is very exciting to have this kind of news. It is also exciting to see the technology that BMW plans to employ in Spartanburg. They are going to bring clean diesel for the first time to the United States. It is going to be in the brand new X–6, all of which will be made in Spartanburg, South Carolina.

That car will also get 30 miles per gallon. Frank-Peter Arndt, their board member, explained that even at 125 miles an hour on the autobahn, the X–6 with the deep clean diesel will get 30 miles per gallon. It is a wonderful success worth celebrating.

HONORING AND CONGRATULATING THE BROWARD COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT IN FLORIDA

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

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the Broward County School District in Florida for leading the Nation in National Board Certified Teachers. Currently, Broward County has a total of 1,307 National Board Certified Teachers, up 270 teachers from last year. This is truly a testament to the dedication of teachers in Broward County to improving the quality of education in their classrooms.

National Board Certified Teachers are among the most advanced and highly qualified teachers in our country. By pursuing this high degree of certification, the teachers of Broward County have demonstrated their commitment to elevating and improving instruction in their schools. They will also join the tens of thousands of other teachers from across the country in an effort to improve student achievement nationwide.

I strongly believe that teachers have one of the most difficult and thankless jobs in America. However, the work they do is so critical to the success of our future generations.

As a parent, I would like to personally thank the teachers of Broward County for their dedication to the teaching profession. The knowledge and skills that they have developed in earning this certification will benefit students for generations to come.

I would also like to congratulate the members of the School Board of Broward County for this tremendous accomplishment. Broward County has truly raised the standards for teacher certification in school districts across the country.

ASTONISHING REVERSALS BEING ACCOMPLISHED IN IRAQ

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, this is an important week here as we are hearing the updated assessments from General David Petraeus and Ambassador Ryan Crocker.

Under the leadership of General Petraeus, our troops in Iraq have accomplished an astonishing reversal in a nation that was on the road to crippling ethno-sectarian violence just 18 months ago. One of the statistics that we are seeing is that these ethno-sectarian killings are down 90 percent. And with the security provided by coalition troops, the Iraqi parliament is now learning how to work as a parliament as a legislative body to negotiate and to cooperate.

By passing their 2008 budget this February, the Iraqis demonstrated their commitment to bolstering security gains by working toward reconciliation, stability, and economic growth.

The people of a Muslim state in the heart of the Middle East have rejected violence and extremism, they have cast their lot with the modern world and they have chose freedom. It is significant, Mr. Speaker.

BAD JOB NUMBERS SHOW THE NEED FOR A SECOND ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

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

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, American families are facing real hardships as news of the slowing economy continues to make headlines. The latest troubles came with the release of the March job numbers, the fact that 80,000 people lost their jobs last month. This was not only the third straight month of job losses, but it also was the worst in the last 5 years.

Clearly, Washington must do more to stimulate the economy and assist middle-class families. Already this year, working in a bipartisan way, the Democratic Congress enacted an economic stimulus package that will give families in real need relief by providing recovery rebates starting this next month, raising loan limits for mortgages, and backing the Federal Housing Administration.

This is a good start, but it can't be the end of our efforts to reverse the negative impact of 7 years of failed economic policies.

Mr. Speaker, we did earlier this year what Democrats need to do, and that is pursue commonsense solutions to what our problems are and help get our economy back on track, create jobs, and speed assistance to families that are struggling.

BRINGING AN END TO HATEFUL SPEECH IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the Middle East Research Institute, which monitors extremist media, recently reported on a disturbing children's production that aired on Hamas TV. The program, aimed at a child audience, depicted a little boy who accuses President Bush, along with Israel, of killing his family. In the show, the boy proceeds to take out a sword and stabs the President to death. This is a children's program.

There is little chance for peace in the Middle East if the young minds of the region are polluted with this type of hatred and violence. Many young people in the region are being exposed to similar messages in their school textbooks.

I commend the Council of Religious Leaders in the Holy Land, religious leaders from the Jewish, Christian, and Muslim faith who are working together to counter this type of hate speech and violent message, and they do it with moral authority. We need more brave leaders like those on the Council if we are going to create a condition for peacemaking in the Middle East.

□ 1015

IRAQ WAR IS COSTING US MILLIONS AT HOME

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, every day that we spend money in Iraq means missed opportunities to invest in priorities here at home. While the Bush administration spends $339 million a day in Iraq, we are diverting money from our Nation's needs.

With that $339 million that we spend today, we could instead ensure that 2.6 million Americans have access to medical and dental care at community health centers. We can provide 955,000 families with help for their energy bills, and we could hire 50,000 more cops to protect our citizens on our streets.

With the funds we are spending in Iraq today we could also provide 937,000 grants for research into diseases like cancer, Alzheimer's and diabetes, provide 317,000 kids with vaccinations and could send 18,000 more students to school.

The millions we are pumping into Iraq today is desperately needed here at home as this country stares recession in the face. Yet President Bush continues to recommend nothing but the status quo in Iraq.

Put America first.

HELP OUR FARMERS AND OUR AGRICULTURAL COMMUNITY

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, hopefully in the very near future Congress will be ready to vote on a new farm bill, one that would help our farmers and our agricultural community continue to do what they do so very well, feed America and help feed the entire world.

We recognize and we encourage the very hard work and the ongoing negotiations between the House, the Senate and the administration as we face the expiration of the current farm bill on April 18. But planting season is here, and our farmers are faced with difficult decisions about what crops to plant and how much without knowing what direction the Federal Government is moving, and yet we look to our farmers to provide us with a stable food supply. There are many issues affecting the development of every farmer's business plan this year and into the next, certainly the rising prices of fuel and other costs as well, but the uncertainty of the national farm program needs to be resolved as quickly as possible.

I look forward to working together with our House and our Senate leaders and the administration on a successful piece of legislation that will serve our farmers and all Americans fairly and well.

IRAQ WAR AND OUR ECONOMY

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, American families continue to struggle in the face of this recession and yet in 1 day the Bush administration spends $339 million on the war in Iraq.

As General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker appear before Congress this week to defend this occupation, congressional Democrats have many questions about the costs of this occupation. This country has spent more than $500 billion in Iraq. It could go up to 3 to $4 trillion. Yet 47 million Americans have no health insurance.

Last month, then GAO Comptroller David Walker stated the Iraqis have a budget surplus. We have a huge budget deficit.

One of the questions is who should be paying? That's a really good question, considering that we are currently pumping billions of dollars into this war, which is stimulating economies in Iraq, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia while the American economy is in recession. What about investing money here instead of in education, health care and infrastructure to create jobs?

This occupation has placed a massive human and financial cost on the United States, and yet President Bush demands more of the same. We must end this occupation and bring our troops home.

ADDRESSING ENTITLEMENT SPENDING WILL REQUIRE BIPARTISAN LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, in his first speech in the British Parliament in 1789 describing the slave trade, William Wilberforce concluded by telling his colleagues this: ''Having heard all of this you may choose to look the other way, but you can never again say you did not know.''

None of us can say that we do not know about the Nation's long-term financial outlook, which former Comptroller General David Walker said will result in a tsunami of spending debt level that will swamp our ship of state. It is time that this Congress and this administration and Secretary Paulson wake up to the massive debt that we are amassing.

Congressman JIM COOPER and I are working together on a bipartisan plan called the SAFE Commission, where 78 colleagues are with us. If there are other bipartisan solutions that you all have, put them on the table and let's get them discussed. It will take the leadership on a Wilberforce level from both sides of the aisle.

We know what is happening, and for the sake of our children and our grandchildren, we must not look the other way. Wilberforce said, and I close, having heard all of this, you may choose to look the other way, but you can never again say you did not know.

FIRST APOSTOLIC VISIT OF POPE BENEDICT XVI

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I am here in support of House Resolution 838.

As a Catholic and as a member of the Rialto St. Catherine's Church, I humbly welcome His Holiness, Pope Benedict XVI, on his first apostolic visit to the United States. Tomorrow we will have a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to present a special service to His Holiness.

In faith, his presence will be felt nationwide by Catholics and non-Catholics. However, His Holiness wants us to focus on Jesus Christ, not the person of the Pope. This is his wish since when he was named at the highest office of the Catholic Church, to humbly quote His Holiness, ''I shall come to the United States as pope for the first time to proclaim this great truth: Jesus Christ is hope for men and women of every language, race, culture and social condition.''

His Holiness comes with unity and hope for everyone cutting through the language barriers. ''Christ is our Hope'' is his message for us.

I stand here in support of H.R. 838 and humbly welcome His Holiness to this country awaiting his message of hope and unity.

CELEBRATING THE LIVES OF OUR FALLEN HEROES

(Mrs. SCHMIDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, tonight in my community we will celebrate the lives of our fallen heroes who have fought so bravely to defend our freedom, including our own Matt Maupin.

Today General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker will speak to us and report on the surge and its success. As we debate this issue, I ask that we continue to support our men and women who have chosen to wear the uniform of our country and fight to keep us free. They know all too well freedom is not free.

FIRST APOSTOLIC VISIT OF POPE BENEDICT XVI

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

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our county and my congressional district, which includes the University of Notre Dame, we want to welcome Pope Benedict XVI on his first apostolic visit to the United States.

He is a highly regarded theologian and scholar, having written over 25

books. Reconciliation and peace have been the major themes of his papacy. He has focused on the dignity of the human person, standing behind refugees, exiles and others.

We welcome Pope Benedict XVI to our beloved country. He has been a leader for peace, and we look forward to his visit.

SEND OUR ATHLETES TO THE BEIJING OLYMPICS BUT NOT OUR POLITICIANS

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, as the Olympic torch goes through San Francisco today, I would just like to bring attention to the fact that I, as well as others on each side of the aisle, will be introducing legislation to ensure that we send our athletes to the games but not our politicians.

In the past, America has sent their athletes to the Olympics to show what free people can achieve, most notably in 1936 when Jesse Owens won gold and disabused the world of the Fuhrer's propaganda that there was an inferior race amongst us. FDR did not go to the Olympics.

I would encourage American politicians, including the President of the United States, not to politicize the games by their attendance, but rather stay home and attend to the pressing issues which face us as a people. This would be the proper way for the United States to both honor the spirit of the Olympics and the spirit of our free people.

HOW MUCH LONGER WILL OUR TROOPS CONTINUE TO SACRIFICE?

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker made it clear that the Bush administration intends to continue its current strategy in Iraq with no changes, despite absolutely no progress on political reconciliation.

Today when we listen to both General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker testify again, it's important to remember that the principal objective of the President's troop escalation plan was to give the Iraq Government time and the proper environment to create political reconciliation.

I recently returned from Iraq, and it's obvious that the political reconciliation that we hoped for is not taking place. They have had both, but the reconciliation remains elusive. General Petraeus himself has admitted that there has been no sufficient progress by any means in the area of national reconciliation in Iraq.

How much longer will General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker and this administration demand our troops and our Nation continue to sacrifice for the sake of an Iraqi government that is unwilling and unable to secure its own future? I would like to hear the answer to that question today, because many of us here in Congress do not believe it is our Nation's best interest to keep more troops on the ground in Iraq.

FREEDOM AND FAIR TRADE

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

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, what kind of Nation would we be if we did not stand up and speak out in favor of liberty everywhere in the world?

On January 6, 1941, right here in this Congress, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt enunciated a voice for all the world, our four essential human freedoms, freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom of speech and freedom to worship God in one's own way. These are the freedoms we fought two world wars for and won. These are the freedoms we must endorse everywhere in the world. I encourage the current leaders of Communist China to support these four essential human freedoms everywhere in the world.

Soon, very soon, the Olympic games will be held in China, and wouldn't it be grand if China would compete fairly and openly on a level playing field, not just in the Olympic games but in marketing their products as well. We must ship our values overseas, not our jobs.

That is the goal of our presence here on this floor. We must represent people here in these United States, not in China.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISRAEL). 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 later.

WELCOMING HIS HOLINESS POPE BENEDICT XVI ON HIS FIRST APOSTOLIC VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 838) welcoming His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI on his first apostolic visit to the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 838

Whereas Joseph Alois Ratzinger ascended to the Papacy and chose the name Benedict XVI on April 19, 2005, becoming the 265th reigning Pope in the history of the Roman Catholic Church;

Whereas he was born and baptized on April 16, 1927, in Marktl am Inn, Germany;

Whereas he was required to leave seminary at the age of 16 and forced into military service for Nazi Germany;

Whereas he risked grave danger by defecting from the Nazi anti-aircraft corps in 1945 and subsequently spent time in an Allied prisoner of war camp;

Whereas he was ordained to the priesthood on June 29, 1951;

Whereas he is a highly regarded theologian and scholar, having served in various university posts from 1959 until 1977;

Whereas he has written 25 books and given thousands of hours of lectures, making him one of the most prolific theologians in modern times;

Whereas he participated as a theological advisor to the Second Vatican Council from 1962 until 1965;

Whereas he was appointed Archbishop of Munich and Freising in Germany on March 24, 1977, and ordained a bishop on May 28, 1977;

Whereas he was elevated to cardinal on June 27, 1977;

Whereas he was appointed Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and President of the Pontifical Biblical Commission on November 25, 1981;

Whereas he was elected Dean of the College of Cardinals on November 27, 2002;

Whereas Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger was installed as Bishop of Rome on April 24, 2005;

Whereas Pope Benedict XVI has made repeated calls for peaceful resolutions to international conflicts;

Whereas Pope Benedict XVI has made reconciliation and peace an important goal of his Papacy on an ecumenical level reaching out to both Orthodox and Protestant Churches and in an inter-religious manner with Judaism and Islam;

Whereas Pope Benedict XVI has affirmed the dignity of the human person with respect to refugees, exiles, evacuees, and other migrant persons;

Whereas Pope Benedict XVI has decried the imminent dangers posed by terrorism and extremism; and

Whereas Pope Benedict XVI has identified the failed revolutions and violent ideologies of the 20th century as being the result of the ''Dictatorship of Relativism'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States House of Representatives welcomes His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI on his first apostolic visit to the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I would first like to commend my distinguished colleague, Representative MCCOTTER of Michigan, for introducing this timely and important measure.

Next week, His Holiness, Pope Benedict XVI, will make his first apostolic visit to the United States. It is appropriate that the House support H. Res. 838 in welcoming this distinguished leader of a church, which has more than 1 billion members worldwide.

During his 5-day visit, Pope Benedict will hold numerous meetings in Washington, DC, and New York City. His schedule includes a private conversation with President Bush, a candle lighting and prayer service at Ground Zero, and two widely anticipated masses—at the brand new Nationals Park and the venerable Yankee Stadium. He will be only the third person in history to address the United Nations General Assembly.

In addition to meeting U.S. bishops and Catholic groups, Pope Benedict will spend time with members of non-Christian faiths. In particular, he will meet with representatives of Jewish groups to acknowledge the start of Passover.

□ 1030

This practice is very much in keeping with Pope Benedict's stated emphasis on reconciliation and faith at the ecumenical level, as he has sought to foster dialogue with a range of religious groups.

And last but not least, during his visit to our country Pope Benedict will celebrate an important milestone, his 81st birthday.

Joseph Ratzinger was born and baptized on April 16, 1927, in Marktl am Inn, Germany. Forced to leave seminary at the age of 16 for compulsory military service with the Nazi anti-aircraft corps, he defected at great personal risk and spent time in an Allied prisoner of war camp.

In 1951, he was ordained to the priesthood, embarking on a career as one of the most prolific theologians in modern times. He served in numerous university posts, authored 25 books and thousands of hours of lectures, and participated as a theological adviser to the Second Vatican Council.

Before becoming Pope, he distinguished himself first as Archbishop of Munich and Freising, and then dean of the College of Cardinals, and finally as the Bishop of Rome.

He ascended to the Papacy on April 19, 2005. After nine apostolic visits in Europe and one to Brazil, the 265th pontiff is now traveling to the United States. It is with great pleasure that I welcome him to our country, the home of more than 66 million Catholics. I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of H. Res. 838 extending this Chamber's welcome to Pope Benedict XVI who will be making his first visit to the United States next week in his role as leader of the Catholic Church.

Pope Benedict was elected to the Papacy just 3 years ago, succeeding Pope John Paul II, who had led the Catholic Church for close to three decades.

The Holy Father's visit provides an opportunity to reflect on his life and his teachings. Pope Benedict has devoted his life to his faith and to the promotion of peace. From his early days as a priest, he has also sought to inspire others to always search for the truth.

On May 28, 1977, over 30 years ago, he declared that his duty was to ''follow the truth and be at its service.'' On that occasion, he went on to say, ''In today's world the theme of truth is omitted almost entirely, as something too great for man, and yet everything collapses if truth is missing.''

Moreover, Pope Benedict has spent his years of service in the church in an effort to clarify the tenets of the Catholic faith. After serving as president of the commission that reviewed the Catholic Catechism, he presented a new Catechism to Pope John Paul II.

To date, he has written 25 books, which are now used as reference sources for many who are interested in a deeper study of theology. He served as the adviser of theological affairs to the Second Ecumenical Vatican Council, a gathering of great importance that was the largest in the church's history. This council adopted significant changes in the doctrines of the Catholic Church and its central legacy—its reforms—were meant to ensure that the heart of the church and its mission would be focused on helping people.

The council urged greater engagement by the church to elevate the dignity of all human life, to ease suffering, end poverty in needy countries, and to promote international peace. This council was also intent on encouraging reconciliation between those in the Catholic Church and those of other beliefs.

Since ascending to the Papacy in April of 2005, the Pope has advanced those doctrines in church affairs, particularly in inter-religious dialogue.

On September 7, 2007, Pope Benedict visited Austria, where he joined Jewish leaders in a silent tribute to the victims of the Nazi Holocaust, and he joined Vienna's chief rabbi in a memorial to the 65,000 Viennese Jews who perished in Nazi death camps.

During his time in the United States, he will visit the Park Street Synagogue in New York City and he will meet with Holocaust survivor Rabbi Arthur Schneier.

Monsignor David Malloy, general secretary of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, said of this meeting: ''By this personal and informal visit, which is not part of his official program, His Holiness wishes to express his good will toward the local Jewish community as they prepare for Passover.''

In October of 2006, Pope Benedict met with the Dalai Lama in the Vatican. And when he visited Turkey, he prayed at the Blue Mosque, and he now plans to meet with Muslim scholars and religious leaders at a Catholic-Muslim seminar to be held later this year in Rome.

Pope Benedict has underscored his support for interfaith reconciliation with statements such as the following: ''If friendship with God becomes for us something even more important and decisive, then we will begin to love those whom God loves and who are in need of us. God wants us to be friends of his friends and we can be so.''

Mr. Speaker, Pope Benedict's wise words of inspiration, hope, and peace can serve to guide all of us. It is my pleasure to rise in support of this resolution welcoming His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI to the United States.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 838 to welcome His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI on his first apostolic visit to the United States, and to honor a key reason for his visit: The bicentennial of the Archdiocese of Louisville.

Only Baltimore and New Orleans retain older Archdioceses than the four created by Pope Pius VII 200 years ago yesterday. It was on that day, April 8, 1808, that His Holiness created a diocese in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Bardstown, Kentucky. To be Bishop in Bardstown, he tabbed an exile of the French Revolution, Benedict Joseph Flaget, a name revered in Louisville to this day.

Dubbed the ''First Bishop of the West,'' Bishop Flaget was responsible for an area that now covers more than 40 dioceses. He immediately led a spirited period of growth in the area, establishing numerous seminaries, churches, and schools where none had existed before. For many, these institutions provided the lone opportunity to pursue a quality education and reinforce one's faith.

And it was Bishop Flaget, in 1841, who moved the Bardstown diocese to the burgeoning city of Louisville. With the diocese at its core, a strong Catholic community grew in Louisville and in the surrounding areas; one united not only by a shared faith, but by a mutual moral sense of community, education and service.

That community grew and thrived for nearly a century, and in 1937 became the Archdiocese of Louisville as we know it today, now serving over a million people and 24 Kentucky counties. It was in service to the Archdiocese of Louisville that Thomas Merton, one of the most influential religious authors of the 20th century, had his legendary ''Louisville Epiphany'' that led to an impassioned and inspired quest for peace and social justice.

The Archdiocese of Lousiville also operates Catholic Charities of Louisville which offers countless services to people of all religious, ethnic, social, and economic backgrounds throughout our community. The efforts of Catholic Charities can be seen in every corner of Louisville, giving hope to disadvantaged youth, assisting the elderly, lending support to those who need help to stand on their own, and revitalizing neighborhoods that have fallen into disarray.

We also have the Archdiocese to thank for one of the truly outstanding parochial school systems in the Nation. For more than a century, and through every stage of a young person's development, Louisville's Catholic schools have helped to foster generations of great citizens, role models and leaders.

During my tenure representing Louisville in Congress, I have had the pleasure of serving alongside two Archbishops. Archbishop Thomas Kelly retired this past year after a quarter century defined by interfaith outreach, multi-cultural ministry, and a commitment to social services. Archbishop Joseph Kurtz now leads the Archdiocese, and in his first year, he has shown the leadership abilities and initiative to build upon the incredible foundation already in place in Louisville.

The theme for this year's bicentennial is ''Serving God's People: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow.'' It is a fitting tribute to an institution that has always done and continues to do exactly that: Serve all of the people of the Louisville area through acts of faith, peace and kindness.

Extraordinary is nothing new for the Archdiocese of Louisville. Still an Apostolic visit to the United States from His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI to mark the bicentennial is a recognition that will be forever treasured by our community. I join my colleagues in thanking and welcoming His Holiness to the United States of America, and know they join me in honoring the Archdiocese of Louisville on its bicentennial and thanking our Catholic community for two centuries of faith and service.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) who is the author of this resolution.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank Chairman BERMAN, Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN, and all of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for bringing this resolution to the floor.

You know, I remember back when I was growing up there was a movie, and the movie was called ''A Hard Day's Night.'' This was at the height of Beatlemania, and the Beatles had obviously been wildly popular and well-received when they first hit our shores. And yet in the movie there is a scene where a reporter, seemingly unaware of this, asked John Lennon a question. And the question was this: ''How did you find America?''

And Lennon said, ''I turned left at Greenland.''

The point I bring this up for is quite simple. Today we hear many inane questions about how His Holiness will be received by the American people. How will America find the Pope? How will the Pope find America? Well, I think these questions are inane for a very simple reason: The United States understands the Holy Father because he advocates that we use faith and reason to find our way through these trying times and on to a transcendent Creator.

The United States, our revolutionary experiment in human freedom, was founded upon faith and reason. The Founders had the faith that they were playing a role in divine provenance, that they had rights that were endowed to them and inalienable by a Creator. And yet it was not passion alone that allowed for the founding of our free republic; they also used their reason to find their way to express how those rights could be guaranteed against government, and how individual citizens could live together with their rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

This is no different than the message that the Holy Father brings today. The Holy Father has said that faith and reason are concomitant blessings from God which allow us to find him not only in ourselves but in each other.

So as Americans await the Pope's first visit, I am not saying that there will be teenyboppers dropping in the streets as the popemobile passes, but I do say His Holiness will receive a warm reception from people who have understood and who continue to understand that faith and reason are gifts from God we squander at our own peril.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 838, welcoming His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI on his first apostolic visit to the United States. For centuries, Popes have provided inspiration and a strong foundation of faith for millions of Catholics around the world and many non-Catholics as well. As spiritual leader of the Roman Catholic Church, the Pope serves as the impassioned defender of Catholic doctrine and values, a role this Pope has taken to new heights.

On April 19, 2005, Catholics everywhere were introduced to Pope Benedict XVI, and in just 3 years, the Pope has emerged as a vocal and effective advocate, combating what many see as the world's sloping trend towards secularism. Rather than steering the Catholic Church towards a more moderate and relaxed approach to worship, Pope Benedict XVI has demonstrated the benefit and need of returning to fundamental Christian values. Certainly, it is not easy for a leader to take such a bold stand that bucks popular trends and culture, but it is an example of pure conviction and true leadership that inspires millions of Catholic believers.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to welcome Pope Benedict XVI to America as he continues to spread his message of faith, love, and service in Christ. Millions are inspired by his presence; and his passionate convictions cast a light that all Catholics strive to follow. Your Holiness, it is my honor to join in welcoming you to the United States.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 838, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING CARIBBEAN DRUG CRIME

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 865) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the March 2007 report of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development makes an important contribution to the understanding of the high levels of crime and violence in the Caribbean, and that the United States should work with Caribbean countries to address crime and violence in the region, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 865

Whereas, in his 2006 New Year's address, then Prime Minister of Jamaica, P.J. Patterson, said, ''Without a doubt, the high level of violent crime remains our most troubling and pressing problem.'';

Whereas, in opening the Parliament of Trinidad and Tobago in September 2005, President George Maxwell Richards said his country was in crisis due to the escalating crime rate;

Whereas, in March 2007, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) issued a report entitled, ''Crime, Violence, and Development: Trends, Costs, and Policy Options in the Caribbean'';

Whereas the UNODC and World Bank report presents detailed analyses of crime and violence in the Caribbean region and offers possible policy responses;

Whereas the UNODC and World Bank report draws on input from governments, civil society organizations, and Caribbean experts;

Whereas the UNODC and World Bank report that the Caribbean region has the highest murder and assault rates in the world, with murder rates at 4 times the level of the United States;

Whereas the UNODC and World Bank report that high crime levels have long term developmental effects on the Caribbean:

(1) crime cost the Jamaican economy $12,400,000,000 in Jamaican dollars, 3.7 percent of its gross domestic product, in 2001; and

(2) reducing the region-wide homicide rate by ⅓ could over double the rate of economic growth per capita; and

Whereas the UNODC and World Bank report reached the following conclusions:

(1) Caribbean countries are transit points and not producers of cocaine. Interdiction needs to be complemented by other strategies outside the region: principally demand reduction in consumer countries and eradication and/or alternative development in producer countries;

(2) illegal gun trafficking is a dangerous outgrowth of the drug trade. Better enforcement methods help, as can improved gun interdiction in ports;

(3) deaths and injuries from youth violence constitute a major threat to public health and social and economic progress across the Caribbean. Youth are disproportionately represented in the ranks of both victims and perpetrators of crime and violence;

(4) although the average deportee from the United States to the Caribbean is not involved in criminal activity, a minority of deportees may be causing serious problems, both by direct involvement in crime and by providing a perverse role model for youth. The report recommends that more services be offered to reintegrate deportees, with deporting countries contributing to the cost of these programs;

(5) some types of crime, such as organized crime and drug and illegal firearms trafficking, are impervious to alternative prevention initiatives and require an efficient criminal justice system, and therefore urgent priorities for improving the criminal justice system in the region include the development of management information systems, tracking of justice system performance, monitoring of reform programs, and increased accountability to citizens;

(6) several Caribbean countries are increasingly investing in crime prevention—using approaches such as integrated citizen security programs, crime prevention through environmental design, and a public health approach that focuses on risk factors for violent behaviors;

(7) youth violence is a particularly serious problem in the region, and youth homicide rates in several countries of the region are significantly above the world average. To address issues of youth violence, Caribbean policymakers should invest in programs that have been shown to be successful in careful evaluations such as: (i) early childhood development and mentoring programs; (ii) interventions to keep high risk youth in secondary schools; and (iii) opening schools after hours and on weekends to offer additional activities and training; and

(8) many of the issues facing the Caribbean transcend national boundaries and require a coordinated regional and international response. Demand for drugs emanates from Europe and the United States; deportees are sent back to the region from the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada; and many weapons that are trafficked are brought from the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) welcomes the recommendations for more effective law enforcement and crime prevention efforts contained in the March 2007 UNODC and World Bank report, ''Crime, Violence, and Development: Trends, Costs, and Policy Options in the Caribbean'', to the extent those recommendations do not conflict with existing U.S. law;

(2) urges the United States Government to consider fully and carefully the recommendations in the UNODC and World Bank Report and to take the recommendations into account when developing United States policy toward the current member states of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) and the Dominican Republic;

(3) urges the governments of United States and other drug-consuming countries to increase counter-narcotics assistance to the current member states of CARICOM and the Dominican Republic;

(4) urges the United States Government to increase coordination on policy development and implementation with the current member states of CARICOM and the Dominican Republic to help combat crime and violence in the region;

(5) urges the Department of State and the Department of Homeland Security to work with the current member states of CARICOM and the Dominican Republic to mitigate the negative effects of United States deportation policy;

(6) urges the current member states of CARICOM and the Dominican Republic to consider fully and carefully the recommendations in the UNODC and World Bank Report, and to take the recommendations into account, especially regarding improvements in their criminal justice systems; and

(7) urges the United States Government to consider the impact on the current member states of CARICOM and the Dominican Republic of the proposed Merida Initiative to combat drugs, violence, and transnational crime in Mexico and Central America, especially whether a successful plan will drive narco-traffickers from Mexico and Central America to the current member states of CARICOM or the Dominican Republic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Over the past decade, the level of crime and violence throughout the Caribbean basin has increased. Last year, the United Nations and the World Bank issued a joint report titled, ''Crime, Violence, and Development: Trends, Costs and Policy Options in the Caribbean'' which confirms this trend.

The report makes a very disturbing finding: Crime and violence have generally increased in the Caribbean, to the point where the region as a whole now possesses the highest overall crime rate of any region in the world.

While I note that each member of the Caribbean community is different, and that some countries are successful in maintaining relatively low levels of crime, the report's numbers, while taken as a whole, are alarming. They document extremely high levels of murder, rape, and drug trafficking on a massive scale.

If the high levels of crime and violence in the Caribbean persist, they will undermine long-term economic development by eroding the region's trade, commerce, and tourism.

□ 1045

The impact of this regional law and order would have a crisis which could extend beyond the borders of CARICOM states by impacting immigration patterns to the United States and by undermining our efforts to fight organized crime and drug trade. Regional instability related to crime and violence in the region could also undermine U.S. border security efforts.

As the report points out, the United States is part of the cause of some of these problems, and we could also be a big part in the solution. Our allies in the Caribbean stand ready to partner with us in finding workable solutions. We have an opportunity to address this problem before it destabilizes much of the hemisphere and jeopardizes U.S. security.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 865 and the accompanying amendment in the nature of a substitute to express the sense of the House that the United States and its CARICOM allies take up the U.N./World Bank report's recommendations and work together to solve this potentially devastating problem before it's too late.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The alarming rate of crime and violence in the Caribbean region cannot be ignored. Several countries have reached the point of crisis, while attempting to counter the social, economic and political repercussions of organized gangs and narcotrafficking.

Murder rates in the Caribbean are higher than in any other region in the world, and have risen in recent years for many of the countries in the region. Recent increases in kidnappings have been observed in the region over the past few years, and assault rates, based on police reports, are significantly above the world average.

Serving as seemingly insurmountable obstacles to the economic and social progress of countries in the Caribbean, the pervasive nature of crime and violence again cannot be ignored. We have a shared responsibility to confront this threat and engage in coordinated efforts that improve the quality of life for all of our communities.

The security threats faced in the Western Hemisphere as a result of violence and narcotrafficking call for strong action on the part of our government. So far, our partnerships with countries throughout the hemisphere are demonstrating significant success in the fight against drugs and crime; such as the case of Colombia, where substantial improvements in security have yielded positive patterns of growth, stability, and investment.

We have good reason to be optimistic, Mr. Speaker. The deadly flow of

cocaine into the United States has seen a dramatic decline in the last few months. Purity levels are falling, and retail prices are rising.

We must remain committed to defeating the perilous threats of crime and violence that endanger the youth and prosperity of our Nations today. Together, we must tackle these challenges and strive to further tighten the bonds that hold us together as nearby neighbors.

I am confident that through future cooperation and coordination, we can continue to see success and support the true potential of our friends in the Caribbean.

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

Mr. PAYNE. I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) who, incidentally, her district has one of the largest Caribbean communities in the United States, and her heritage is from the Caribbean. I am so pleased to yield her 5 minutes on her first resolution in her freshman year. I commend you for that.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Representative from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for yielding time, and for his words about this important resolution.

I also wholeheartedly thank Chairman HOWARD BERMAN of the Foreign Affairs Committee along with Western Hemisphere Subcommittee Chairman ELIOT ENGEL, full committee ranking member ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and subcommittee ranking member DAN BURTON for their support and great help in moving this legislation through committee to the House floor.

The release of the U.N./World Bank report, ''Crime, Violence and Development: Trends, Costs and Policy Options in the Caribbean'' should be a wake-up call for every American interested in the security of our Nation.

As the report points out, a variety of factors, including some for which we in the U.S. are partly responsible, such as a seemingly insatiable and heavy illicit legal drug consumption and extremely problematic deportation policies has contributed to our neighboring Caribbean region having the highest crime rate in the world.

While today the region remains a wonderful place for Americans to visit, and most hospitable tourist destination in the world, in the long term, if this trend continues, it will wreak serious social, economic, and security troubles for many of the tranquil Caribbean nations.

Allowing this situation to deteriorate for years to come will ultimately create a security threat, not just for the Caribbean states, but, indeed, for our own country, as well as an unstable Caribbean region, and would create a vast vulnerability in America's border security.

Many of the problems identified by this report have long been recognized by Caribbean leadership. These emerging democracies and developing nations are doing everything within their means to collaborate on the safety of their respective nations and, by extension, our hemisphere.

Now, with the confirmation provided by this report in hand, ignorance is no excuse. The U.S. must partner with its Western Hemisphere neighbors and allow it to find workable solutions that will help the people of the Caribbean and ensure long-term security and stability of our region.

As the daughter of Caribbean immigrants, and a district that boasts the largest concentration of Caribbean Americans in the Nation, and as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I ask my colleagues to support this resolution calling for the U.S. to take up the solutions contained in the very important U.N./World Bank report. If we act now, we will help our allies to reduce crime greatly at levels before the situation becomes far less manageable and a threat to the Western Hemisphere that is, indeed, within our global community.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 865, ''Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the March 2007 report of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development makes an important contribution to the understanding of the high levels of crime and violence in the Caribbean, and that the United States should work with Caribbean countries to address crime and violence in the region,'' introduced by my friend and colleague Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE, of which I am proud to be an original cosponsor.

Mr. Speaker, I have traveled in the Caribbean recently, and I, together with many of my colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, had the opportunity to meet with CARICOM leaders last year. I believe that it is extremely beneficial to all our nations, and to the international community, that we continue this trend of increasing engagement and interaction. Equally important is that we ensure that, in our process of engagement, that we are truly listening and responding to the concerns presented by government and civil society leaders of the Caribbean nations, as well as addressing our own social, economic, and security goals.

Crime and violence in the Caribbean region is undoubtedly one area in which our concerns are in line with local needs. Most observers have indicated that the level of crime and violence throughout the Caribbean basin has increased over the past decade, a trend confirmed by a joint report issued by the United Nations and the World Bank last year. This report, titled ''Crime, Violence, and Development: Trends, Costs, and Policy Options in the Caribbean,'' found that crime and violence have increased throughout the Caribbean to such an alarming extent that the region, as a whole, now has the highest overall crime rate of any region in the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is dangerous to characterize an entire region, as each nation is different; however, there are some general statistics regarding the Caribbean Community that cannot be ignored. While some countries have been relatively successful at maintaining low levels of crime, as a whole, the Caribbean has murder rates four times higher than those of the United States. Regional rape rates are above the global average, and three countries in the region are among the 10 countries globally with the highest rate of rape.

In addition to violent crime, trafficking of drugs remains a significant problem in the region, and one that has a serious impact on our own country as well. In 2005 alone, for example, 30 tons of cocaine transited through Jamaica, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic. According to the White House's Office of National Drug Policy, the Caribbean Corridor accounted for approximately 8 percent of the total documented flow of cocaine departing South America in 2004. The region also plays a prominent role in drug-related money laundering.

Mr. Speaker, these facts combine to create a crisis with long-term developmental consequences. Trade, commerce, tourism, and social well-being are all threatened by these crimes, and the nations in the Caribbean region will not be the only ones to suffer. Declining stability in the Western Hemisphere will seriously impair U.S. efforts to fight organized crime and drug trade, while instability in the Caribbean region has historically impacted immigration patterns to the United States. The Caribbean Community is one of our most important allies in ensuring our borders are secure—regional instability means gaps in our border protection efforts.

The United States must work together with our Caribbean friends and allies, to develop effective partnerships in search of workable solutions. If the Caribbean is destabilized, all of our nations will suffer the consequences. We have an opportunity to address this problem before it destabilizes much of the hemisphere and jeopardizes U.S. security.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 865 to express the sense of the House that the U.S. and its CARICOM allies take up the U.N./World Bank report's recommendations and work together to solve this potentially devastating problem before it is too late.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 865, welcoming the recommendations contained in the March 2007 World Bank report ''Crime, Violence, and Development: Trends, Costs, and Policy Options in the Caribbean.'' I would like to commend my colleague and sister from the Caribbean, Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE inroducing this legislation.

Too often the Caribbean is overlooked when issues of global economy and diplomacy are discussed. I am pleased that H. Res. 865 urges the United States, other drug-consuming countries, and the Caribbean countries to increase counter-narcotics efforts in the Caribbean region. As a member of the House representing the U.S. Virgin Islands, I know firsthand the negative impact that crime can have on the economy of Caribbean islands. The report indicates that high rates of crime and violence in the Caribbean are undermining growth, threatening human welfare, and impeding social development. For the most part, the economy of the Caribbean is tourism driven. Safety and security are vital to providing quality tourism, and crime is a direct threat to the Caribbean tourism industry.

One contributing factor to the growing crime problem in the region is our country's deportation program that sends individuals who have

lived in this country for years—almost all their lives in some cases—back to their native country, if they have committed a crime. The individuals who learned their trade in this country are sent back often with no notification, many times without any known family and sometimes not knowing the language, as in Haiti. As long as we continue to deport criminals as we do now, we will continue to seed the growing drug and criminal activity in the Caribbean. Churches, especially those associated with Prison Ministries International are concerned and actively pursuing programs to address this situation.

Today, H. Res. 865 takes a positive step toward addressing the crime in the Caribbean by recognizing that a resolution requires an approach that ''transcends Caribbean national boundaries.'' I am encouraged and hopeful that this report will provide a basis for developing good practices to eradicate crime in the Caribbean.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 865, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: ''A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the March 2007 report of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development makes an important contribution to the understanding of the high levels of crime and violence in the Caribbean, and that the United States should work with the current member states of Caribbean Community and the Dominican Republic to address crime and violence in the region.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRESSWOMAN JO ANN S. DAVIS POST OFFICE

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5489) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6892 Main Street in Gloucester, Virginia, as the ''Congresswoman Jo Ann S. Davis Post Office''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5489

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

SECTION 1. CONGRESSWOMAN JO ANN S. DAVIS POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6892 Main Street in Gloucester, Virginia, shall be known and designated as the ''Congresswoman Jo Ann S. Davis Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Congresswoman Jo Ann S. Davis Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 5489, which seeks to honor the life of Congresswoman Jo Ann Davis, and the example she has set for all of us; as an American stateswoman, legislator, and most importantly, as our friend, by naming a U.S. post office in her name.

Congresswoman Davis represented Virginia's first Congressional District from 2001 until her untimely death in 2007. She was the second woman ever to be elected to Congress from Virginia.

A woman of faith and strong conviction, Congresswoman Davis lived admirably and with down-to-earth humility, which is why her presence here in the House is sure to be missed for quite some time to come.

The bill before us, H.R. 5489, was introduced by Representative ROBERT WITTMAN of Virginia on February 26, 2008 and was considered by and reported from the Oversight Committee on March 13, 2008 by voice vote. The measure has the support of over 20 Members of Congress, and provides our body a collective opportunity to acknowledge one of our very own for her dedication and congressional action to improve the lives of others, whether in her congressional district, her beloved home State of Virginia, or throughout our great country.

Jo Ann Davis was born in Rowan County, North Carolina on June 29, 1950. At the age of 9, her parents moved to the Virginia peninsula. Despite her humble beginnings, Congresswoman Davis set her sights high and the expectations for herself even higher. In 1968 she graduated from Kecoughtan High School in Hampton, Virginia and then went on to attend Hampton Roads Business College. After graduating she became an executive secretary at a real estate company in Newport News until she obtained her real estate license in 1984 and soon thereafter, founded Jo Ann Davis Realty.

Her whole life she exceeded expectations, so it should come as no surprise when she ran for Congress in 1999 and won by receiving 58 percent of the vote in her Southern Virginia District.

Representative Davis' congressional record is a testimony to her fight for employees' rights and fairness in the workplace. Her first piece of legislation raised the life insurance benefit paid to survivors of military members killed on duty, and she also pushed for improving dental and vision benefits for government employees, and argued in favor of a more evenhanded system for compensating Federal law enforcement officers.

Our country owes her our sincere appreciation for her efforts in making public service, which is the lifeblood of our Nation, a more equitable and beneficial system.

In September 2005, our dear friend Congresswoman Davis was diagnosed with breast cancer and for years underwent the necessary treatments. Although she was planning to seek reelection in 2008, Congresswoman Davis unfortunately succumbed to the cancer on October 6, 2007 in her home in Gloucester, Virginia.

□ 1100

She is survived by her husband, Chuck Davis, a battalion chief of the Hampton Fire Department, two sons, and a granddaughter.

Mr. Speaker, let's join together this day to express our thanks and to pay our respects for the sacrifices and battles Congresswoman Jo Ann Davis fought in the name of liberty and justice and pass H.R. 5489 which would designate the Main Street post office in her hometown of Gloucester, Virginia, as the ''Congresswoman Jo Ann S. Davis Post Office.'' I urge the swift passage of the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, born in North Carolina but a Virginian since the age of 9, Jo Ann Davis set the standard for Republican women in Virginia. After graduating from high school in Hampton, Virginia, she attended Hampton Roads Business College and became a real estate agent. Prior to her election to the House of Representatives in November 2000, she served in the General Assembly of Virginia. Subsequently, she was the first Republican woman elected in her own right to the United States Congress from the Commonwealth. Congresswoman Davis served honorably for four terms as the representative of the First Congressional District of Virginia.

During her tenure, Congresswoman Davis served on the House Armed Services Committee and on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Congresswoman Davis was particularly proud of securing funding for the construction of the Navy's next-generation aircraft carrier, the CVN–21.

In 2001, the House passed her first piece of legislation, H.R. 1015, the SGLI Adjustment Act which increased the

amount of life insurance paid to beneficiaries of the Armed Forces who died in the performance of duty between November 2000 and April 2001.

In 2005, Congresswoman Davis was diagnosed with breast cancer. Tragically, in 2007, the cancer returned and her condition rapidly worsened. Congresswoman Davis died in October at the age of 57 leaving behind her husband, Chuck Davis, and two sons and a granddaughter.

Congresswoman Davis was an inspiration to so many of our Members, as well as her constituents, as she battled breast cancer courageously for over 2 years. Her determination to continue serving the citizens of the First District of Virginia while undergoing treatment set a remarkable standard of perseverance for many of us.

I believe that the naming of the postal service located at 6892 Main Street in Gloucester, Virginia, after Congresswoman Davis is a fitting tribute to her years of public service.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARCHANT. I yield as much time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5489, a bill to designate a United States Postal Service facility located at 6892 Main Street in Gloucester, Virginia, as the ''Congresswoman Jo Ann S. Davis Post Office.'' I introduced this legislation to honor Jo Ann who dedicated her entire being to serving the First District of Virginia.

As you've heard, Jo Ann made history in 2000 when she became the first female Republican elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from the Commonwealth of Virginia. In Congress, she was a passionate advocate for better government, lower taxes, and a strong national defense. Jo Ann believed that God called her to service, and in her years of service to this Nation, Jo Ann's reliance on God never wavered.

Virginia's First District is home to one of our Nation's most treasured historical sites. In 1607, our Nation's first settlement was founded at Jamestown. Jo Ann often reminded others in Virginia and around the Nation that she actually represented America's First District where the beginnings of America were founded.

Indeed, the First District has a rich history, including a significant and important military community. And Jo Ann was a tireless advocate for our brave servicemembers. She constantly supported legislation that strengthened our armed services and improved benefits for our men and women in uniform. As cochair and founding member of the Ship Building Caucus, she worked tirelessly to ensure that Congress provided for our Navy.

Jo Ann truly loved her family and had an unwavering faith in our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. She regularly attended the Members' weekly prayer breakfast, and she was also cochair of the 2007 National Prayer Breakfast, an event designed to bring leaders of the country and leaders from around the world together in recognition of our dedication to God.

Jo Ann was known as an extraordinarily caring and helpful person, and anyone who came across her was touched. She worked on both sides of the aisle and truly defined bipartisanship.

Jo Ann represented the people of the First District of Virginia with extraordinary distinction, and through her service, she set an example of courage in the face of adversity. She refused to allow a disease that afflicts many to affect her life or to take away from her work that she loved so dearly. She was dedicated to representing her constituents even while undergoing chemotherapy treatments. And I have to say that the day after one of those chemotherapy treatments, she was in the little town of Kilmarnock in the northern neck of Virginia to celebrate their 75th anniversary. I had the privilege of being with Jo Ann that day, and it was a cold, windy spring day, and she was there without a coat on. And I thought, how brave for her to be there right after a chemotherapy session, to be out there celebrating with the folks of Kilmarnock. And afterwards I got her aside and said, Jo Ann, I am so surprised that you're here after that chemotherapy treatment. And she said, Rob, listen, I'm not different than anybody else. I have adversity in my life just like everybody else, and I don't expect for me to do anything different than anybody else who faces adversity would have to do.

And that just proved to me what a brave and humble soul Jo Ann was and how she really had in mind others above herself.

Mr. Speaker, because of Jo Ann Davis' diligence and devoted service to our country, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the people of the First District, I am proud to sponsor this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5489.

Mr. CLAY. I continue to reserve.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield as much time as she may use to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE).

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to thank my colleagues for this resolution today in honor of my dear friend, Congresswoman Jo Ann Davis.

Jo Ann really was the American dream, and we have all heard a lot about her life since her very unfortunate and very early passing last fall. But she came from a very poor childhood and reached just, I think, the highest of success to serve in this body.

But she was a success because she cared for other people and she put them first. And that's what people saw in Jo Ann. They loved and trusted her. She was a woman of great faith, great courage, great honesty, great strength, and great integrity.

Jo Ann was a very private person, and when she told me of her diagnosis with breast cancer, I was really quite surprised that she had made the decision that she would be very public with her illness for the purpose of helping other women. I think we all admire and thank her for doing that. But I watched as she went through her chemo, and I saw how she struggled to be here with each and every one of us.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank my colleagues. I know if Jo Ann were here today she would say, oh, don't bother doing that. But we all need a memory of Jo Ann. I think this is a fitting way to do it. She loved America. She served her constituents, she was true to herself, and she was a gift to each and every one of us who knew her.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK).

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and also for bringing this resolution forward as a small token of honor for Jo Ann Davis.

All of us in this Chamber loved her because Jo Ann was Jo Ann. She was simply who she was. She made no bones about it. As the gentlewoman from Virginia said, she came from a humble background and achieved very good things in her life. She did care about other people, and I think having this post office named after her lets the people in her district, every time they go by it, because it's on a main road, every time they go in it they will remember Jo Ann.

She was a breast cancer survivor, as was mentioned, and she and I had a special bond not only because of that but because of a lot of similarities in our lives, and we all miss her greatly.

But the thing about Jo Ann was she was here for the right reasons. She was here to do public service, she was here to help her constituents, and she did that, even in trying times. She still came here and did her job. And she served her people well.

Thank you again for this resolution, and I hope everyone will support it.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers at this time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to give this recognition to our former colleague, Representative Jo Ann Davis, and urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my former colleague and friend, Jo Ann Davis. Congresswoman Davis was a remarkable woman whose courage under challenging circumstances made so many of us proud to be her friend. She never gave up during her valiant two-year fight

against breast cancer and continued to serve the citizens of the 1st District of Virginia throughout her treatments until her untimely death on October 6, 2007.

Inasmuch as Congresswoman Davis' district had a large number of Federal employees, and because of her impressive knowledge and advocacy on behalf of all civil servants, I appointed her Chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service and Agency Organization when I was Chairman of the Committee on Government Reform. Her dedication and sense of teamwork while a Member of Congress were traits I could always count on—as could the entire Virginia Delegation.

It is with pleasure I support the passage of H.R. 5489 and thank Mr. WITTMAN for taking this opportunity to dedicate the Postal Service located at 6892 Main Street in Gloucester, Virginia in honor of our esteemed former colleague, Congresswoman Jo Ann Davis.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5489, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6892 Main Street in Gloucester, Virginia, as the ''Congresswoman Jo Ann S. Davis Post Office.''

I would like to thank Congressman ROB WITTMAN for introducing this legislation to honor the memory of our colleague and friend.

Congresswoman Davis was not only my House colleague, she was my Virginia colleague who represented the First District of Virginia—a district, which she proudly called ''America's 1st District'' because of our country's roots at Jamestown and the many significant events in history, which occurred there.

Her career in elected office spanned 10 short years—from her first election in 1997 to the Virginia House of Delegates to her four elected terms in the House beginning in 2000. But over that decade, she made her mark as a deeply caring and hard-working public servant who believed in commonsense, conservative ideals.

She was a person of honesty, integrity, and strong moral conviction in representing her district and living her life. She was a dedicated and tenacious fighter for her beliefs, and the importance of her faith was obvious in the way she cared for and treated others. And, above all else, she worked tirelessly to protect the interests of the men and women in uniform, their families, and veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this designation will serve as a constant reminder to the constituents of the First District of Jo Ann's service and leadership. I wholeheartedly urge my colleagues to join us in recognizing Jo Ann's memory by supporting this bill.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, just a few months ago, we said farewell to a great woman and a great patriot, my colleague of several years, Jo Ann Davis. Jo Ann was a terrific friend, and the Commonwealth of Virginia suffered tremendously from her loss.

Since my days of serving with her in the Virginia House of Delegates, Jo Ann fought for and embodied the core values of Virginia. She was an ardent advocate for veterans, national defense and a strong military. The naming of a Gloucester post office in honor of Jo Ann Davis is a wonderful tribute that will serve as a reminder of her love and service to Virginia's First District.

Mr. CLAY. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5489.

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. WITTMAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

JULIA M. CARSON POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5472) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2650 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, as the ''Julia M. Carson Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5472

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

SECTION 1. JULIA M. CARSON POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2650 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, shall be known and designated as the ''Julia M. Carson Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Julia M. Carson Post Office Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the sponsor of the legislation, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5472, a measure to name a post office in honor of our departed colleague and dear friend, Representative Julia Carson.

I would like to thank the 46 Members of the House who agreed to support and cosponsor this measure, as well as Senator BAYH for introducing S. 2534, the Senate companion legislation.

I would also like to acknowledge that Representative MEEK and Representative DAVID SCOTT have expressed their support, though they were unable to become official cosponsors of the measure due to its rapid movement out of committee. I would also be remiss if I did not thank the Chair and the ranking member of the full committee, as well as the ranking member and Chair of the subcommittee for considering the bill and reporting it out.

Julia Carson was a tremendous human being. She passed away on December 15 after a life devoted to service. And as I pointed out last December, with the solstice upon us, the darkest day of the year, that Julia Carson was a light to everyone she came into contact with and certainly was a beacon in this House.

□ 1115

She could be tough, she could be gentle, but she was always effective.

It is a tribute to her life and to her service to name this Federal facility after her. And I only speak for myself when I would say, however, that Julia is probably looking in on this, is honored, but asking, why aren't we out helping someone else right now, because that was her life. And I would hope that we all take this moment and this honor to rededicate ourselves to helping others along life's path as this great and wonderful and kind and gentle woman has done.

Again, I thank the Chair and ranking member for their courtesy.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2650 Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, as the ''Julia M. Carson Post Office Building.''

Julia May Carson dedicated her life to the service of this country. Her career in public service began in 1972 when she was elected to the Indiana State House of Representatives. This was the first of many victories to come.

In her long and illustrious career, Julia never lost an election. In 1976, Julia ran for the Indiana State Senate, where she served 14 years. In 1990, she became the Trustee for the Center Township, a post she held for 6 years until she ran for the United States Congress, becoming both the first woman and the first African American to represent Indiana in Congress.

As a daughter of a single mother who worked as a housekeeper and a graduate of a segregated public school in Indiana, Julia's background was very different from those of her fellow representatives, but in the 10 years she served the Seventh District of Indiana, Julia never forgot her roots. She tried hard to represent the poor and the working class of Indiana, concentrated her energies on women's rights, children's issues, and efforts to reduce homelessness.

Throughout most of her time in Congress, Julia battled significant health problems. She finally succumbed to a lifelong struggle with lung cancer in December, 2007 at the age of 69.

In honor of her years of faithful service to her country and to the great State of Indiana, I ask my fellow Members to join me in support of this bill and rename the post office located at 2650 Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Street in Indianapolis, Indiana, in honor of her memory and long-lasting accomplishments.

I would like to thank Mr. VISCLOSKY for introducing this resolution and express my strong support for this bill.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) for 2 minutes.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5472 to designate an Indianapolis postal facility after my late colleague, Congresswoman Julia Carson.

A Hoosier icon, ''Ms. Carson,'' as her staff and friends admiringly called her, was both loved and respected by her district. She was living proof to them and to all of us that hard work and determination can take you very far in this country.

Ms. Carson had persevered through some difficult times in American history, growing up in poverty and segregation, yet she rose up to serve more than 20 years in the Indiana State Legislature and for a decade here in the House of Representatives.

It is fitting that the ''Julia M. Carson Post Office Building'' would be located on Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Street. Like Dr. King, Ms. Carson achieved much for civil rights, leading the drive to award civil rights icon Rosa Parks a Congressional Gold Medal and becoming both the first African American and the first woman to represent Indianapolis in the United States Congress.

It is bittersweet today to honor Ms. Carson, as we all wish Julia was still here with us. However, we are blessed to have her grandson, Andre, as a colleague representing the Seventh District of Indiana.

I am honored to offer my strong support for this bill.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recognized for as much time as I may consume.

Representative Carson advocated and represented with distinction Indiana's Seventh Congressional District from 1997 until she passed away in the winter of 2007.

The first woman and the first African American to represent Indiana's Seventh Congressional District, Congresswoman Carson worked her way up the ranks to be a prominent Member of this body and a friend and confidant to many of us.

H.R. 5472 was first introduced by Carson's close colleague, Representative PETER VISCLOSKY of Indiana, on February 14, 2008 and was considered by and reported from the Oversight Committee on March 13, 2008 by voice vote.

The measure has the support of over 45 Members of Congress and affords us a chance to recognize and pay tribute before the American public to a woman whose life serves as a testimony to the American dream. Her story is an inspiration to those who face insurmountable odds and reminds us that we live in a country where anything can be accomplished with diligence in one hand and dedication in the other.

Julia Carson was born in Louisville, Kentucky on July 8, 1938 to a single teenage mother. Despite her apparent disadvantages, Congresswoman Carson overcame the odds she was dealt by fate and achieved extraordinary goals and objectives by faith.

As a young girl, we learned that Congresswoman Carson shouldered a host of jobs in order to support her family, including waiting tables, delivering newspapers, and serving as a farm hand. In other words, our friend had to work for what she got and had to toil greatly to get where she got.

Julia Carson was first introduced to politics in 1972 when Congressman Andy Jacobs encouraged her to run for the Indiana House of Representatives. She served as a member for 4 years, and then moved on to the Indiana Senate, where she held a seat for 14 years. In 1990, she was elected as a Trustee for Center Township of downtown Indianapolis and was responsible for running the welfare office. Over the course of merely 6 years, Carson managed to take a $20 million debt and turn it into a $6 million surplus.

On November 25, 2007, it was reported that Julia Carson had been diagnosed with terminal lung cancer, which took her life. We are certainly at a loss for a dear colleague, and believe me, Julia Carson will be missed by this body.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. HILL. I'd like to thank the gentleman for yielding his time.

Mr. Speaker, I knew Julia Carson for more than 20 years. I served with her in the legislature, and I got to know her very well. She was a great public servant in the Indiana legislature and she was a great public servant in the Congress of the United States.

Now, we've had several speakers here today, and I'm not going to repeat everything that they have said, but I would like to leave you with this departing thought about Julia:

Julia had a difficult childhood; she had a difficult life growing up. I have talked to Julia many times about her reaching to the point where she became an elected official in the Indiana Legislature and she actually became a Member of Congress.

I can't tell you how proud she was to be a Member of this august body. It was the highlight of her life. Other than her family, I don't think there was anything else that she felt better about than becoming a Member of Congress.

I can tell you without a shadow of a doubt that one of the biggest honors, and if Julia is looking from above, I know she's got a big smile on her face right now, and to have a post office named in her name would be the highlight of her career. And so it's with a great deal of happiness that I have the opportunity to speak on her behalf to acknowledge her great accomplishments in the Congress of the United States.

We all know about Julia's political points of view, but more importantly, I think I want to leave with this body that she was so proud to be one of the Members of the Congress of the United States. And I know that she would be very proud to have this post office named in her honor.

I rise today to honor one of Indiana's finest, Julia Carson. I knew Julia for more than 20 years, and am a better person for it. She was a dear friend and her spirit will unarguably live on not only in the halls of Congress, but in the neighborhoods of Indianapolis where she touched the lives of so many.

I am pleased we are able to recognize her by dedicating a post office in her hometown of Indianapolis in her honor. She had an enormous presence in Indianapolis and was always striving to help those in need. Julia embodied the true meaning of a ''liberal''—a woman who was always fighting for those without a voice.

She championed civil rights and walked alongside Martin Luther King, Jr. fighting for equality. She was to me, and so many others, a true hero. Julia was not only proud to be a Member of Congress and represent the fine people of Indianapolis, but she was constantly amazed at how far she had come.

As many know, Julia had a difficult upbringing but only used those experiences to strengthen and shape her political views. Julia constantly reminded us all how fortunate we are to be Members of Congress. I am so honored to have known Julia for so many years and to have worked so closely with her.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and friend, Julia, was an exemplary woman, a loyal patriot, and a formidable political force. She has also left us with someone who is just as capable as she. And at this time, I would like to recognize our new colleague, and her grandson, the gentleman from Indiana, Representative CARSON, for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Thank you, Congressman CLAY.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank my dear friend, Senator BAYH, my colleague, Congressman VISCLOSKY, and the entire Indiana delegation for supporting this important piece of legislation. I also would like to extend my sincere thanks to Subcommittee Chairman DANNY DAVIS and his staff for all

of their work in quickly bringing this bill to the floor for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today with a heavy heart, but also with an overwhelming sense of gratitude and humility. I am sad that my grandmother, former Congresswoman Julia Carson, is not able to be here on this wonderful occasion, but I am also deeply grateful that my colleagues have chosen to honor my grandmother by authorizing a postal facility in my hometown of Indianapolis, Indiana to be renamed the ''Julia Carson Post Office Building.''

Congresswoman Carson was many good things to many people in the Indianapolis area. Many will remember her as a staunch advocate for the poor from her years in the Indiana State legislature. Others will perhaps remember her for her efforts in helping needy children receive health care services. But I think, most importantly, many people will just remember her for being who she was, and that was a good person with a kind and caring heart.

So I would like to thank again all of my colleagues who were instrumental in bringing this bill to the floor today, and I know that if my grandmother were here, she would thank you all.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, in memory of our dear colleague and courageous colleague, let us pass H.R. 5472 and designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 2650 Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, as the ''Julia M. Carson Post Office Building.''

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the designation of the Julia M. Carson Post Office Building in Indianapolis, IN.

Congresswoman Carson was not only a colleague but also a dear friend. It is truly gratifying to me, and surely her family and the constituents of the 7th Congressional District of Indiana, that the House of Representatives would seek to recognize her in this special way.

Congresswoman Carson's accomplishments in the House of Representatives are numerous. Most notably, her work to authorize a Congressional Gold Medal for Rosa Parks; sponsorship of an Amtrak reauthorization bill; and passage of language to improve the eligibility requirements for SCHIP, demonstrate her commitment to the needs of underserved people.

Her book, My Neighbor as Myself, outlines a vision of how she felt we, as public servants, should serve our community. In this book she discussed the plight of our children and the need for ''powerful parenting'', providing ''responsible relief'' for the poor, job creation, economic empowerment, and community reentry. She was tireless in her efforts to advocate for people who are rarely able to advocate for themselves.

Congresswoman Julia Carson will certainly be remembered in the halls of Congress for her character, humor, and unyielding commitment to oppressed and impoverished people. It is my hope that the naming of this post office after such a noble and honorable woman will inspire her story to continue to be told.

In years to come, when the children of Indiana ask, ''Who was Julia Carson?'' may they learn the story of a woman who came from the same neighborhood, overcame the same struggles, and pushed for the rights of all in our Nation's capitol. May they learn of a heroine who accomplished great personal success but always remained mindful of who she was here to serve. I pray that the designation of this post office in the name of my dear friend will provide inspiration to those she worked tirelessly for in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of a dear friend and respected colleague of mine, Representative Julia Carson, and strongly support the underlying bill, H.R. 5472, ''To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2650 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street, Indianapolis, IN, as the ''Julia M. Carson Post Office Building.''

Born in poverty and racial segregation to a teenage single mother in 1938, Julia Porter Carson worked her way up through politics to become one of the most influential people in central Indiana. Julia Carson had a long career as a public servant.

In 1965, while working as a secretary at UAW Local 550, she was hired away by newly elected congressman Andy Jacobs to do casework in his Indianapolis office. When his own electoral prospects looked dim in 1972, he encouraged Carson to run for the Indiana State House of Representatives, which she did; she was elected in 1972, serving as a member for 4 years. In 1976, she successfully ran for the Indiana State Senate.

In 1990, she was elected as a trustee for Center Township that covers downtown Indianapolis, and was responsible for running welfare programs in central Indianapolis. Carson served 6 years as a trustee, creating a $6-million surplus from the office's $20-million debt. Carson employed an aggressive workfare program and anti-fraud procedures to quickly erase the enormous debt, while still providing much needed emergency services to the poor of Indianapolis. Her budget-balancing feat earned compliments from both sides of the political spectrum, including that of republican county auditor John Von Arx, who said, ''Julia Carson wrestled that monster to the ground.''

In 1996, Julia Carson made history by becoming the first African-American woman Indiana has ever sent to Congress. Despite all her accomplishments and success, she never forgot her roots; she always remained true to herself and her beliefs. With all her success and accomplishments, she could have moved to a better neighborhood but chose not to. To the day she died, Julia Carson's home telephone number was in the Indianapolis phone book.

In all my years in Congress, I am not sure I can remember anyone as dedicated to their constituents as Julia was. She reached out to senior citizens, mothers of men and women serving in Iraq, crime victims and those struggling to pay the rent. She sent cards and routinely showed up at funerals and hospitals and front doors. She worked to find work for young men who were coming out of prison. She helped crime victims who were seeking justice.

While I didn't always agree with Julia politically, I always enjoyed working with her and her welcoming smile. She was a great woman and a dedicated public servant. While I was lucky to serve with her in this body, I was luckier to call her my friend. It is right that we honor her in the community that she served by naming this post office in her memory.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5472, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2650 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street, Indianapolis, IN, as the ''Julia M. Carson Post Office Building,'' introduced by my distinguished colleague from Indiana, Representative PETER VISCLOSKY. Through this important resolution, the House of Representatives will give final tribute to our colleague, sister, mentor and friend.

As a member of this House, I have been privileged to work with some extraordinary men and women. Julia Carson was an extraordinary woman and an extraordinary champion of justice and equality. Julia Carson was a powerful force for change in this country and was an articulate champion for the poor, homeless and those who suffered from discrimination and racial injustice.

As the first woman and first African-American elected to represent Indianapolis in Congress, Julia truly represented and will be remembered as an American hero. Julia was so keenly committed to those who could not speak for themselves and could not help themselves. A longtime legislator in the Indiana State Legislature and advocate for her community, Julia's history, by its very nature, directed her to the fight for those who, like herself, grew up with very little, but yet could look to this great country and actually believe that they could achieve their dreams.

Julia Carson who grew up poor and lived through segregation was elected in 1996 to the U.S. House of Representatives. Among many, one of her biggest achievements came in 1999 when she successfully pushed through legislation granting the Congressional Gold Medal to Rosa Parks, the mother of the civil rights movement.

Congresswoman Julia Carson lived her life to the fullest extent. She left few stones unturned. Her passion for family and community was unparallel. Though she was only a member of this body for 11 years, her life and legacy will last an eternity.

Representative Carson was a true advocate for and of the people. For over 35 years she worked tirelessly for her community and she was the greatest example of humility, self-determination, fortitude, strength and resilience. She will always be remembered for her advocacy of the most disadvantaged and she will truly be missed.

It is because of the legacy of Congresswoman Julia Carson that I rise today in support of the naming the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2650 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street, Indianapolis, IN, as the ''Julia M. Carson Post Office Building''. Though Julia is no longer with us, we can still honor her.

Mr. Speaker, we must never forget the life and legacy of a woman who touched the hearts and minds of so many. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support designating the post office located at 2650 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street, INndianapolis, IN, as the Julia M. Carson Post Office Building.

This past December, my friend and colleague, Julia Carson, lost her battle with cancer. She had devoted her life to public service and her loss is still felt greatly. Congresswoman Carson was an extraordinary person, and a woman of principle who unabashedly championed the issues in which she believed. Her constituents and the Nation have lost a great legislator and an outstanding leader.

Congresswoman Carson made history in 1996 by becoming the first woman and the first African-American Indianapolis has ever sent to Congress. And she came to Congress with one mission—to improve the lives of the people of her community. Even as she rose to a position of prominence in this body, she never forgot the people she was sent here to serve. She truly dedicated her career to them—and for that, earned the respect and gratitude of all Americans.

Since her days in the Indiana State Senate, Congresswoman Carson was committed to helping seniors live with independence and dignity as they age. Throughout her career, she has provided exceptional leadership and devoted service to America's senior citizens.

Congresswoman Carson was also a strong proponent of civil rights movement, scaling the barriers imposed by poverty and sexism. She was a leader in advocating for voting rights, and worked diligently for the health and income needs of people experiencing homelessness and families at risk of homelessness.

Today her grandson continues her legacy here within the House of Representatives. I know that this honor is very meaningful to the Carson family and to her constituents in the 7th District of Indiana, and I'm certain if Julia were here today she would be touched as well. This post office designation is a fitting honor for a woman so dedicated to public service, and I fully support this resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my late great friend Congresswoman Julia M. Carson, a dedicated public servant from Indianapolis. I thank my colleague, Congressman VISCLOSKY, for introducing a resolution to recognize her achievements by naming a post office in her honor in Indianapolis as the Julia M. Carson Post Office Building.

Julia Carson was born on July 8, 1938 in Louisville, Kentucky and served in various elected offices. We first became colleagues when she was elected to the 105th Congress and served together until she passed away on December 15, 2007.

As the first African American and first woman to be elected to Congress from Indianapolis, Julia Carson was a woman of outstanding ambition and achievements. Not only was Julia a star in her city of Indianapolis, but she was a star of the nation. Her many invaluable legislative contributions, including the recognition of Rosa Parks with a Congressional Gold Medal, were a testament to her star qualities. I hope that my colleagues realize what we lost when Julia passed away.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no one more deserving of this enduring recognition than Julia Carson. This resolution is fitting recognition for a tremendous woman who continued to deliver the truth until her final days. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution as we can all attest to her unprecedented devotion in serving her community and society.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of 5471, naming a U.S. Post Office the ''Julia M. Carson Post Office Building.'' It is fitting and right that we recognize and honor the extraordinary life of our dear friend and former colleague Julia May Carson.

It is also fitting that the Julia Carson building will be located at 2650 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street in Indianapolis, Indiana.

Like Dr. King, Congresswoman Carson championed the rights of the underprivileged, the underrepresented and the overlooked.

Many people in Indiana and many of us in Congress need no help to remember the great woman that Julia Carson was or what her service meant to her community and the Nation.

We came to depend on her determined leadership and commitment throughout her tenure in Congress. She was a true voice for the voiceless.

I know that her legacy will be carried on through the work of her grandson, the newest member of Congress, ANDRÉ CARSON.

Naming this post office after Julia is the least that we can do to mark her dedication and service to the people of Indianapolis and a grateful nation.

Her loyalty and her patriotism, her service and her love of our country will never be forgotten. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5472.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5472, which designates the post office at 2650 Martin Luther King, Jr. Street, Indianapolis, Indiana as the ''Julia M. Carson Post Office Building'' in honor of my friend and former colleague, Congresswoman Julia Carson.

Julia Carson was a tireless representative of the people of Indiana who served them from her position as a congressional aide in the 1960s to two terms in the Indiana House of Representatives to service in the Indiana Senate from 1976 to 1990. She vigorously pursued issues related to the needs of working men and women, public health, the environment, and fundamental justice. When the AIDS epidemic broke out, Mrs. Carson was one of the early champions of the right of the sick to be treated fairly as she worked to bring public understanding about the new illness.

As a victim herself of discrimination in health care, which delayed the diagnosis and treatment of her heart disease, she was an ardent advocate for the elimination of all health disparities.

Julia Carson coupled her career in public service with a 10-year stint in corporate America. As Marion County Center Township Trustee in 1990, she saved the financially floundering office, earning the accolade of Indianapolis Woman of the Year from the Indianapolis Star for the second time in her career.

Julia Carson came to Congress in 1996 and brought the same energy and enthusiasm to this body to which her constituents in Indiana had grown accustomed.

As a Congresswoman, Julia Carson was proud of her vote against the Iraq War, her legislation that awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor to Rosa Parks, and her tireless advocacy for women, children, the homeless.

After more than 40 years of service to the people of her district and the State of Indiana and indeed to the country as a whole, I join my colleagues in their overwhelming support of the Indianapolis post office being named in her honor.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 5472 and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5472.

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. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1130

WILLIAM ''BILL'' CLAY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5395) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11001 Dunklin Drive in St. Louis, Missouri, as the ''William 'Bill' Clay Post Office Building.''

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5395

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

SECTION 1. WILLIAM "BILL" CLAY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11001 Dunklin Drive in St. Louis, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the ''William 'Bill' Clay Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''William 'Bill' Clay Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Once again I stand as a member of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 5395, which would rename the post office facility at 11001 Dunklin Drive in

St. Louis, Missouri, after a true hero of mine: my beloved father, the Honorable William ''Bill'' Clay, Sr.

The measure before us was first introduced by my friend and colleague Representative RUSS CARNAHAN from my home State of Missouri on February 12, 2008. I am proud to say that the bill now enjoys the support and cosponsorship of nearly 60 Members of Congress, including the entire congressional delegation from the ''Show Me State'' of Missouri. H.R. 5395 was taken up by the House Oversight Committee on March 13, 2008, and reported out of the committee by voice vote that same day.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you can imagine that in commemorating the achievements and accomplishments of my father, I could begin anywhere and probably go on endlessly. Throughout my lifetime I have been blessed to experience and witness firsthand my father's commitment to his community and his country.

Congressman Clay served Missouri's First Congressional District for 32 years from 1968 to 2000. Born and raised in St. Louis, Missouri, Bill Clay served in the U.S. Army from 1953 to 1955. Prior to his service in the U.S. House of Representatives, my father held the position of alderman in St. Louis from 1959 to 1964. And prior to that, he held jobs as a real estate broker, a labor coordinator, and a union affiliate for the St. Louis City Employees Union from 1961 to 1964 and an education coordinator for the Steamfitters Union up until 1967.

During his tenure in Congress, Bill Clay became an advocate for environmentalism, labor issues, and social justice. Co-founder of the Congressional Black Caucus, he chaired the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service from 1991 to 1995. His leadership in this policy arena serves as greater evidence for passing the measure at hand, which would name the Dunklin Drive post office in his honor. Upon retiring in 2000, I was fortunate and honored to pick up where my father left off representing Missouri's First Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, as we move to recognize the accomplishments of a great statesman, father, and to many of us friend, I ask that we pass the underlying bill without reservation and pay tribute to service and diligence rendered by Congressman Clay to this body over a 32-year period. I urge passage of H.R. 5395.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I really had to come over and couldn't let this opportunity slip by without coming to the floor to say a few words about my friend former Congressman Bill Clay, even though we still kind of call him ''Congressman.'' This is such a well-deserved honor for the former chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee but really more so because of the man that he is.

Bill Clay has dedicated his life to his community in St. Louis, the State of Missouri, our Nation, and is well loved throughout the State, not just in St. Louis, where he is from. He was a magnificent leader in this Congress for civil rights and a congressman who really exemplified what's good about this institution, and that is that there are so many of us who can put aside differences and strive to work for a common good, and Bill Clay always did that. He was not a partisan politician. He was and he does remain a true leader.

So that is why I am happy to support this legislation to name a post office after our former colleague, a wonderful man and my friend, Bill Clay.

Mr. CLAY. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Missouri, my friend and colleague, for those kind words. I certainly appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the sponsor of this amendment, my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN).

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to sponsor this bill today before us, H.R. 5395, a bill to name a Missouri post office after a true champion of civil rights, Congressman William ''Bill'' Clay. Mr. Clay retired from the House of Representatives in the year 2000 after a stellar career in public service.

It's especially appropriate to have this tribute for him to name the Florissant, Missouri, post office in his honor that is located in Missouri's First Congressional District that he represented for 32 years in Congress, where he rose to become chairman of the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service and achieved the third highest rank in seniority in the entire U.S. House.

Mr. Clay was born in St. Louis, Missouri, and began his political career in 1959 as a member of the St. Louis Board of Aldermen, where he served until 1964. Prior to entering Congress in 1968, he also worked as a real estate broker and later as a labor coordinator. He worked for the union of St. Louis City employees from 1961 to 1964 and then with the Steamfitters Union until 1967.

Congressman Bill Clay is known as a true pioneer of civil rights. Throughout his tenure in Congress, he became a champion of social justice and labor rights, working on behalf of the poor and the disenfranchised. Bill Clay was co-founder of the Congressional Black Caucus. He was an author of the history of African Americans who served in Congress. And he had a famous saying, that he did not have permanent friends or permanent enemies in politics, just permanent interest. He looked out for the people that he represented, and he served them well. He's been credited with turning back racial discrimination throughout his career. He remains today an outspoken leader in our community, an accomplished author. This will be a fitting tribute to his years of dedication in public service.

I ask that the U.S. House of Representatives respect this living legend, this inspirational leader, Congressman William ''Bill'' Clay with this fitting tribute of naming a Missouri post office in his honor.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my friend and colleague Mr. CARNAHAN from Missouri for those kind words and for his friendship to our family. We are both proud Missourians with political families, and I'm certainly honored to serve with him in this body and honored that he would recognize a great Missourian like he has.

Let me also thank Mr. MARCHANT of Texas, too, for his indulgence and his support of this measure and thank the entire body for their support.

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 5395.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker. I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5395, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11001 Dunklin Drive in St. Louis, Missouri, as the ''William 'Bill' Clay Post Office Building.'' I would like to thank my colleague Congressman CARNAHAN for introducing this bill, and Chairman WAXMAN of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee for bringing this important legislation to the floor today.

As my colleagues are aware, William 'Bill' Clay served in the House of Representatives for 32 years, until his retirement in 2000. He was a true leader, a champion of civil rights, and a tireless voice for the people of Missouri's 1st Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Clay was born in 1931 in St. Louis, Missouri and he graduated from St. Louis University. He began his political career in 1959, serving as a member of the St. Louis Board of Aldermen until 1964. He also worked as a real estate broker, and served his community as a labor coordinator. From 1961–1964, he worked for the union of St. Louis city employees, and later with a steamfitters union until 1967.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Clay was also a true champion of civil rights. He was one of the founders of the Congressional Black Caucus, and, throughout his time in Congress, he championed social justice and labor issues. He worked tirelessly on behalf of the poor and disenfranchised, always seeking to give them a voice in these halls. He was instrumental in fighting racial discrimination whenever and wherever it occurred. Congressman Clay authored the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Capital Financing Act, which provides $375 million in federal loan guarantees for construction and renovation projects at Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

Because of his commitment to labor he selected committees whose primary business

deals with labor issues, and he served as a senior Member of the Education and the Workforce Committee. Congressman Clay was a champion of education and played a key role in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, including efforts to reduce early grade class sizes by hiring 100,000 teachers nationwide. He has also leading the way for our Nation's schools to be first in getting the resources necessary for school construction, renovation and modernization. His work in education has also included winning concessions from the Republicans to increase the amount of Pell Grant funding and the reduction of student loan interest rates.

From 1991 until 1995, Congressman Clay chaired the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service. Upon his retirement in 2000, he was succeeded by his son, my colleague, Congressman WILLIAM LACY CLAY.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will honor a true champion of civil rights in a very fitting way. It is fitting that a former Chairman of the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service be honored with a post office in the very town where his political career begun.

I am very proud to support this legislation, and I ask my colleagues to join me in voting honoring William ''Bill'' Clay and voting for H.R. 5395.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill designating the facility of the United State Postal Service located at 11001 Dunklin Drive in St. Louis, Missouri as the William ''Bill'' Clay Post Office Building. Representing the people of St. Louis in this chamber for 32 years, Bill Clay was the consummate advocate for Civil Rights, labor, and his community.

Born in St. Louis, Missouri in April of 1931, Clay grew up in the city and graduated from St. Louis University in 1953 with a bachelors degree in Political Science. After 2 years with the U.S. Army from 1953 to 1955, Clay returned home to begin his career serving the people of St. Louis. After spending some time as a real estate broker, Clay was elected to the Board of Aldermen in 1959. He held this position, representing the 26th Ward until 1964.

When Bill Clay, Sr. was elected to Congress in 1968, he was the first African American member elected from Missouri and one of only two African American representatives from states west of the Mississippi River. Throughout his 16 terms in Congress, he gained a reputation for his streetwise urban politics. A staunch advocate for civil rights and social justice, he also served as one of the founders of the Congressional Black Caucus. From 1991 to 1995 he chaired the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service and served as the Ranking Member on the Education and the Workforce Committee until he retired. In all that he did while he was serving the people of Missouri in Congress, he still found time to author several books.

Bill Clay, Sr. retired from Congress in 2000 but his legacy lives on through his successor whom I am proud to serve with in this chamber. His successor also happens to be his son, the gentleman from Missouri, WILLIAM LACY CLAY, Jr.

I urge my colleagues to support me in this resolution honoring a man who spent over 3 decades serving his community, state, and country.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, let me take this moment to recognize my former colleague, fellow Missourian, and good friend Bill Clay. Today, I join with my colleagues in support of H.R. 5395, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11001 Dunklin Drive in St. Louis, Missouri, as the ''William 'Bill' Clay Post Office

Bill was born in St. Louis, Missouri, the very town in which he carried out his storied political career. In 1959, he was elected as a member of the St. Louis Board of Alderman, where he served until 1964, Between 1964 and 1967, Bill worked as a real estate broker and later as a labor coordinator. He also worked for the union of St. Louis city employees and then with a Steamfitters Union.

In 1968, Mr. Clay was first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, and he proudly served the residents of Missouri's First Congressional District for 32 years. Throughout his years in office, Bill became known as a champion of social justice and a true pioneer for civil rights. He was a co-founder of the Congressional Black Caucus and Chairman of the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service. He was always a truly delightful colleague and I am proud to have served with him as a fellow Missouri Congressman. I must also say, Mr. Speaker, that I am also so very honored to serve with Bill's son, LACY, who was elected to represent the First District upon Bill's retirement.

Naming a St. Louis post office after Bill Clay is an outstanding way to pay tribute to an outstanding public servant and a true pioneer in American politics. I urge the House to honor Bill for his years of public service and his commitment to his community by supporting H.R. 5395.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the naming of the U.S. Post Office at 11001 Dunklin Drive in St. Louis, Missouri, as the ''William 'Bill' Clay'' Post Office Building.

William ''Bill'' Clay served his country and his community at an important juncture in history, as he was one of the cofounders of the Congressional Black Caucus, an institution in this body that has grown in size and stature to 43 members, of which I am proud to be a part.

From his work in his native St. Louis as a real estate broker, labor coordinator and union affiliate, Bill Clay brought a reservoir of knowledge and experience to his service in this body for 33 years. He was well respected and he served as a mentor to me and other members as we learned our way around the House of Representatives.

William ''Bill'' Clay chaired the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service from 1991 until 1995. It is even more fitting that a U.S. Post Office in his beloved city bear his name and the memory of his work on behalf of so many.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5395.

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.

RECOGNIZING THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1038) recognizing the fifth anniversary of the Department of Homeland Security and honoring the Department's employees for their extraordinary efforts and contributions to protect and secure our Nation.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1038

Whereas, in the wake of the attacks of September 11, 2001, the Department of Homeland Security was created in an effort to consolidate our Nation's efforts to prevent, prepare for, respond to, and mitigate against threats to the homeland, including acts of terrorism, natural disasters, or other emergencies;

Whereas the Department of Homeland Security marked its fifth year of full-scale operations on March 1, 2008;

Whereas the Department has strived to integrate 22 disparate agencies and offices, while at the same time has been successful in helping prevent another terrorist attack over this period;

Whereas the United States must continue to remain vigilant against all such threats;

Whereas the employees of the Department of Homeland Security have spent the past 5 years enhancing our Nation's domestic preparedness and collective response to terrorism and standing ready to assist State, local, and tribal governments as they prepare for and prevent acts of terrorism and respond to natural disasters and other emergencies;

Whereas the Department's employees work diligently to deter, detect, and prevent acts of terrorism and stand willing, ready, and able to respond in the event of a terrorist incident or other major emergency;

Whereas the Department's employees have cooperated closely with the private sector to enhance emergency preparedness across the Nation;

Whereas the American people rely on the Department's employees to protect our Nation's borders, airports, seaports, rail lines, and other transit systems;

Whereas the continuing efforts of the Department's employees will be crucial to the security of our Nation in the years to come;

Whereas the Department's employees have sacrificed, and will continue to sacrifice, time with their families and working long hours to fulfill the Department's vital mission;

Whereas because the Nation depends on the Department's employees to keep the American people safe from harm, they deserve the best in training, testing, and equipment;

Whereas the Department's employees often do not receive the recognition they deserve; and

Whereas the Nation is indebted to the Department's employees for their sacrifices, efforts, and contributions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the fifth anniversary of the Department of Homeland Security; and

(2) honors the Department's dedicated public servants for their extraordinary service to this Nation in helping preserve the safety and security of the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. CARNEY) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this resolution.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to recognize the fifth anniversary of the Department of Homeland Security. This is an opportunity for us to praise the tireless employees who, day in and day out, are working hard to prevent another terrorist attack on our soil, in our skies, and on our waters, and to also ensure that we're prepared should a catastrophe strike again.

Congress is often critical of DHS, and we have had some harsh hearings in the Homeland Security Committee. But our criticism of the management at DHS is only because we hope to ensure the department's employees have the resources they need to do their jobs and to keep America safe. The department is still in its formative years and still experiencing expected growing pains.

When DHS was established, it was the largest reorganization of the Federal Government since the creation of the Department of Defense 60 years ago, with 180,000 employees and 22 agencies that merged to form one new department. That number has grown by nearly 30,000 since then.

Let's take a moment to honor DHS in its 5-year anniversary but also to recognize these employees for their dedicated service.

To the Customs and Border Patrol officers and the Border Patrol agents protecting our borders, at our ports of entry and in between; and to our Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents ensuring that criminal aliens are accounted for and removed; and to our Transportation Security officers, protecting millions of passengers daily and quickly adapting to threats to prevent future hijackings or worse; and to our Federal Air Marshals, quietly protecting our skies; and to our Secret Service, called upon earlier than ever to protect presidential candidates; and to the men and women of the Coast Guard, protecting 360 ports and over 90,000 miles of coastline, ready to respond at a moment's notice; and to the first responders of FEMA, who have again proven themselves in their response to the California wildfires and the recent Midwest tornadoes.

Thank you. We know all too well the long hours you've committed to our country and the time away from your homes and families. We sincerely appreciate all of your work and your service.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to fully support this resolution, which speaks to this Congress, appropriately recognizing and honoring the brave Americans, the great patriots, who work to protect us all through their service at the Department of Homeland Security.

And I believe that the first and foremost responsibility of the Federal Government is to provide for the national defense. That is actually in the preamble of our Constitution. Additionally, for all of us who have the honor to serve in this House, protecting our homeland and securing our borders against those who would harm us is something that we all take an oath to do.

Before those horrific attacks on our Nation on 9/11, we thought about national defense more in terms of having a strong military, the best trained, the best resourced, facing down enemies overseas in conflicts where we had a national interest in spots around the world. We didn't usually think in terms of actually being attacked or continuing to be threatened with attacks on American soil here in our homeland.

□ 1145

9/11 changed all of our lives, as on that day cowardly terrorists murdered nearly 3,000 of our fellow Americans, innocent people who were just going about their daily lives. And the terrorists used the tools of our own freedoms against us. And why? Because they hate us, and they especially hate our freedoms.

They sought to weaken us, to destroy us, and instead they united us. They awoke us, and instead, made us begin to take the necessary steps to protect ourselves from future attacks.

We knew we had to change the way we practiced security measures at our airports, on our railways, on our roadways, at our ports, and at our border crossings. We knew we had to secure our infrastructure, that we had to better prepare our first responders and local emergency management agencies, that we had to share intelligence, that we had to tear down silo mentalities and do a much better job of sharing intelligence and resources.

And we also knew we had to create an agency here at the Federal level and task them with implementing this seemingly impossible job. And so the Department of Homeland Security was created 5 years ago, and what a remarkable success story it has been.

The brave men and women of the 22 agencies, more than 213,000 individuals that make up the department, deserve our respect, and they deserve our gratitude. We have not had another successful attack on our shores since that day, in no small part due to the vigilance and the hard work of the Department of Homeland Security and their efforts to provide for our common defense against America's enemies, against the enemies of freedom, those who are truly cowards, those who hide in the shadows and who prey on the innocent.

Mr. Speaker, as Congress recognizes and pays tribute to the Department of Homeland Security for the dedication and the commitment they have made to our homeland security during the past 5 years that they have been in existence, we also look forward to standing shoulder to shoulder with them as we look towards the future.

We understand that we need to do more to clearly define the lines of congressional committee jurisdiction, to streamline, to make more effective and cost efficient many of the department's missions. We recognize that the largest room is always the room for improvement, and that the department is looking to Congress to continue to assist them and not to hobble them.

Mr. Speaker, I am a new member of the Committee on Homeland Security, and I am proud to represent my district in Michigan, a border State with many unique dynamics, such as the first and second busiest international border crossings on the northern tier and the busiest rail entry in the country, the magnificent Great Lakes, fully one-fifth of the freshwater supply of the entire planet, a long liquid border that we share with our wonderful neighbors, the Canadians.

These are issues and items that require the attention of the Department of Homeland Security, and yet, Mr. Speaker, every Member, every Member of this House, could tell us of particular dynamics in their district, or their State, or their region of the country that also require the attention of the department.

Identifying and dealing with the threats to our homeland are done each and every day, 24/7, by the remarkable men and women of the Department of Homeland Security. And it is certainly appropriate that we honor those who serve us so well, that we thank them for their vigilance, we salute them for their dedication, we appreciate their commitment to democracy and liberty and freedom.

I urge my colleagues to pass the resolution before us and formally thank the great Americans who make up the Department of Homeland Security for keeping our Nation safe.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my great honor to recognize for as much time as he may consume the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I thank Chairman CARNEY for helping to bring this matter to the House floor today, and I rise in strong support of H.

Res. 1038 because we do owe a tremendous debt of gratitude and thanks to all of the employees of the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. Speaker, you and I come from adjoining districts in New York. Probably between our districts we lost well over 200 people on September 11. And I think any of us on September 12 and September 13 anticipated there would have to be another successful attack on our country in the not-too-distant future. Well, the fact is, we have now gone 6½ years without an attack.

During 5 of those years, the Department of Homeland Security has been up and operational. And it was really a tribute to the men and women who comprise the formerly separate 22 agencies who came together to be combined into this one department for what they have been able to do and what they have been able to achieve. It is no accident, it is not luck we haven't been attacked. It is for a number of reasons, but among the very prime reasons is the tremendous effort by all these men and women. And doing that was not easy because they each came from different cultures and traditions. They had different types of training and a different type of emphasis. They had a tough enough job before September 11. But now added to that was the new dimension of homeland security. And they had to do what they were doing at a different level, and they combined their efforts with employees from other agencies who were trained differently, who had a different way of looking at things, and they had to learn to speak and think as one. And they have done it. They have done a terrific job.

I believe it was last year we held hearings on how far the department has come. And yes, it is easy to be a critic. It is easy to stand back and say this should be done better and that should be done better. But the consensus of the testimony we had from experts was that the Department of Homeland Security is further along in its progress than the Defense Department was after a comparable period of time after it was formed over 60 years ago. So it is important to keep that in mind, and also to keep in mind that their work is a 24/7 job, that at any given time, there are active threats against the United States or active plots against the United States, and there is no simple easy way to stop it. And there are many ways. We have to fight it overseas. We have to fight it at the national level making sure that all intelligence is coordinated. But no one is more central to that than the Department of Homeland Security because they have to coordinate the national and international intelligence and then also make sure it gets down to the local levels, to make sure that the local police, the State police and the local law enforcements throughout the country are apprised of what could be happening, what might be happening, and also to absorb information that is sent back up from the local governments to the Department of Homeland Security.

So I commend them. I think it is too easy to take shots. And we see it in Presidential debates, we see people who take random shots at the people in this department, and it is so unfair because they are literally on the firing lines for us. They are on the front lines for us. In many ways, they are doing it anonymously because obviously their successes cannot be recorded. They are not publicized. How do you prove an attack didn't happen that was actually going to happen and didn't? And those that we do know about often can't be spoken about. But they are there. They are doing it. And in addition to that, they have the added responsibility from Congress because of the events of September 11 and having to do much more as far as border security and illegal immigration is concerned. So there is just a myriad of responsibilities that have been thrust upon them in addition to all they have been doing before, and they are doing it first class.

It is important for us in the Congress to live up to that same level, that same standard, that these employees are setting. It's important for us to get our act coordinated in the Congress, to make sure that jurisdiction is consolidated as much as possible so that we can speak with one voice, not to take partisan advantage, not to be allowing jurisdictional disputes between and among committees to impede the job that we should be doing. We can take a lesson from those employees out there who have put aside their prerogatives, put aside their own petty interests for the common good.

So I commend all the employees of the Department of Homeland Security on the fifth anniversary. Thanks for keeping us safe. Thanks for doing what you are doing. And I believe we can speak for all Members of this House that we will continue to do what we have to do to make sure that you get the tools to do your job and also get the support that you so richly deserve from all of us, and most important, from your fellow Americans whom you have done so much to protect.

I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers.

If the gentlewoman from Michigan has no more, and she is ready to close, I will close after she does.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Yes, I have no further speakers at this time, Mr. Speaker. And so I would certainly urge my colleagues to pass the resolution before us and honor the brave men and women of the Department of Homeland Security, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

I would like to talk about what the department does for a few moments. It is imperative that we honor and recognize the fact that the Department of Homeland Security and all its components provides the awareness for our Nation to prevent threats and identify our vulnerabilities. It prevents threats through detection and deterrence, and it mitigates those accidents and those attacks that might happen. It protects people and/or critical infrastructure and, of course, the economy. It responds to terrorism. It responds to natural disasters and certainly any other emergencies. It provides us the opportunity and the ability to recover from terrorism and from natural disasters. And it serves the public by facilitating lawful trade, lawful travel and lawful immigration.

It is committed to organizational excellence, and through that organizational excellence, we are all protected.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker I rise today to support H. Res. 1038, ''Recognizing the 5th Anniversary of the Department of Homeland Security and honoring the Department's Employees for their Extraordinary Efforts to Protect and Secure our Nation.

On September 11, 2001 this nation suffered a terrorist attack that surpassed anything we had dealt with before. After witnessing those events, I decided that the protection of our homeland would be at the forefront of my legislative agenda. I knew that all of our collective efforts as Americans would all be in vain if we did not achieve our most important priority: the security of our Nation.

After the events of September 11th, the Department of Homeland Security was created in an effort to consolidate our Nation's efforts to prevent, respond to, and mitigate threats to the homeland, including acts of terrorism, natural disasters, or other emergencies.

Since its first full scale year in 2003, the Department of Homeland Security has integrated 22 disparate agencies and offices. Due to the Homeland Security's employees' diligence, the department has done a magnificent job of deterring, detecting, and preventing acts of terrorism from occurring on U.S. soil.

Over 331 pieces of legislation related to Homeland Security have been introduced since the Department's inception. From the health-related issues surrounding clean up of Ground Zero to Customs and Border Protection, the Department covers several facets affecting our national security.

Working for the Department of Homeland Security is more than a job. It would be like saying that we as Members of Congress simply have a job. Homeland Security is a belief in the greatness of this nation and the desire to protect it no matter where the enemy comes from, no matter how large or small the attack.

I thank the employees for the work they do and their belief in the need for protecting our Nation's borders, airports, seaports, rail lines, transit systems, and most importantly our way of life.

That is why I have introduced legislation such as H.R. 750 [110th] the Save America Comprehensive Immigration Act of 2007, which seeks to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) to provide increased protections and eligibility for family-sponsored immigrants. It would authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to deny a family-based immigration petition by a U.S. petitioner for an alien spouse or child if: (1) the petitioner is on

the national sex offender registry for a conviction that resulted in more than one year's imprisonment; (2) the petitioner has failed to rebut such information within 90 days; and (3) granting the petition would put a spouse or child beneficiary in danger of sexual abuse. Among other things it would direct the Secretary to establish the Task Force to Rescue Immigrant Victims of American Sex Offenders.

I also introduced H.R. 1530, the Chemical Facility Security Improvement Act of 2007 to prohibit federal funds from being used by the Secretary of Homeland Security to approve a site security plan for a chemical facility unless the facility meets or exceeds security standards and requirements to protect it against terrorist acts established by the State or local government for the area where it is located.

Because while I support and commend the Department of Homeland Security, I still believe that the Department's mission and goals are still malleable. We need to continue to improve the Department's comprehensive national strategies to ensure that the more than 87,000 different governmental jurisdictions at the Federal, State, and local level are protecting our nation's borders, transit systems, people, and ideals.

This work could not be done however, without the more than 208,000 employees of the Department working to ensure disaster preparedness at all levels of government while sacrificing their invaluable time with their family and working long hours to stand willing, able, and ready to respond if catastrophe strikes.

The Department of Homeland Security is critical in ensuring our great nation's preparation for future terrorist threats and attacks. Its employees step beyond the ordinary call of duty and tirelessly help to prepare our Nation to counter acts of terrorism, natural disasters, and other emergencies.

I urge my colleagues to support the achievements of the Department of Homeland Security, and support this resolution honoring the 5th anniversary of the Department of Homeland Security and its extraordinary employees.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, It is my pleasure to be here today to honor the employees of the Department of Homeland Security. As we mark the Department's fifth anniversary, we must keep in mind that it is the people of the Department who make the sacrifices to keep us all safe.

Five years ago, this new Department was created and charged with the crucial mission of protecting and securing our homeland. This was not an easy task in the wake of the September 11th attacks. Hurricane Katrina demonstrated that this was a broader mission than the Department's leadership initially thought. However, despite the challenges before them, the employees of the Department have remained focused on ensuring the security of all Americans.

We talk about the activities of TSA or FEMA or CBP. What sometimes gets lost in the discussion are the individuals behind the acronyms. The people of DHS deserve our praise and our gratitude. They include the Customs and Border Protection Officers who man our ports-of-entry; the Federal Air Marshals who, everyday, sit through the same flight delays that so frustrate the American public to do their part to keep the flying public secure; FEMA teams who trek selflessly into disaster zones to help those in need; and support personnel such as contracting officers, administrative assistants, technical support teams without whom the folks on the front lines could not do their jobs.

I could go on, but my time is limited and I think my point is clear. All the men and women of the Department deserve to be recognized for 5 years of hard work. They work nights, weekends, and holidays. They put their life on the line to secure our country from all manner of threats. Today, we are here to extend a hard-earned and much deserved ''Thank You.''

As Chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, it is an honor for me to stand here today in support of this resolution. I have, at times, been critical of the Department's management. But I want to be very clear: my criticism of the Department's management should in no way be construed as a lack of appreciation for the individuals who are making daily sacrifices to secure our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring these ''everyday heroes.''

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1038, which recognizes and honors the employees of the Department of Homeland Security for their contributions in protecting our Nation from terrorist attacks.

We commend today the more than 200,000 employees of the Department that have dedicated themselves to the ongoing effort to secure our Nation.

In January 2003, the Department of Homeland Security officially was established, and in March 2003, 22 Federal agencies were brought together and the Department became operational. The Department has come a long way these five years.

With great interest, our Subcommittee on Management, Investigations, and Oversight has watched and encouraged the Department's progress in managing its components, organizing its people, and executing the critical mission of protecting the Nation.

I am especially pleased with the 21 percent staffing increase that Customs and Border Protection achieved in just one year. I have every confidence these agents are working tirelessly to help improve the security of our borders every single day.

Similarly, the hard-working people at the Transportation Security Administration have implemented a wide range of improvements at our Nation's airports. T-S-A is now training its own employees to be explosives detection canine handlers, which will allow for a considerable surge in detection in the event of a threat to any transportation system.

I am also proud that two key DHS facilities are located in my hometown of Anniston, Alabama. The Center for Domestic Preparedness provides live chemical agent training to first responders, and the Noble Training Center provides training for hospital and healthcare professionals to prepare for and respond to disasters.

The people who serve at the CDP and Noble Training Center provide an invaluable service to our Nation and deserve our thanks.

Yet as we look back over five years of growth and accomplishment, we must also look forward to next year's transition and beyond.

Consolidation of congressional oversight authority is still sorely needed, and remains the sole recommendation of the 9/11 Commission yet to be enacted. The lack of consolidated Congressional oversight jurisdiction over the Department has a direct negative impact on the Department's ability to fulfill its mission of securing the homeland. Congress must address this issue immediately.

In addition, the Congress needs to establish an annual DHS authorization bill to provide the steady-handed guidance that 86 different committees and subcommittees cannot. This Committee, followed by the House and our colleagues in the Senate, must produce an authorization bill in advance of any appropriations bill this year.

And finally, we must allow the Department's employees to work unimpeded by further organizational shuffling.

These and many more challenges lie in front of us. It is our job to ensure that the Department is ready for the future, especially as it prepares to transition to a new administration.

We therefore gladly extend our thanks to the many dedicated individuals that make up the backbone of our Nation's current and future security.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of this resolution.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in overwhelming support of H. Res. 1038, recognizing the fifth anniversary of the Department of Homeland Security and honoring the Department's employees for their extraordinary efforts and contributions to protect and secure our country.

As a member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, I am proud to work side-by-side with DHS on keeping our Nation secure. We have come a long way and it is hard to believe that so much has been accomplished in 5 years. For certain, consolidating 22 different agencies has been extremely challenging as it is the first act of its kind. The Department now employs more than 200,000 workers in its efforts to keep the Nation secure. Although there are many issues to still be resolved, and there always will be, I commend Secretary Chertoff and the DHS employees for their success in preventing another terrorist attack, thus far, and intercepting terrorists plots.

My colleagues and I remain committed to working on ensuring that the agency has the support and resources it needs to continue to get the job done. One of our top priorities and concerns has always been staff morale. We believe that the employees are the backbone of the agency and that the agency is a reflection of its employees' approach and outlook toward their job. Their continuing efforts are crucial to the security of our Nation in the years to come.

I would like to extend heartfelt congratulations to Secretary Chertoff and the employees of DHS, especially those in the U.S. Virgin Islands, for their outstanding service.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks of this resolution and include any extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1038.

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. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL PLUMBING INDUSTRY WEEK

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. Res. 1082) recognizing the plumbing industry and supporting the goals and ideals of ''National Plumbing Industry Week''.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1082

Whereas on June 27, 1883, Victorian plumbers came together at the Old Masonic Temple in New York City, New York, for the first-ever convention of master plumbers;

Whereas the Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors—National Association (PHCC) is the oldest trade association in the construction industry;

Whereas for over 125 years, our Nation has been paving the way for today's plumbing, heating, and cooling contractor's status as important, and independent small business people;

Whereas the majority of plumbing contractors are small business owners, who help create critical jobs in this country;

Whereas the men and women who design, manufacture, install, and maintain water efficient plumbing systems play a crucial role in our economy;

Whereas this industry has one of the best and most extensive training programs in the country by providing young men and women with thousands of dollars in scholarships every year;

Whereas professional certified plumbers save our Nation millions of dollars each year through the design and installation of more efficient equipment that provides essential comfort while reducing water consumption; and

Whereas the House of Representatives supports the industry in its celebration of ''National Plumbing Industry Week'', April 27 through May 3, 2008: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes that small business plumbing contractors have benefitted from the reduced regulatory burden provided as a result of passage of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (Public Law 96–354) and the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–121);

(2) recognizes that the loan guarantee program under Section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) administered by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration has provided access to capital for small business plumbing contractors;

(3) recognizes that approximately 80 percent of plumbing contractors around the country are small, family owned and run companies;

(4) recognizes these small firms account for a large percentage of our Nation's GDP, through sales, service, and repair;

(5) recognizes how small businesses in the plumbing industry are the leader in developing, and utilizing new innovative technologies which help improve and maintain the infrastructure our Nation depends on; and

(6) supports the goals and ideals of ''National Plumbing Industry Week''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as Chair of the House Small Business Committee, I rise to support this resolution recognizing the contributions of the U.S. plumbing industry during National Plumbing Industry Week. I am pleased to be joined by my ranking member, Representative STEVE CHABOT, in offering this legislation.

I stand before you today to honor a sector of the U.S. small businesses that provide vital contributions to the lives of millions of Americans. The plumbing industry is one of the oldest trades in the country. It employs thousands and serves every American. In fact, over 90 percent of the firms in this sector are led by entrepreneurs. And their companies create jobs in every city and town across the Nation.

In the coming weeks, one of the leading trade associations representing these plumbers will be celebrating its 125th anniversary. The Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors National Association was founded in my home city of New York in 1883.

This resolution highlights the contributions of many of its members, as well as those of other American plumbing professionals. During National Plumbing Industry Week, many of them will visit Capitol Hill, as they have done in previous years, to advocate issues of critical importance to their trade.

The industry will also use the observance to promote greater energy efficiency, water conservation and worker training. On this last point, it is worth noting that because the plumbing industry has placed such emphasis on professional skills, it has one of the best and most extensive training programs in this country. That program has been vital in meeting the demands of the new green economy. Consumers in every community are benefiting from its careful design and unparalleled success. To accommodate the growing needs of our greener economy, the plumbing trade also has a newly developed apprentice and education program. It will create new opportunities and further showcase the positive impacts of green jobs.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this resolution will focus the country's attention on the important role that plumbing contractors play in our daily lives. Their industry is vital to our economy for its work and for the job opportunities it provides thousands of our fellow Americans.

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, without this industry, it would be difficult to be assured that the water our family uses to drink and bathe in is safe and nontoxic. We are proud this House will take a moment to thank such an important part of our Nation's infrastructure and economic base, our plumbers.

I urge my colleagues to join me and Mr. CHABOT in passing this resolution, and I urge support of this legislation.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from New York, the distinguished chairwoman of the Small Business Committee, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, for bringing this bipartisan measure to the floor recognizing the plumbing industry and supporting the goals and ideals of National Plumbing Industry Week.

Like many of our small businesses today, plumbing contractors face difficult times and many difficult issues; a burdensome regulatory system, confiscatory taxation policy at virtually every level of government, rising energy prices, and often the unavailability of affordable health care for their employees and families. Congress can and must help these entrepreneurs, and we will continue to work with the chairwoman and my colleagues on the Small Business Committee to address these obstacles to the success of our Nation's small business plumbing contractors.

As Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ has pointed out, the Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors National Association is the oldest trade association in the American construction industry. I congratulate the association for its contributions over the years and encourage the industry to continue its good work, especially in training and mentoring our future industry leaders in that field.

I have no doubt that our friends and neighbors in the plumbing industry

will continue to make strides in the design and installation of energy efficient equipment that will carry us through the 21st century.

I again want to thank my colleague, Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ, for working in a bipartisan manner on this issue, as we do virtually on every issue in the Small Business Committee. I thank her for bringing this resolution to the floor today. I am happy to join her in supporting it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as Members of this Chamber know, our Nation's small businesses come in all types and a broad range of sizes. Each one makes an important contribution to our society and is an essential part of the great economic engine. In fact, there is no other nation on Earth where a person's dreams of service and innovation can be translated so effectively into the brand of success that yields both wealth and concrete benefits to communities. Entrepreneurs are the reason for this. They are the lifeblood of the U.S. economy.

Moving forward, we should remember that these hard-working business people, including those who are part of the plumbing trade, are the reason our Nation has thrived. So in recognizing the men and women of the plumbing industry today, we extend our salute to every small business person across America.

We thank plumbers for their invaluable effort and encourage the American spirit of service, progress and business excellence. That is the hallmark of our Nation's small firms, and it is one we should all be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1082.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2016, NATIONAL LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION SYSTEM ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1084 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1084

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2016) to establish the National Landscape Conservation System, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment 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. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 2016 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend and namesake, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1084.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1084 provides for consideration of H.R. 2016, the National Landscape Conservation System Act, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, controlled by the Committee on Natural Resources.

The rule makes in order the eight amendments listed in the Rules Committee report on this resolution. Six of these amendments will be offered by Republican Members, two by Democrats. Each amendment is debatable for 10 minutes. This rule is a continuation of our commitment to ensuring that the minority be given a fair opportunity to amend legislation on the House floor.

The rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the American public has a vested interest in protecting our Nation's lands from the destructive uses that would ruin their natural beauty. In my home State of Florida, the protection and preservation of the magnificent ecosystem known as the Everglades, which spans 3 million acres of wetlands and is home to rare and endangered species, is of utmost importance to me and my constituents. It is a national priority to ensure that these majestic wetlands and others around our country will be preserved for all future generations of Americans to enjoy. The preservation of the National Landscape Conservation System is equally important to this Nation and to this Congress.

The underlying legislation would protect 27 million acres of land of the American West considered to have significant historical, cultural, ecological, scientific or scenic value. Most of the lands in this system are already protected and administered by the Bureau of Land Management, including wilderness areas, wild and scenic rivers and national monuments. This bill will help to streamline management of the system and reduce overall bureaucracy in the program.

If the statement of the gentleman from Alaska yesterday in the Rules Committee is any indication, and I am referring to our colleague Congressman YOUNG, there is a small minority of Members who may try and argue that this bill strips the private property rights of landowners. Quite the contrary. This bill protects only the lands the Bureau of Land Management already has authority over. Additionally, no owners' rights have been violated in the past, and there is no reason to believe they will be violated in the future.

Some may also argue that the underlying legislation changes the core management authority governing the individual National Landscape Conservation System units. Conversely, the bill includes an extensive savings clause that makes it abundantly clear that nothing in the bill alters the management authority governing the individual units.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the bill would not affect the Bureau of Land Management's budget, direct spending or revenues, or the budgets of State, local or tribal governments.

Finally, the amendments made in order under the rule go a step further to address energy development, grazing rights, hunting and fishing and border security, ensuring that this bill does not change the law in these areas at all. All this bill does is help conserve and protect our Nation's land, our Nation's heritage.

It enjoys broad bipartisan support from groups including the Wilderness Society, Sierra Club, Defenders of Wildlife, American Hiking Society, the National Council of Churches, Boone and Crockett Club, National Trust for Historic Preservation, National Wildlife Foundation, and the Outdoor Industry Association.

The bill also enjoys the often unheard of support from both President Bush and former President Clinton.

It is my sincere hope that the House will pass this rule and underlying bill with the same overwhelming bipartisan support it currently enjoys. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the National Landscape Conservation System Act as we further our efforts to protect and preserve public lands throughout America.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and namesake Mr. HASTINGS from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this is an unfair rule making in order, in my view, a bad bill, and a poor way to run the House of Representatives. It is claimed by this legislation's proponents that it is just an attempt to write into Federal law a new BLM, Bureau of Land Management, land management scheme that was invented by then-Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt.

□ 1215

It is the weakest of justifications for passing legislation and an abdication of responsibility for the legislative branch, for this Democratic Congress, to argue that we have to pass this bill to authorize what the last Democratic President created by fiat. Yet the harm to the powers and responsibilities of the House and our public lands is far greater.

This bill simply doesn't write into law the national landscape conservation system that Secretary Babbitt created, because this bill is written so poorly and loosely that it actually gifts the authority of the Congress over to the political appointees and career department bureaucrats in the Interior Department.

Vague words such as ''values'' are left undefined by this bill. It is the job of the Congress to define terms and write bills plainly and clearly. Not doing so gives away the power to these presidential appointees and career bureaucrats. When the elected Congress doesn't do its job, the unelected agencies and departments are free to impose their opinions and philosophy as laws and regulations.

With the faults and deficiencies of this bill so obvious, it was no surprise that last night 28 amendments to improve this legislation were filed with the Rules Committee, and with the Democratic track record of shutting down debate in this Congress, it was certainly no surprise when the Democratic Rules Committee blocked 19 of these amendments and denied representatives an ability to come to the floor and have a debate and a vote on their proposals.

My dear friend from Florida noted that the rule makes in order two Democratic amendments and six by Republicans, but I must point out that this means that every amendment offered by the Democrats were made in order, but 19 were not allowed to be made in order that were sponsored by Republicans.

Many relevant and constructive amendments were shut down by the Democratic Rules Committee. These include amendments to ensure the ability for wind and solar energy production on these public lands, to require that the Federal Government fully fund payments in lieu of taxes to local governments before spending new funds on landscaping, to ensure that there is no net loss of off-highway recreation areas and boating access facilities, to protect existing grazing rights, to ensure that hunting, fishing, recreational shooting and other current uses can continue on BLM lands and to require that the privately owned property of American citizens are not included in the NCLS without the written consent of the owner.

When the Rules Committee blocked these amendments, they acted to put the decisions in the hands of the Interior Department. This bill is a threat to the ability of citizens to enjoy and use their public lands. Democrat leaders won't even permit Members of the House to vote on whether Americans will be able to continue to ride, boat, graze livestock, shoot, hunt or fish on the lands that they can use today. This Congress says to Americans that their private property rights are not certain, that these rights and their land is at risk subject to the whims of the Interior Department.

That Democratic leaders are shutting down debate on this bill is truly not a surprise, but it is a broken promise. When the new majority took control after the 2006 elections, they promised to run the most open House in history. Unfortunately, they have not kept this promise.

In fact, the Democratic majority has set a historic record of the most closed rules in the history of the House, and they have already done that in record time. They have shut down debate on the House floor more than any other majority ever.

Why have they done so? It certainly isn't because of the tremendous accomplishments of the 110th Congress. The list of items not done, overdue bills and unfinished business of this House is long and growing longer.

For example, House Democrats have refused to pass the bipartisan Senate bill to protect our country by modernizing the 1970-era FISA law to monitor foreign persons in foreign places. Another example is the farm bill that expired last September, and America's farmers have been left waiting for months and wondering when this Congress will act.

Another is fixing the Medicare payments to doctors so that they can keep caring for seniors. Another is passing funding for the war on terrorism. The new No Child Left Behind act awaits renewal later this fall. Also the Secure Rural Schools Act desperately needs to be passed to keep the Federal promise made to rural communities whose hospitals and schools are at risk.

The State sales tax deduction expired last December for those States that don't have a State income tax like Washington and Florida. With the deadline just 6 days away, the new majority has yet to create a final budget outline for the next fiscal year.

The House isn't working on these national priorities, but last week the Rules Committee went so far as to pass a rule to restrict debate and permit only three amendments on legislation to renew the Fire Administration.

The end result of this closed process was that all three amendments passed by a voice vote and the bill passed this House by 412–0. Hardly a controversial bill, but under the closed process we are left with that example of how this House is being run.

With the House neglecting its work and not acting on these priorities, we have a lot of free time on our hands, to which the new majority leaders respond by shutting down Republicans from being allowed to offer amendments on even the most noncontroversial bills, like last week and what we will take up this week.

This is an unfair rule on a poorly written bill that threatens each and every American's ability to recreate, use and enjoy their public lands. It puts citizens' private property rights at a real risk.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule, to oppose the bill and insist that the House get to work on the important business this Congress is thus far failing to get done.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will reserve my time until the gentleman has closed and yielded back his time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 4 minutes to my good friend and former member of the Rules Committee, Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the gentleman from Washington yielding me the time. It is always a pleasure for me to be on the floor with the two Representative HASTINGS who represent different parts of the country here. It's a pleasure.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a young State legislator in my second term, actually I was still in my twenties, so you know that was a long, long time ago, someone once came to me with an idea of doing some PR by doing what everyone wants to do, and that is to eliminate useless legislation. I thought this is great. This is going to be a great stunt that I can use to eliminate some useless legislation.

I picked a statute still in the Utah code still on the books which required the State of Utah to fund a summer encampment for every veteran of the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and, since when this was written, it also said the Great War. Since there were no veterans alive, I thought this was an ideal situation to try to pass, and I introduced the bill.

The unfortunate thing is, even though this bill was supposed to do nothing, when it went to the committees of jurisdiction, there was this impending desire on the part of legislators to make the bill actually do something. By the time it went actually through the process, this bill allowed for any veterans group, including Boy Scouts, to be able to use all the National Guard armories in the State of Utah free of charge.

It got to the point where I killed my own bill, because all of a sudden something that wasn't supposed to do anything was now doing something. What it was doing was really, really wrong and not intended.

Now the proponents of this particular bill say the greatest benefit from this bill is simply that it basically does nothing. It doesn't change anything.

However, one of the proponents, when asked by his local newspaper if this would increase the cost and the regulations on these lands said, well, you establish the system first and then we go to step two.

It is what that step two may or may not be that has the greatest amount of concern with this particular bill, which direction will we be going? This bill talks about establishing values for the management of this land, but nowhere does it ever talk about what these values actually are.

We will hear amendments on the floor that we are talking about grazing and hunting and fishing and energy rights, as those are part of the values that should have been described and should have been defined in the very basis of this bill.

But what is significant is what will not be allowed to be discussed on this floor with this particular bill. Specifically, how do you treat individuals with this bill? We had an amendment that deals with the concept of recreation, boating and shooting rights. There would be no net loss of territory. On these types of recreation activities, this is a perfect example to talk about is this part of the value of these lands? It's traditional, and yet it was denied the ability to even present that on the floor.

We talked about the border security. There will be an amendment which will codify the status quo on border security, which is not what we wanted to bring up, because what we were talking about is not the status quo, which is bad, but changing the status quo. Those efforts to try and expand that opportunity on border security were denied discussion on this floor on the rule.

Now, this particular entity, this national land conservation system, came from the fertile mind of Secretary Babbitt. It also did not have a specific definition of what the values were.

There are two types of parks and monuments. Not all parks and monuments are created equal. Parks and monuments, run by the Park Service, talk about values and they are specified as to what those values are. What this bill is now trying to do is codify a new entity that will be talking about values of BLM, parks and national monuments.

Now, when you talk to the Department of the Interior, one of the reasons they say they are somewhat supportive of the concept of this bill was because it would allow them to maintain the multiple use values that make a difference between park service land and BLM land.

Yet when we tried to add an amendment to this bill, both in committee and again in the Rules Committee, to specifically say that one of the values must be multiple use, it was defeated on a straight party-line vote.

Once again, the very essence of the difference between national park monuments and national parks and BLM national parks and national monuments is this concept of multiple use. Yet we are not allowed to even talk about that, which goes to the question, if people eventually take legislation and want it to do something, in what direction will this take us? What will they start wanting to do?

If the core difference between national park land and BLM land is not specified in this legislation, where, actually, will we end up? This bill may, indeed, do something that we do not want to see happening, and this entity, which is nothing more than a $15 million a year boondoggle right now, a redundancy at best, could indeed end up to do something that creates real harm and real destructive elements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Now there is one other part that should have been part of this discussion and was not allowed by my friends on the Rules Committee.

It was briefly addressed by the gentleman from Florida, but he missed the point, I think, that the gentleman from Alaska was trying to make dealing with personal property.

Supposedly this issue does not deal with personal property because we are only dealing with BLM property. The difference, though, is with all of those entities within the Bureau of Land Management proposal, there are private inholdings. They have been a constant source of problem and contentions.

Unless you specify the significant value of how you are going to treat these inholdings, you make the situation of those private property holders much more difficult. You raise the specter of trying to change access restrictions because, indeed, if you are now going to run this land like the park service land, that will be a problem.

Not only do you create another level of bureaucracy to make those trying to solve their problems much more difficult to get equity, you also create all sorts of different solutions to be there that should have been specified in the legislation.

Protecting the private property holders' inholdings in those properties right now is one of the values that BLM lands should be doing, and it should be specified. It is not in this bill. The fact that we cannot add that to this bill, because of a ruling on a partisan vote by Rules Committee, is devastatingly wrong.

□ 1230

It will take us down a path where who knows what will be the end result. But, it is an end result that will have the high likelihood of harming individual people, individual people who use this land right now, either for recreation purposes, for sporting purposes, for hunting purposes, or for their own land value purposes, will be harmed unless those issues are clearly specified in this language, and the amendments to do that were not made in order.

Several good amendments were made in order, not nearly enough because this bill, as written, is flawed; and this bill, as amended, would still be flawed because it doesn't address those particular issues.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend from Utah not to leave, and I am going to ask him a question and then yield time to him, with the Speaker's permission.

The gentleman from Utah is my good friend and he served with us on the Rules Committee, but I am just curious, as the ranking member of the committee of relevant jurisdiction, did you offer these measures? And, in addition, in the Rules Committee did you offer any statement in support of your measures? Finally, you did offer one amendment that I would suggest we save yourself from by not making it in order because you are not asking, of course, or want us to take up a measure that is going to cost the Treasury $5 billion.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Thank you very much, but please don't try and save myself from anything in the future.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I will work on that.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Put all of my amendments on the floor, and then, then you've got a good argument that is there.

Indeed, one of these amendments, specifically the amendment on multiple use, was discussed in committee and was defeated on a partisan voice vote. That issue still is one that is relevant and needs to be part of this bill. If it is not, you have taken the core values between BLM and National Parks and blurred the lines into nonexistence. You can't do that. That has to be one of the values that is here.

The second issue I am talking about is private property rights. As I recall, I did not present that in the committee so but it is still very relevant and should be here, and is one of the problems that we are developing if we continue to go on with this.

I do have to say to the gentleman from Florida, no, I did not have the privilege of going before your committee and testifying last night. Gosh, I wish I could have done that, and I know you guys really wanted me to be there to continue the testimony and elongate the meeting last night.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Reclaiming my time, did you not have the privilege or did you choose not to come?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank you if I can answer that question, and as much as I would have loved to, I must say in reality Delta Airlines made the decision for me.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Yes, but that wasn't a privilege lost, that was just an airline not working.

Reclaiming my time, I wanted my friend to have an opportunity to say those things that he did. And notwithstanding his admonition, I can assure him that when he is offering measures that are going to cost the Treasury $5 billion and violate the PAYGO rule, that on the Rules Committee I will try to save him one more time.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would just make this point: There are many times when amendments are filed by Members of this body and they do not come to the Rules Committee and their amendments are made in order, and that was the case, for example, of one of the amendments that was made in order by a Democrat Member last night. Those things do happen.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, this is a restrictive rule that prevents Members of this House from offering amendments to try and improve the poorly and loosely written underlying bill.

As has been said several times, 19 amendments were blocked by the Rules Committee. This rule does not allow the House to debate amendments to protect American's current ability to enjoy these BLM lands through fishing, riding, hunting, and boating.

But even more egregious is that this rule blocks the House from voting on an amendment to protect private property rights of American citizens. As Representative BISHOP has pointed out, and he had filed an amendment to the Rules Committee, it was amendment No. 13, that would have simply directed the Secretary of the Interior not to include private property within the National Landscape Conservation System without the written consent of the landowner, and this deals with the issue of in holdings, as Mr. BISHOP mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair amendment. It is an important amendment. It seeks only to protect the private property rights of American citizens. The Rules Committee should not have blocked his amendment from being made in order and let Members vote ''yes'' or ''no'' on that amendment.

So I am going to give, Mr. Speaker, Members an opportunity to support or oppose private property rights by asking Members of the House to defeat the previous question on the rule. By defeating the previous question, I will seek to amend the rule to allow Representative BISHOP to offer his private property rights amendment No. 13. By voting ''no'' on the previous question, Members are voting to respect and protect the private property rights of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material inserted into the RECORD prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question and the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule and an inclusive rule. We have heard here why we must pass this rule and the National Landscape Conservation System Act. Far too many of our Nation's natural treasures have already been compromised by a variety of destructive threats. It is Congress' responsibility to ensure that the National Landscape Conservation System is forever protected. Each National Landscape Conservation System unit has been established by Congress or Presidential proclamation and is managed according to its enabling authority. This legislation establishes the system in statute.

It is crucial for Congress to act as a good steward for environmental land protection and fully codify the National Landscape Conservation System. It is our duty to help preserve the natural heritage of our Nation for all future generations of Americans to one day enjoy. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1084 OFFERED BY REP. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 4 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in the report of the Committee on Rules if offered by Representative Bishop of Utah or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 4. The amendment referred to in section 3 is as follows:

Page 4, line 9, strike ''and''.

Page 4, line 11, strike the period and insert the following:

(3) by ensuring that no private property will be included in the system without written consent of the owner.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry,

asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and suspending the rules with respect to House Resolution 1077.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 190, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 164]

YEAS—220

Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—190

Aderholt
Akin
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Abercrombie
Alexander
Boucher
Buyer
Cubin
Davis, Tom
Diaz-Balart, L.
Ferguson
Granger
Hill
Hunter
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Larson (CT)
Neugebauer
Rothman
Rush
Shays
Sires
Velázquez

□ 1300

Mr. NUNES, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. LAMPSON changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. HOLT changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 188, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—220

Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth

Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—188

Aderholt
Akin
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Abercrombie
Alexander
Boucher
Buyer
Cubin
Davis, Tom
Diaz-Balart, L.
Ferguson
Granger
Green, Al
Larson (CT)
McGovern
Neugebauer
Rothman
Rush
Shays
Sires
Sullivan
Sutton
Udall (CO)
Velázquez
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remaining in this vote. Two minutes remaining.

□ 1307

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably delayed and missed the vote on H. Res. 1084, the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2016, the National Landscape Conservation System Act (rollcall 165). Although H. Res. 1084 passed by a vote of 220–188, I respectfully request the opportunity to record my position. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 165.

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA TO END ITS CRACKDOWN IN TIBET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1077, 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 California (Mr. BERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1077.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

YEAS—413

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
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 Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
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
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
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
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—17

Abercrombie
Boucher
Buyer
Cubin
Diaz-Balart, L.
Feeney
Ferguson
Granger
Larson (CT)
Miller, George
Neugebauer
Rothman
Rush
Shays
Sires
Udall (CO)
Velázquez

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remaining in this vote. Two minutes remain.

□ 1315

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.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1665

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1665.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SARBANES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2016.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION SYSTEM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1084 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2016.

□ 1317

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2016) to establish the National Landscape Conservation System, and for other purposes, with Mr. HOLDEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2016 is simple, straightforward legislation. The bill would provide statutory authorization for a conservation system which was established administratively nearly a decade ago. This is not a land management policy bill, rather, it seeks to finally grant the National Landscape Conservation System the congressional recognition that it truly deserves.

The NLCS covers approximately 26 million acres, about 10 percent of the land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, including all national scenic and historic trails, national conservation areas, national monuments, wilderness areas, wild and scenic rivers, and wilderness study areas managed by the BLM.

The individual lists which make up the National Landscape Conservation System are unique and beautiful. Canyons of the Ancients in Colorado, Craters of the Moon in Idaho, Agua Fria and Vermillion Cliffs in my home State of Arizona, these are poetic names for poetic landscapes. And Mr. Chairman, these units are truly nationally significant, ecologically, scientifically and culturally. For example, Agua Fria National Monument is remarkable for its natural splendor, with the Agua Fria River cutting through Sonoran Desert mesas, and for its unique and diverse wildlife, which includes pronghorn antelope, javelina, and the gila monster, among many others. But the monument also preserves significant and intact pueblo ruins, some with more than 100 rooms, terraced agricultural fields, which bear witness to the lives and stories of those that came long before us.

Like Agua Fria, each of the units included within the NLCS was created to conserve unique cultural and natural resources. But while the individual monument or wild and scenic river or other designations which make up the system are about conservation, creation of the NLCS itself has more to do with accomplishing the full mission of the Bureau of Land Management. From 1946 to 1996, very large, new national monuments created under the Antiquities Act was removed from BLM management and turned over to National Park Service.

The National Landscape Conservation System was created to assure that these valued public lands remain in the BLM system, allowing the agency to manage them and fully realize the conversation aspect of its multiple-use mandate.

The NLCS has been enormously successful. Visitation to these areas is increasing as more people are learning about BLM's spectacular landscapes. From its red rock deserts to its rugged coastlines, NLCS units provide unique and world-class outdoor recreation opportunities for hikers, hunters, anglers, climbers and bird watchers, among many others. Sportsmen consider these areas essential not only for their recreational value, but also because the NLCS is critical to the conservation of fish and wildlife habitat on BLM lands.

Mr. Chairman, opponents of this bill seem to be concerned that it will somehow change or alter the current management of these lands. This is simply not true. Included in H.R. 2016 is a section that specifically states, ''Nothing in this act shall be construed to enhance, diminish or modify any law or proclamation (or regulations related to such law or proclamation) under which the components of the system identified in section 3(b) were established or are managed, including but not limited to the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, the Wilderness act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, the National Trails System Act, and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act.''

After almost a decade of success, it is time for Congress to finally put its stamp of approval on this system by formally authorizing NLCS. H.R. 2016 does nothing more or less than write the NLCS into statute. The bill will not alter management of a single acre of Federal, State or private land. Enactment of this legislation will not change the management of these areas, but it will change the perception; it will not upgrade their protection, but it will upgrade their stature.

The coalition of organizations supporting 2016 is as diverse as the system itself, including environmental groups, the American Hiking Society, the National Council of Churches, American Sportfishing Association, Boone and Crockett Club, National Trust for Historic Preservation, National Wildlife Federation, and the Outdoor Industry Association. The Bush Administration has enthusiastically supported the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, what we have here are uniquely American places that should and must be recognized. The NLCS deserves congressional sanction, and we should grant it.

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

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

You know, there was a time when Pete Rose was trying out to make a baseball team, and the scouting report said that ''Rose can't make a double play, he can't throw, he can't hit left-handed and he can't run.'' The first time Fred Astaire tried to make a movie preview, the report coming back on Fred Astaire was, ''he can't act, he's slightly bald, and he can dance a little bit.'' The Boston Red Sox were reviewing a new outfielder, and the scouting report came back saying, ''he's not the Red Sox type.'' The guy they were actually scouting was Willie Mays. Which simply means, in life, sometimes what we see and sometimes what we're told is not necessarily the reality of situations. As groups and individual Members of Congress are starting to see this bill for what the details are is one of the reasons why we see some of those groups peeling off on their support.

Why, some of the issues we raised in committee, it was said they're not really issues, now there are amendments that have been proposed by the majority party to deal with those so-called ''nonissues.''

It is said all we're trying to do here is codify and make permanent an institution that's already in existence, but it is much, much more than that. My freshman year, the goal of the freshman class was to try to eliminate waste, fraud and abuse in government. Sometimes I wish we were still doing this because today we have reached the mother lode of waste, fraud and abuse.

This is an entity, the National Landscape Conservation System, which spends money, but it does not hire anyone, it does not fire anyone, it does not write regulations, it does not repeal regulations, it doesn't administer any land, it doesn't manage any land. For the life of me, we have been trying to figure out what this thing does other than spend $50 million a year to encourage and to bring attention to certain particular areas.

We are told that this bill would not change any of that. This bill apparently does nothing to an entity that does nothing. But I'm going to portend to you that the reason this entity has been so successful so far is simply because it's been under the auspices of the Secretary of the Interior. But if, indeed, we codify this and put this into statute, an entity right now which sticks out on a flowchart like a sore thumb that doesn't really do anything will change, it will change significantly, and all of a sudden it will start to do something. And that's where the danger arises. Because when we wrote down the values of this supposed new system, they are extremely vague, which means, first of all, it opens us up to lawsuits right and left. If the amendment that will be offered later does not pass to try and limit the impact of those lawsuits, we are offering this Nation a great deal of harm and potential peril.

We have spent $50 million every year on what can best be called a redundant organization, but it actually should be changed. And the question obviously is, will we be spending more in this society? Now, once again, the proponents say nothing will change, it's not going to cost more, CBO says it's not going to cost more, there will be no regulations. The chairman of the subcommittee that sponsored this bill was asked once again at one point in time, will this create more cost, more regulation, and the answer was simply this: Well, you go in to establish the system, and then you go to step two. What that step two is is the fear that happens to be here. The values that have never been identified in this legislation dealing these parts of land deal with such issues as recreation. Amendments to actually define that were not allowed to be discussed. It deals with border security. Amendments to define that were not allowed to be discussed. We will have another border security amendment which, in my estimation, does anything more than establish the status quo as our policy when the status quo is not sufficient.

We will have discussions over grazing issues and energy issues. We should have had discussions over private end holding issues. All of those should be defined as part of the values that we are talking about here.

The Department of Interior has been very positive about this. They said they support this concept because it allows them to do what has always been done that is the difference between BLM monuments and parks versus national park monuments and parks, and that is, the value of multiple use. But in committee, when we tried to amend the language so that multiple use was a value to be maintained, it was defeated on a party line vote. And when we went to the Rules Committee and tried to make sure that we had a chance to discuss this, to put in multiple use as the value that is significant, it was again denied the ability even to discuss that on the floor. And that is the sum and substance that is different.

Now, we are dealing with a system that impacts people and their lives. It was said by Sir Henry Maine, ''Nobody is at liberty to attack civil property and say at the same time they value civilization because the history of two can never be disentangled.'' And that is where we're at.

Unless this bill is significantly modified, this bill will do harm to people. Unless this bill is changed and this system is moved back, it will do significant harm to people.

We have problems within this entity right now. Rather than solve any of these problems, it provides vague and fluffy language that will make the situation worse. It does not solve the problems, but it does create a permanent statutory entity without any solutions and, indeed, goes the other direction and makes permanent solutions to our problems more difficult actually to accomplish.

This simply is a bill whose time is not now. This is a bill that does not tell us exactly what to expect. It opens up the Federal Government to all sorts of potential lawsuits, and doesn't actually come up with a value that makes BLM land different than Park Service land, which is multiple use. That phrase has to be in that bill if this bill has any chance of having any some rationality of purpose.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), for his excellent leadership on this issue. He is the sponsor of it. I rise as chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources to lend my strong support thereto.

The National Landscape Conservation System was administratively established 8 years ago. It is comprised of Western public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management that have been placed in conservation status either by presidential proclamation or by acts of Congress.

The BLM refers to the NLCS as ''Landscapes of the American Spirit.'' And the agency is enthusiastic about this system. And rightly so because it works. It works to highlight some of the unique features of these lands, and it helps BLM shed its imagine of simply being the Bureau of Livestock and Mining.

The pending legislation is supported by the Bush administration. I know that may raise some suspicion in certain quarters, but I can assure those of my colleagues who may have reservations with the bill due to this fact that the Natural Resources Committee has thoroughly examined the legislation. And under Chairman GRIJALVA's leadership, I'm here to assure you that there are no hidden provisions of this legislation to grow even more oil rigs on our already pressed public lands or to overthrow past presidential proclamations creating national monuments. This bill is a congressional stamp of approval of the existing NLCS system.

Each of the 850 or so areas that are part of this system came into it through different avenues. Many were designated by Congress as wilderness areas or national wild and scenic rivers, national conservation areas, or national historic and scenic trails. Others were designated by Presidents as national monuments under the Antiquities Act. As such, each element of the NLCS carries with it its own management regime. There is no one size fits all. The pending legislation does not change that.

And to make that point crystal clear, the bill contains a savings clause. It is a sweeping savings clause stating that nothing in this legislation enhances, diminishes, or modifies any law or proclamation under which the various components of the NLCS were established.

Later during debate on this bill, an amendment will be offered by the floor manager, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), which will further elaborate on the savings clause by specifying nothing in this legislation can impede Homeland Security. I urge my colleagues to support that amendment. In addition, there will be an amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. JASON ALTMIRE, to further elaborate on the savings clause as it relates to hunting, fishing, trapping, and recreational shooting that may take place on NLCS lands. This is a constructive amendment and one which we worked with my good friends at the National Rifle Association, and I urge my colleagues to support that amendment as well.

There are other amendments which fall under the category of putting forth a solution in search of a problem which simply does not exist, and I would urge opposition to those amendments.

So in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the bill and again commend the gentleman from Arizona for managing it on the floor today, for his sponsorship, and his valuable leadership.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Idaho, a member of the committee (Mr. SALI).

Mr. SALI. Mr. Chairman, those recreating in Idaho, whether residents or tourists, will likely head to lands encompassed by this bill. More than 2 million acres in Idaho alone will be affected, which will in turn affect many of the uses enjoyed in Idaho, four wheelers and off-highway motorbikes, hunting, boating, and shooting. All of that today is at risk because of the legislation before us.

But more than just recreation is threatened by the bill. Federally managed public lands, treasured by so many, are in jeopardy of being cut off except to those who have the health and the strength to hike or perhaps to mountain bike.

My 84-year-old mother can only walk with a walker but still enjoys the outdoors. Mr. Chairman, look at that smile. I think everyone wishes that their mother could have that kind of enjoyment. With activities including off-highway vehicle use threatened under this bill, my mother and others like her will have no meaningful way to enjoy these lands. The same is true of people with disabilities. Today we are telling those individuals that these 2 million acres in Idaho and 26 million acres across the West will not be accessible to them and will only be available to a small segment of our society with very narrow uses.

Public lands should be available for everyone, including the elderly and people with disabilities, not just a select few. We can and must do better.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), an original cosponsor of H.R. 2016.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the National Landscape Conservation System Act. This bill will help protect some of our Nation's most treasured landscapes. I want to commend my chairmen, both Mr. GRIJALVA, the subcommittee chairman from Arizona; and Mr. RAHALL, the full committee chairman, for bringing this important legislation to the floor today.

The NLCS was created administratively in 2000 to guide the management of the national monuments, wilderness areas, and other significant public lands under the Bureau of Land Management's authority. Many of these lands, like the Carrizo Plain National Monument and California Coastal Monument in my congressional district, are on par with our national parks in their beauty and value to the American people.

Unfortunately, the system has taken a back seat in our country's land conservation efforts. It's been shortchanged in funding in the President's budget year after year. There are not enough resources or staff to properly manage these lands. And reports continue to surface that the natural, cultural, and archeological sites on NLCS lands are being overrun or destroyed.

Today we can take the first step in improving the stewardship of these lands by passing H.R. 2016. This is a straightforward bill. It simply writes the NLCS into law. I want to stress to my colleagues this bill does not change how any of the units in the system are presently managed. Grazing rights, water rights, and public access to the areas are unchanged. The bill does, however, recognize that these landscapes are of great significance to the American people and should be managed to protect their values. Over the coming decades, these lands will become more widely used, and we must be prepared to handle that increase.

Finally, we have other areas that should be part of NLCS, and I hope they are, places like the Piedras Blancas Light Station in any district. I hope this will special place as one example, a place on California's central coast, will be soon be added to the system through legislation I have already introduced.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a logical and needed next step toward improving the management of the units that make up the NLCS. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 2016.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to one of the sponsors of this bill, our good friend and colleague from California, where obviously at this particular time both physically and intellectually we are on different sides of the field on this particular issue, but I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO MACK).

Mrs. BONO MACK. I thank the ranking member for his generosity in yielding me this time.

I rise today as a co-Chair of the NLCS Caucus and supporter of H.R. 2016. This system, which is managed by the executive branch, deserves the oversight of Congress that comes with the passage of this legislation. One unit of the NLCS, the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument, is within my congressional District. This monument is instructive to today's debate. The unit was created by Congress in 2000 and was the direct result of the desire to have the public get involved in the creation of a large Federal land designation. The result is an impressive example of Federal lands that are to this day managed in their own unique manner. The intention of this bill is to continue the management and specific uses that are allowed on Federal lands across the country, the same approach taken at this monument ever since the creation of the NLCS in 2000.

With bipartisan backing and the endorsement of the administration, again, the endorsement of the administration, it is my hope that we can agree to move this bill forward.

Again, I thank my ranking member very much for his generosity and his time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey, a sponsor of the legislation (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2016, the National Landscape Conservation System Act.

Think about it. Ranging from the awe-inspiring volcanic landscape of the craters of the Moon National Monument in Idaho to the majestic White Mountain National Recreation Area in Alaska, the Bureau of Land Management's National Landscape Conservation System protects some of the most spectacular landscapes in America. Altogether it protects 26 million acres of America's diverse public lands from Alaskan tundra to red-rock wilderness, deep river canyons to ocean coasts, to American Indian cliff dwellings, and our Nation's oldest trails. These sites provide Americans with unique venues for recreation, for wildlife viewing, for exploring history, for scientific research, and for a wide range of traditional uses.

H.R. 2016 would ensure that all 800 sites that comprise the NLCS remain a cohesive and protected system for generations to come. Now, currently these are recognized only through BLM administrative regulations. There's no guarantee that these beautiful sites, that this system, will continue to exist even 5 years from now.

President Lyndon Johnson put it well. He said, ''If future generations are to remember us more with gratitude than sorrow, we must achieve more than just the miracles of technology. We must leave them a glimpse of the world as it was created, not just as it looked when we got through with it.'' By making the NLCS Federal statute, we will ensure that future generations will enjoy these national treasures, and I urge my colleagues to support Mr. GRIJALVA's legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, it is vital that we work to protect grazing on public and private lands. In fact, communities throughout the United States depend on it.

Millions of acres of lands within the NLCS have grazing. The NLCS is a direct threat to grazing for these several reasons. This is not by accident. Advocates who testified in support of H.R. 2016 list grazing as a ''threat'' to NLCS lands.

This bill, in fact, directs the Secretary of Interior to manage NLCS lands similar to the National Park Service. This is a problem because there is no grazing on National Park Service lands. Outside groups will use this to drive off ranchers through lawsuits. This is harmful not only to ranchers themselves, a very difficult industry at this time, but to the communities in which they reside. It is also harmful ultimately to the American consumer.

I urge others to vote ''no'' on H.R. 2016 and encourage a balanced policy as a result.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you very much, Chairman GRIJALVA and Chairman RAHALL, for your very hard work on bringing this bill to the House floor today.

Connecticut's Fifth District, which I have the honor to represent, is rich in the kind of landmarks and natural treasures that today's legislation would help to better manage. From the beautiful Farmington River, a Wild and Scenic River, to the Metacomet Monadnock Mattabesett Trail, soon to be a National Scenic Trail, my constituents are personally familiar with the kind of benefits and resources these designations can provide in encouraging community-driven conservation and land management.

As we continue to grow as a region and as a Nation, we need to be mindful of preserving that delicate balance with the natural world around us. My home State of Connecticut has the highest proportional rate of farm land development in the country, creating a quandary for communities who want to promote economic development but don't want to sacrifice the unique character of their towns and of their regions in the process.

□ 1345

This is the kind of bipartisan issue that brings many of us together. The designations that my district enjoys today come by virtue of the hard work of my predecessor, Congresswoman JOHNSON. This brings together hunting enthusiasts as much as it does environmental advocates, and they are all asking the question, how do we best leverage the resources of the Federal Government to partner with communities?

The Federal Government can and should be that type of partner in helping support the regional management of the outdoors. A better coordinated Federal effort, which this bill will bring, can empower communities and can empower individuals to have a larger, more constructive role in the sensible conservation of our land and of our resources.

Again, I thank the chairman for his work on this bill. And I urge my colleagues to support it this afternoon.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to a member of the committee, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2016. One of the Resources Committee staffers was just pointing out that 6 years ago she paid $1.10 for gasoline. Now we are seeing the price of gasoline at $3.30 and increasing. Now what have we done to improve the lives of the middle-class citizens who are struggling to pay taxes and to pay the cost of fuel for their car, and then face the prospect of losing jobs? Well, in 1995, the Republican Congress passed the provision to drill in ANWR. President Clinton vetoed that. If that had been passed, today we would have 1.5 million barrels of oil in production coming daily from there to help stem the price of gasoline. We have limited the ability to drill in our outer continental shelf, even though China is drilling 47 miles off our coast. So again, we are allowing foreign countries to develop our resources, yet we are restricting ourselves.

This past December, this Congress, under the leadership of NANCY PELOSI, put 2 trillion barrels of shale oil off limits in Colorado saying, I guess, that we're going to go ahead and import, and we're going to face the higher price of gasoline. Now, if we think there is no connection between the price of gasoline and this bill, take a look at the Wilderness Society and their 18-page brochure which tells us that it is imperative that we do something with this bill, that we pass this bill. It lists as problems that this bill will correct, road building, energy exploration, mining, recreational use, offroad vehicle use, boundary adjustments. These are all the immediate threats that the Wilderness Society points out that the NLCS is going to stop.

So we find that even the supporters of the legislation realize it is going to affect energy development, and yet our friends on the other side of the aisle say we are going to accept $3 gasoline, we are going to import from Hugo Chavez, and we are going to continue to import from the Middle Eastern countries that despise us and work against us. And they say they, as a majority, are not going to do anything. And in fact, they are going to pass this bill, which makes it more difficult for us to produce energy off of Federal lands. It just does not make sense in these times when it is a struggle for middle-class taxpayers to pay the bills of the family, to feed the family and then get the kids to the soccer games, to the classrooms and back, and we are passing a bill that has significant effects on the western lands of this country.

In many of my counties, we have 10 percent private lands. In many of my counties, the back will be broken of all economic activity as we undergo this management change, this way we manage our lands. Our western lands are managed well. Maybe the Bureau of Reclamation and the Forest Service could do a better job. But they are doing a good job. Instead, we are going to say we are going to treat all of the western lands like parklands where we have no economic activity at all.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is sadly misguided. And it is not without understanding. My office proposed an amendment for wind energy on these lands. And they rejected without debate the idea that we would not only want to have energy production, but also convert to renewables on public lands. They rejected that without debate, without discussion, because they know they do not want the footprint of any entity, not even oil and gas or renewable energy.

Mr. Chairman, I would recommend that we turn this bill down flat because it is going to affect the future of all of our hardworking citizens. Just last year, Dow Chemical announced a $22 billion facility is going to Saudi Arabia. It is going because the price of natural gas is so high here. It took over 10,000 jobs with it when it went. We are seeing our jobs leave because of the policies that are being put in place by this majority. And this bill is just one more addition to those bad pieces of legislation of bad policy that is restricting oil and gas and restricting renewable development on the lands.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. If the gentleman from Arizona would like to reclaim his time, I realize he has just had one of his speakers come in here, and we can keep the order going, which would be fine with me.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, let me recognize Congressman INSLEE, a member of the Resources Committee, a sponsor of the legislation, for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. INSLEE. I rise in support of Mr. GRIJALVA's bill. I really applaud his leadership on this. It is long overdue.

This bill really takes care of the landscape conservation treasures that

we have come to enjoy. It protects 26 million acres of BLM's most exceptional landscapes. And to put it in perspective, that is a lot of territory, but it is only 10 percent of the BLM-managed areas. It is a very reasonable thing for us to do. And the reason is that it protects the heritage, the ancient Native American sites, pioneer ranches and pioneer homesteads. I am a fellow of the West. I enjoy looking at them. It preserves historic trails, rugged and remote mountains, deserts, prairies and rivers. These are the jewels in the crown of the BLM-managed property, and all Americans have a stake in them.

When you think about how expansive this is, there is something for everybody in America in this bill, those who like to raft, to hunt, to sightsee, to fish, to hike, to study, to bird-watch or to just hang around with their kids. This is an all-purpose bill. And it is a lot of places: Colorado's Canyons of the Ancients National Monument the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail, Idaho's Craters of the Moon National Monument, California's Headwaters Forest Preserve, Nevada's Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area, Montana's Upper Missouri River Breaks National Monument, Utah's Beaver Dam Mountain Wilderness Area, Oregon's Lower Deschutes Wild and Scenic River, and my kind of favorite, the Pacific Crest and Continental Divide National Trail System, a trail system that is in trouble and this bill can help preserve.

So this really is a universal bill. And I want to point out something that is kind of uniquely American. These systems really rely on volunteers to keep them healthy. And I want to commend the thousands of volunteers who spend their weekends working on these trails providing interpretive services. Thank you to all of you who are doing this. This bill will help them to have a more organized system, and I think it is a real economically sound thing to do.

The Bush administration has indicated its support for this bill. It's straightforward codifying legislation. As a member of the Resources Committee, I want to applaud Mr. GRIJALVA and all of those Americans who are going to take their kids out to these places and have a grand time. Congratulations on passing this bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. At this time, I am happy to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding time.

This legislation will turn 26 million acres of land, the same size of all of New England, or 16 States, that are now in the Western part of the United States into vast tracks that will be walled off from almost all human use to the United States except illegals. And here is the reason I say that.

This bill is nothing more than another land grab by the Federal Government to restrict land use in America. Under current law, the Border Patrol is prohibited from patrolling these areas in the West and the Southwest. Remember, we are talking about the size of New England. And they are prohibited from doing so because of current law. And this measure will make it actually worse. All in the name of protecting the environment, we are going to restrict land use by our Border Patrol and American citizens.

Here is part of the problem that is already occurring on current land that we are trying to protect the environment from. This is a place called ''Amnesty Highway'' in Arizona where illegals come through the United States in an area where the Border Patrol cannot patrol with their vehicles. They are dumping all kinds of garbage and then moving into the vastness of the United States. This bill should be called the ''Illegal Immigrants Paradise Land Act'' because the area in question under this act will be a safe haven for illegal immigrants. In fact, just 2 months ago in the Tucson Weekly, it reported rampant illegal immigrant activity in Arizona's Ironwood Forest National Monument, that is this area right here, an estimated 180,000-acre preserve managed already by the Federal Government. People in Arizona call this the ''Amnesty Trail,'' the ''Amnesty Highway.'' The article reports that probably hundreds of illegals a week make it into the Ironwood area because of the ''Amnesty Trail.'' Areas that were once pristine wilderness now resemble dump yards because of the illegals already coming into this area. This bill will make this problem worse. In Arizona's Ironwood National Monument, 2 tons of trash left by illegal immigrants is removed every week. Trash like this that we see.

Federal land management officials can't even do their job now, and they want to restrict use of this land to Americans. In fact, for several weeks last year, Land Management officials did not even enter this area because three people were found executed. Supposedly they were illegals coming into the United States, maybe drug dealers.

So why doesn't the government do something about this problem and resolve this problem before we restrict the use of land in America to Americans? Almost all the lands included under current law have prohibitions against Border Patrol and law enforcement officials performing regular patrols by vehicles. And as I said, this bill will make the problem worse.

This other photograph is on the same trail, the ''Amnesty Trail.'' It is not a very good photograph, but it is taken with a telephoto lens. It shows a vehicle bringing in approximately 40 to 50 people in a pickup truck coming from south of the border into the United States, presumably illegals, traveling the highway that the Border Patrol is not even allowed to travel with their vehicles.

So it is important that we, for several reasons, don't pass this legislation. You know, the Border Patrol cannot protect the land, so the smugglers and the illegals have a sanctuary area in our national landscape. So much for protecting the environment. What we don't hear is that the Ironwood National Forest Monument is part of the largest human trafficking corridor in the world. Even government officials now acknowledge that there is a human trafficking problem in this area. They admit that smugglers are bringing people further north every year, giving them drugs and then abandoning them on this monument land where many of them die of starvation. So naturally, this is where all the drug runners and human traffickers go into the Arizona area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I offer the Member 1 more minute.

Mr. POE. What our government ought to be doing is opening up these lands to our law enforcement, so they can protect our Nation rather than putting another layer of Federal bureaucracy on these lands, which is what this legislation does. This bill does nothing to protect our lands, but makes our lands more susceptible to the land invasion by coyotes and drug smugglers.

There is a border crisis occurring on Federal land, and this bill ought to address that issue instead of making this bad situation worse.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. GRIJALVA. May I inquire as to how much time remains.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona has 13 minutes remaining. And the gentleman from Utah has 12 minutes remaining.

□ 1400

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

I think in the course of the debate on H.R. 2016 we are going to hear a lot of claims, a lot of allegations, of how H.R. 2016 will change the management of these public lands, how H.R. 2016 will restrict uses in the future for these public lands. I want to remind Members of section 4, Statutory Construction, the savings clause, which in fact codifies the existing management and codifies the existing uses. But we are going to continue to hear that, the generalizations. And with those generalizations come half-truths and untruths as to what this bill does and does not do.

What this bill does not do, it does not encroach on private property rights. What this bill does not do, it does not change grazing and oil and gas development on these lands. It does not threaten recreational and traditional uses of the land, including hunting, rock climbing, hiking, camping, rafting and motorized use. It does not make the conservation system park-like or eventually managed by the national parks. It does not provide additional protections for Wilderness Study

Areas in the conservation system, and will not designate new wilderness. It does not create a new level of bureaucracy. It does not take money away from national parks. It does not increase spending on government land acquisitions. And it does not impede border security.

I find it ironic that the now-minority, having been the majority for the past 7 years, has not been able to change some of the land designations that they are so upset about today. This vehicle, H.R. 2016, should not be the vehicle for them to vent their frustration. H.R. 2016 has gone through a rigorous process and has bipartisan support.

With regard to border security, the failure of this Congress to comprehensively grapple with the security issues, the border issues and the immigration issues that are facing this country, a broken immigration system that all of us can agree to, that failure to enact those should not be now made the responsibility of H.R. 2016, for the crisis that has been created by the inaction and the fearful reaction of many Members of Congress to try to deal with border issues and border security.

H.R. 2016 is a good piece of legislation. Specifically, the savings clause protects the intention of those lands, the management of those lands and the uses of those lands.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard several things about this particular piece of legislation. This new entity, the National Land Conservation System, not to be confused with the National League Championship Series, which is a much better concept, this entity was not created by congressional action. It was created as the dream child of a former Secretary of Interior less than 10 years ago.

When asked in a hearing of the Bureau of Land Management if they were incompetent to manage these lands before this new entity was established, the simple answer was no. One would then ask the question, why was there a need 10 years ago for this new entity, because this new entity still does not administer anything, they don't manage anything, they don't regulate anything, nor will they, as has been carefully delineated by the sponsor of this legislation.

The first question still should be asked, what do they really do, other than to provide some vague philosophy of recognition and enhancement and anything else? If we really simply wanted to just create this system statutorily, a one-sentence piece of legislation would do: ''There is established a National Land Conservation System.''

Is there a threat to any lands that are currently under the auspices of the Bureau of Land Management, as has been indicated by certain speakers? The answer is no. The sponsor just admitted there is no threat to that. All we are talking about is some vague new entity, and the issue of concern with this vague new entity is the language now says this new entity has certain values that it is supposed to uphold. These values are vague. Nowhere does it specifically say what these values are.

Is this a threat to private property? No more than the present system. But that is where the issue comes in. We already have threats to the private property within this system, and this piece of legislation, rather than solving that issue, exacerbates that issue altogether.

Is there a border security issue? Yes, presently, and this piece of legislation does not help that issue. It exacerbates the issue, if anything else.

It is the vagueness of the language in this bill that puts into statutory language an entity that really doesn't do anything right now. That is a problem for the future, if at some stage or some point in time Congress wants or even the entity itself wants to make it do something proactively.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY).

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman RAHALL and Chairman GRIJALVA for their continued commitment to America's natural and historic treasures.

Our national parks, forests and public lands are among our Nation's most valuable resources. In fact, one of our country's most unique national parks, the Everglades National Park, is located near my district. It is important that we continue to protect these environmentally sensitive and historically significant areas for future generations to enjoy. I believe that the bill before us today, H.R. 2016, the National Landscape Conservation System Act, does just that.

The National Landscape Conservation System, and, more specifically, the Outstanding Natural Area designation which is part of that system, was created in 2000 by the Department of Interior in an effort to better meet the management needs of our Nation's public lands and historic treasures. In addition to the better management practices, the system promotes the designation of areas under the system to help spur tourism and expand educational opportunities in surrounding communities.

Mr. Chairman, just a few short weeks ago the House passed H.R. 1922, the Jupiter Inlet Lighthouse Outstanding Natural Areas Act. This bill, which I sponsored, would designate this historic lighthouse as an Outstanding Natural Area. It is important to note that the lighthouse is much more than a historical marker. It has become a symbol of our community, woven into the fabric of our culture, even appearing on the Town of Jupiter seal. With the passage of this legislation today, we have the ability to permanently protect our historic and natural treasures, such as the Jupiter Inlet Lighthouse, for future generations.

Again, I applaud Chairman GRIJALVA for his efforts.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, in closing, the gentleman from Florida just gave a wonderful speech, and I think he illustrated some of the problems with this particular bill. The territory to which he was speaking is National Park Service land, not BLM land. This bill only deals with BLM land, and that is precisely the problem that we have with this particular bill.

It is very simple one. We have parks and national monuments, some administered by the Bureau of Land Management, some administered by the National Park Service. They are different. Each one of them has a different value.

In the Park Service, the organic act that created it said what the values for this land would be. It is established in statute and in regulation. The Bureau of Land Management does not have that same value system, because they are different lands for a different purpose, which is why the language in this bill is so troubling, because it is simply a vague statement that simply says they will have values, and it has never, never been defined.

When the Department of Interior told me personally that they were in favor of this, it was because they could maintain the Bureau of Land Management parks and monuments with multiple use as the significant value. It would be protected, they said. Which is why I am so chagrined, that when we attempted to clarify in this legislation by amendment in the committee and once again before the Rules Committee that that is specifically the difference between the Park park and the BLM park, it was rejected.

Now, multiple use is the difference between national parks in the Park Service system and national parks in the BLM system, and that language, that language has to be maintained, because that is indeed the only value that makes a difference.

These lands are not threatened if the BLM has them. They are not threatened if we don't make this system, which is redundant at best and expensive at best, codified. But we do do something dangerous if we pass this legislation and now give a vague term of values on to a system that is defined nowhere. It opens us up to litigation problems, it causes problems in administration, and it does change the system. That is why there is so much danger, unless you are willing to do what our side has been saying all along, which is define what those vague terms actually mean.

That, Mr. Chairman, is why we oppose this piece of legislation. It opens up a door that has no definition as to what room we actually enter, and that is wrong. It is simply wrong.

The problem with that is it is going to hurt people, people who use this BLM land now to recreate, people who use it to graze, people who use it for their economy, people who have private property in-holdings in this area. They are put at risk because our language is simply too vague to allow them to understand what our intent is. That is why this bill has to be defeated.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I mentioned earlier the discussion of what H.R. 2016 does not do. I think it is worth mentioning what it does do. It is very important. And I am only going to concentrate on one point. I think we will deal with the values issue in the amendment process.

H.R. 2016 unifies separate units into a coherent system. It ensures permanency, and I think that is the most important point. It will permanently establish perhaps a last great American conservation system in statute, and those lands will continue to be managed by the Bureau of Land Management and prevent any future attempts to get rid of the system. It enhances the statute of this system, and it deserves to be enhanced.

It is a good piece of legislation. It has good support from Members of Congress and from interest groups who care about the conservation issues that we face in this Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. Chairman, seizing land infringes on the most fundamental of Constitutional rights and endangers property owners across our great Nation. NLCS will eternally lock land into Government control and prevent Americans from their right to property ownership.

Our Federal Government already owns 653,229,090 acres of land. Does it really need to control any more? NLCS would take control of 26 million acres of land—13 percent of the nation's surface. This land will be forever taken and the right to own land denied. There is no justification to consume more land.

Second Amendment Rights are also under assault in this legislation. Nothing in this legislation protects hunting, fishing, or gun rights on NLCS land—even though they have traditionally been allowed.

The Constitutional right to own property should always be protected. Citizens should be allowed to utilize and prosper from the land. As chairman of the Property Rights Action Caucus, I believe that no legislation should ever infringe on property rights or attack the Second Amendment. Protect these fundamental Constitutional rights of land and gun use by voting ''no'' on H.R. 2016.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2016, the National Landscape Conservation System, NLCS, Act. This bill would codify the NLCS's management of 26 million acres of land presently under the direction of the Bureau of Land Management, BLM, affording the system the recognition, management, and unification of a national system.

The lands in question have been designated National Monuments, National Conservation Areas, Wilderness, Wild and Scenic Rivers, and National Scenic and Historic Trails by Congress and by Presidential Proclamation. Eight years ago, the Secretary of the Interior established the NLCS to manage these areas. Congressional recognition of NLCS's management of these treasured places only seeks to codify what the BLM currently administers.

H.R. 2016 does not change the BLM's multiple-use mandate. Rather, it celebrates the BLM's ability to manage its special lands for multiple uses, including conservation, for the benefit of the American people. By writing the NLCS into law, this legislation prevents any rescission that might put this new conservation system at risk. It is important that the BLM continue to manage and protect these lands and waterways enjoyed by millions of Americans each year.

I am grateful for the steps the BLM has taken in protecting this system of Federal lands and urge support of final passage of H.R. 2016.

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am a strong supporter of the rights of landowners. H.R. 2016, the National Landscape Conservation System Act, would not affect any private property. The bill deals only with land that is already owned by the Federal Government. No new lands are taken away from any person or added to Federal lands and there is no impact on how landowners can use their property.

Under the guise of protecting landowners, the minority attempted to use the vote on ordering the previous question, roll call number 164, to kill a good, bipartisan bill. I voted to order the previous question because I believe that the House of Representatives should consider and approve H.R. 2016.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SERRANO). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment is as follows:

H.R. 2016

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 ''National Landscape Conservation System Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

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

(2) SYSTEM.—The term ''system'' means the National Landscape Conservation System established by section 3(a).

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION SYSTEM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—In order to conserve, protect, and restore nationally significant landscapes that have outstanding cultural, ecological, and scientific values for the benefit of current and future generations, there is established in the Bureau of Land Management the National Landscape Conservation System.

(b) COMPONENTS.—The system shall include each of the following areas administered by the Bureau of Land Management:

(1) Each area that is designated as—

(A) a national monument;

(B) a national conservation area;

(C) a wilderness study area;

(D) a National Scenic Trail or National Historic Trail designated as a component of the National Trails System;

(E) a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; or

(F) a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

(2) Any area designated by Congress to be administered for conservation purposes, including—

(A) the Steens Mountain Cooperative Management and Protection Area, as designated under section 101(a) of the Steens Mountain Cooperative Management and Protection Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 460nnn–11(a));

(B) the Headwaters Forest Reserve;

(C) the Yaquina Head Outstanding Natural Area; and

(D) any additional area designated by Congress for inclusion in the system.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—The Secretary shall manage the system—

(1) in accordance with each applicable law (including regulations) relating to each component of the system included under subsection (b); and

(2) in a manner that protects the values for which the components of the system were designated.

SEC. 4. STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to enhance, diminish, or modify any law or proclamation (or regulations related to such law or proclamation) under which the components of the system identified in section 3(b) were established, or are managed, including, but not limited to, the Alaska National Interest Land Conservation Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.), the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1241 et seq.), and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in House Report 110–573. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report; by a Member designated in the report; shall be considered read; shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment; shall not be subject to amendment; and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110–573.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. GRIJALVA:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 5. BORDER SECURITY.

Nothing in this Act shall impede any efforts by the Department of Homeland Security to secure the borders of the United States.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1084, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

□ 1415

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment states in its entirety that nothing in this act shall impede any effort by the Department of Homeland Security to secure the borders and enforce the immigration laws of the United States.

Let me be clear, the recent decision by DHS Secretary Chertoff to waive more than 30 bedrock environmental laws, including the Safe Drinking Water Act and the National Park Service Organic Act, in order to build a wall along our southern border was, in my opinion, an abuse of discretion granted to him by the previous Congress.

I have introduced separate standalone legislation, H.R. 2593, the Borderlands Conservation and Security Act to, among other things, repeal this waiver authority because, in my view, there are better ways to secure our borders than requiring them to waive laws which protect the water we drink and the air we breathe.

I have also joined with Members of Congress in filing a notice of our intent to file briefs before the United States Supreme Court because I believe the waiver provisions violate our Constitution.

However, the bill currently before the House, H.R. 2016, is not an appropriate vehicle for addressing these concerns. This is simply an authorization bill for a conservation system. It is not intended to impact the management on any of these units, including management decisions regarding border security.

The amendment I am offering here simply makes this as clear as possible. I oppose the law, and I am using every opportunity to make that opposition plain, but this is not the bill for those opportunities.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, make sure the debate on border security takes place in the appropriate time in an appropriate manner under the appropriate legislation, and then we can move forward on this straightforward conservation bill.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I first ask uanimous consent to include an article from the Tucson Weekly that deals with the areas of this issue.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's request will be covered by General Leave.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate Mr. GRIJALVA actually taking the lead on this issue.

In fact, Republicans had two amendments that were introduced to the Rules Committee that dealt with this same specific issue. Again, in a spirit of bipartisanship, the two Republicans ones were not put in place but the Democrat one was, and at least we are addressing this particular issue.

I do happen to have some objection to this one, because to me, what this amendment does, is put into statute or to put into language the status quo. Nothing in this act shall impede what we are already doing. I think this issue should be more forward thinking. We need to change what is happening in the status quo in this area that is simply now known as the trail of amnesty, where so much illegal narcotics work, illegal human trafficking and illegal gang activity has taken place. The article to which I referred actually specifies what that is there.

That is why the amendments that were not made in order were superior to the one that is made in order here, and it should be recognized.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield to the gentleman from New Mexico 2 minutes of my time for discussion of this amendment.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, again, I would point out that in committee we heard these same comments that we are talking in generalizations, half-truths, complete untruths. We were told then that the border is completely secured in the current legislation, and now we find that maybe there is a reason to kind of adapt the wording.

We also were told that there is nothing that would limit any sports, no hunting, shooting sports, that those assertions on the part of the minority were simply generalizations, half-truths and untruths.

So it's really amazing to me that those half-truths now are being incorporated into the bill by first the bill sponsor and then by another one of the majority Members.

The complete idea and argument that all of our discussions have been generalizations, half-truths and untruths, simply now rises to a level which we have to ask ourselves on which side do the generalizations lie, on which side do the untruths lie and on which side do the half truths lie, because we are finding the majority that is adopting and adapting the bill now in order to make it more secure if they did not blink, if they had not believed the arguments in committee, they would not be making these changes today, they would not be trying to work out deals behind the scenes to make this a little bit more, maybe, less risky.

I think if we all see what's going on, I think if we see the majority blinking in a big way here on the floor, it just tells us we should turn down the underlying language and turn down this offensive impact on our public land management.

I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Do I have remaining time still, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 2 minutes left.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, let me make this clear. I have no intention of opposing or voting against the language from the gentleman from Arizona.

I am appreciative that the gentleman from Arizona and the majority party has finally taken the initiative of bringing issues up here.

My objection is that the language that was proposed to the Rules Committee in other amendments dealing with this issue was far broader and would have been better in the future. When we talk about language right now that nothing of us actually impede, we were talking in other pieces of legislation about not hindering border security, not hindering illegal immigration for Homeland Security or other law enforcement agencies.

The amendments we tried to propose would have been far broader, far more inclusive and would have dealt with issues into future as opposed to this.

But having said that, this is at least a good step in the right direction.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is straightforward, the amendment restates the obvious, and the question about taking initiative is an appropriate question. The initiative should be taken with a committee that has been formed to deal with the issues that are of great concern to some of my colleagues that have spoken.

That committee is the Homeland Security Committee, to take legislation there that would deal with the issues they were concerned about. This is not the vehicle for that legislation.

My amendment states the obvious, reiterates the obvious.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CANNON

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110–573.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. CANNON:

Page 4, at the end of line 23, insert the following: ''In addition, nothing in this Act creates a Federal cause of action based on inclusion within the National Landscape Conservation System.''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1084, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that is necessary to refine the vague language contained within this bill.

The legislation requires the lands included in the National Landscape Conservation System be managed for values, without ever defining what the term values means.

As we all know, values have different meaning to different people. In the case of land management agencies, values can range from cultural and historic resources to things as nebulous as ''smell-scapes.''

The loose definition of the underlying bill leaves the Federal Government open to litigation based on what someone may or may not determine to be consistent with what they believe are the values of lands included within the National Landscape Conservation System.

Our Federal land management agencies are currently overwhelmed with litigation which distracts from their primary mission of land management.

This amendment will prevent unnecessary and onerous litigation.

While the underlying legislation has a savings clause, it does not prevent the bringing of a lawsuit. We have been assured time and again that activities on these lands currently allowed will continue without a problem. However, the language does not include important and defined terms such as multiple use.

To illustrate the problem, in the event that multiple use activities such as grazing are currently accruing on lands within the NLCS system and an individual or group decides that grazing activities are not consistent with the values of NLCS lands, they can sue to stop the grazing activities. Consequently, a permitted activity is left open under this new regime to lawsuits based on the loose definition of values.

Most of the parameters by which management is to occur are clearly defined. Passage of the underlying bill would create standards which are not practical to administer. This will allow external groups of all kinds to challenge the BLM's management of NCLS lands based upon what the perceived values of these lands are.

My amendment merely will prohibit lawsuits against the Bureau of Land Management based on how they manage the lands under the NLCS system.

Given the huge cost that we are now suffering with litigation, preventing unnecessary litigation should be a goal of this body.

I urge all of my colleagues to support getting dollars to the ground for management, rather than tying them up in legal proceedings.

I urge support for this amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman opposed to the amendment?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Not necessarily.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, as with most of these amendments, the Cannon amendment is clearly unnecessary. Once again, we have, in this bill, an ironclad savings clause which I demonstrated earlier. That would be, after the enactment of H.R. 2016. Nothing in this act would diminish or enhance that.

The ability to sue plaintiffs that they have under current law, that would not be changed by H.R. 2016, and nothing in this act would change that. Nothing we do here creates a Federal cause of action. Since the creation of the system in 2000, nothing ever has. The proponents of this amendment are looking for a problem where a problem doesn't exist.

However, if the proponents of this amendment will feel more comfortable that we include language that simply states the obvious, then we will not oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CANNON. I appreciate the gentleman accepting this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, without further ado, I yield back.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 110–573.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

Page 2, strike line 15 and all that follows through page 3, line 2, and insert the following:

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Bureau of Land Management the National Landscape Conservation System.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1084, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, again, as I was speaking earlier about the bill, one of the problems is simply the concept of some vague elements of what ''values'' may or may not be, especially as it applies to Park Service and Bureau of Land Management lands.

The language in question that I ask to be removed from this bill is language that comes specifically from the Organic Act that created the National Park System as well as the Redwood amendments. Those two concepts caused the National Park Service to administer park lands to the same standard.

In the absence of any other definition of what Bureau of Land Management land should be in this system, it is essential that we not have to revert back to what the National Park Service uses as its values standard, and that's the fear that comes in here.

Indeed, in the BLM land that has been put into this system, you have a multitude of different land, from Bureau of Land Management monuments to Bureau of Land Management parks, to wilderness areas, to wilderness study areas. If, indeed, the same language that has forced the Park Service to manage in the same administrative pattern is now imposed on the Bureau of Land Management, it would do irreparable harm to different lands that are specifically there so that they can use multiple use.

Once again, we come back to that issue. BLM lands are supposed to be administered differently. That's why it's BLM lands in the first place. This language opens up the possibility of using the same kind of litigation techniques that force the Park Service to use all of their lands in the exact same manner onto the National Park Service.

If you change it to simply do what we said earlier, establish a National Landscape Conservation System, without the other verbiage, you eliminate that potential problem.

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

□ 1430

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman from Utah's amendment because it would undermine not only this legislation, but the mission and the mandate of the Bureau of Land Management.

The language this amendment would strike reads as follows: ''In order to conserve, protect, and restore nationally significant landscapes that have outstanding cultural, ecological, and scientific values for the benefit of current and future generations.''

These words are not new, nor are they undefined. The NLCS already exists and has existed for nearly a decade and the Bush administration supports these words as a summary of the management goals already in place for these lands under existing law.

Versions of this language are found in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, in the Wilderness Act, in the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, in Presidential proclamations and specific statutes creating these conservation units.

Restating these goals in this authorizing legislation is an appropriate mission statement and preserves the status quo. In contrast, striking them

would send a terrible message. Cutting these words out of the bill implies that these are not worthy management goals.

In effect, this amendment suggests that the BLM should no longer ''conserve, protect or restore'' places like the Canyons of the Ancients or the Vermillion Cliffs.

Cutting these words out of the bill suggests that the Grand Canyon Parashant and the Sonoran Desert are no longer ''nationally significant'' and no longer include ''outstanding values.''

Cutting these words out of the bill suggests that ''providing benefits for future generations'' is no longer a worthy goal of the BLM to pursue at Colorado Canyons or Santa Rosa and San Jacinto.

The language this amendment would strike is not a secret attempt to create a new management standard. Rather, it is simply a restatement of the way these lands are already being managed according to mandates already approved by Congress.

The gentleman may not like it. He may even be surprised to learn it, but these words are accurate reinstatements of BLM's existing conservation mandate. Striking them is an attempt to strike at the heart of that mandate, and it must be defeated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, the language that is put in here is part of the BLM mandate. They are to conserve, protect, restore cultural, ecological and scientific values for the benefit of current and future generations.

The issue at hand, though, is that this is not the only part of the BLM's management authority and management purpose. By refusing to expand this to the other areas to which BLM is supposed to do, the work they are supposed to do on this land, we are in danger of actually going the other way and trying to impose that this is the only way, especially when this language has been used in the Park Service to mandate specific management practices and hurt that process.

If you go on with this particular section, when you go to (b), it lists the kind of areas designated in this new land system. Each one was established with a certain land management plan. They are there. But the fact that we don't put them in here opens up the possibility of litigation to problems that are there.

It is important so we know that the Department of the Interior said they don't mind creating this system by statute, but they were opposed to this language. They said this language is harmful to their mission statement.

I wish to actually try and convince every Member on the floor, all three of us here, that this is indeed not what the department needs. It is not what the bureau needs. It is not the kind of language that you want to put in statute if you want to make sure what we are doing is specifically defined. This opens up more problems than we would otherwise have.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 110–573.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

Page 4, strike lines 5 through 11, and insert the following:

(c) MANAGEMENT.—The Secretary shall manage the system in accordance with each applicable law (including regulations) relating to each component of the system included under subsection (b).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1084, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I can be painfully brief on this amendment.

In two places in this bill you have the same problem we have been talking over and over about, about the vague notion of simply ''values.''

The last amendment took the very superfluous language in the preamble, which has the potential of creating problems, as it has in other sections. But also in section 3(c)(2), we once again find this vague, nefarious language.

It says that the Secretary shall manage the system in a manner that protects the values for which the components of this system were designated.

Once again, by simply saying ''values'' without any kind of definition, nor is there any regulatory definition, you have simply opened this up to a vague, contentious opportunity. If you are going to establish this system and give them something to do, for heaven's sake, tell them what they are going to do and make it simple and make it succinct.

That is why this section should be eliminated. Until we are ready to define these values, you don't put this in statute.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment for the same reasons I opposed the previous amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah.

Like the previous attempt to strike the purposes of this bill, this amendment would strike language instructing the BLM to continue managing these BLM conservation units in a ''manner that protects the values for which the components of the system were designated.''

Mr. BISHOP argues he simply does not understand what this term means, and he worries that the BLM doesn't know what it means either. Let me assure Members that this is not a new standard and that the BLM clearly understands what it means to manage land and to protect its values. In fact, they have been doing so for years.

I have here at least 10 instances in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 in which the term ''values'' is used. Not only does it appear in the declaration of policy section of that law, it actually appears in the definition of the term ''multiple use.''

If that is not clear enough, most, if not all, of the laws or proclamations creating the individual units of the NLCS refer to the ''values'' to be protected.

I have three examples. There are many more, but we have selected three because they were approved by majority-Republican Congresses. The Black Canyon of Gunnison and Santa Rosa National Monuments and the Las Cienegas National Conservation Area, all units of the NLCS, all mention ''values'' in their enabling legislation.

The section this amendment would strike is an accurate reflection of the current management standards applied to these lands. To strike it would be to downgrade these conservation areas.

For a better understanding of what this standard means, I would encourage all of my colleagues to read the law, rather than simply trying to disregard language with which they are not familiar. The amendment needs to be defeated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona's comments. His initial sentence was that I am attempting to strike the very purpose of this act. I don't really think that is accurate because there is no purpose. If there was a purpose, it would have been written down as to what the purpose is. This simply says there will be values; and there is no definition of what those values are.

I would remind all of my colleagues in this room, this is the language that the department said they do not want.

This is the language BLM says does harm to them. This is the language they said was too vague and should be fixed, and it has not been fixed. That is why it should be eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, let me read from the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976: ''the public lands to be managed in a manner that will protect the quality of scientific, scenic, historical, ecological, environmental, air and atmospheric, water resource, and archeological values.'' I repeat, this is not new language. This is language which has been part of the management of these units from its inception.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 110–573.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

Page 4, at the end of line 23, insert the following: ''Moreover, nothing in this Act is intended to additionally restrict or hinder energy development within the system.''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1084, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with one of the other issues that we are talking about as far as potential development of energy on these lands that are currently under the control of the Bureau of Land Management and may or may not actually change with the formalizing of this new entity.

With skyrocketing energy prices, the last thing that Congress should do is lock up more lands that could provide a solution.

The NLCS lands include potentially billions of barrels of oil, vast quantities of natural gas and coal, and unlimited potential for renewable energy sources such as wind and solar.

The energy development on NLCS lands is vital to the economies of western States, and to the Nation. We should be looking at ways to keep the $400 billion that we spend to buy energy overseas here at home. We are only just beginning to understand what potential there is on NLCS lands for renewable energy sources. This amendment would ensure that those options remain open.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman opposed to the amendment?

Mr. GRIJALVA. At this point, not necessarily.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. As we have mentioned, H.R. 2016 already contains an extensive savings clause which makes absolutely clear that the simple act of writing the NLCS into statute will not change the way individual units are managed.

The inclusion of this savings clause should relieve Members of the need to come to the floor today and further amend the bill to enumerate each and every possible use of public lands for specific mention in the legislation.

The underlying bill already makes plain the fact that energy development, along with other authorized uses of these lands, will continue in those areas where they are currently allowed, even after H.R. 2016 is enacted.

Apparently, this broad savings clause is not plain enough. This amendment would single out energy production for special mention as one of those uses not impacted by the bill.

From the standpoint of writing clean, clear legislation that avoids redundancy and needless repetition, I oppose the amendment.

However, if this language provides an extra level of assurance and comfort for some Members, this amendment does not really change the bill, and I am prepared to accept it.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I am assured and comforted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. ALTMIRE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 110–573.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. ALTMIRE:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of the several States to manage, control, or regulate fish and resident wildlife under State law or regulations, including the regulation of hunting, fishing, trapping, and recreational shooting on public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as limiting access for hunting, fishing, trapping, or recreational shooting.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1084, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to offer an amendment to the National Landscape Conservation System Act. Created in 2000, this act provides protective and restorative services to nearly 27 million acres of public lands, including a number of our Nation's most spectacular wilderness and scenic rivers.

□ 1445

The legislation before us today would codify this existing land preservation system, thus ensuring its existence for generations to come. However, as written, this bill does not protect the rights of our Nation's sportsmen, specifically, their continued right to hunt and fish on these lands.

Because I strongly support this right and want to make it absolutely clear that it is never infringed upon, my amendments states that enactment of this legislation will not, in any way, limit access for hunting, fishing, trapping or recreational shooting on the National Landscape Conservation System.

Furthermore, my amendment confirms that the right to manage, control and regulate hunting, fishing and trapping on these lands rests with the States, not with the Federal Government.

My amendment has garnered the enthusiastic support of a number of sportsmen's groups, including the National Rifle Association and Trout Unlimited. It is critically important that we ensure hunting and fishing activities remain a part of our Nation's heritage, so I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I wish to claim the time in opposition although, as some others have said here, I may not necessarily be in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, to be honest, I will be voting in favor of

this particular amendment. I think this is actually a very good amendment. This is the issue we presented in committee that was rejected in committee. I am glad that someone somewhere, between the path of this bill from committee to here on the floor, found religion and is actually looking forward to this particular issue. It's a good one, even though we were told in committee it was just a shadow that we were fighting on the wall.

I would recognize also that there were three amendments that were introduced that did the exact same thing that have now been incorporated in this particular amendment. Somebody once told me, well, when you steal you should steal from the best. I think this is stolen from the best simply because the ones that were not recommended were my amendments.

Therefore, since we're saying the same thing, in the spirit of bipartisanship, what else can I say, other than this is the right thing to do, and I actually personally support this particular amendment. It is the right thing to do. Regardless of who gets credit for it, it is the right thing to do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman for his comments and welcome his support.

I do have a few other speakers who wish to weigh in. I would like to now recognize my good friend and colleague from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Mr. CARNEY) for 2 minutes.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank Mr. ALTMIRE for his leadership on this position.

Hunting and angling are beloved traditions. They are activities I enjoyed with my grandfather and my father, and I enjoy them with my children.

Hunting and angling are not just sports, however. They're also a way of life where fathers and mothers can spend quality time with their children and pass on some knowledge of what they learned as children themselves.

There are over 34 million hunters and anglers in the United States, and they spend more than $76 billion a year in hunting and fishing.

It is safe to say that hunters and anglers are an economic powerhouse, driving the economy from big businesses to rural towns, through booms and recessions. They are directly supportive of 1.6 million jobs, which is twice as many jobs as the combined civilian payrolls of our Air Force, our Army, our Navy and our Marine Corps.

Because of hunters, 28,000 jobs are supported in Pennsylvania alone. Over $425 million of tax revenues is generated that can preserve land and wildlife.

Now, our bill, this amendment does several things. It codifies the National Landscape Conservation System, the NLCS, under the control of the BLM. But it will ensure that nothing in the bill will limit, in any way, access to hunting, fishing, trapping or recreational shooting on the 27 million acres administered by the BLM, the Bureau of Land Management.

It also ensures that the bill will not infringe on a State's right to manage, control or regulate its hunting, fishing, trapping and recreational shooting activities. That is why I urge all my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the coauthor of this important amendment. And at this time I would recognize another freshman colleague from the great State of Ohio, my good friend, Mr. SPACE, for 1 minute.

Mr. SPACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Altmire-Carney amendment before us. This amendment is necessary to ensure that the underlying bill protects the rights of sportsmen across the Nation. The amendment does this by making clear that in no way will the measure affect the ability of the States to regulate fish and wildlife under State laws. It also makes clear that nothing in the bill will limit access for hunting, fishing, trapping or recreational shooting.

As a gun owner, a member of the NRA, and as a member of the Sportsmen's Caucus, this amendment is incredibly important to our second amendment rights. And as my colleague from the great State of Pennsylvania indicated just a few moments ago, Mr. CARNEY, that is important to our way of life.

I'm proud to advocate for this amendment on behalf of my fellow sportsmen and women in Ohio's 18th District, and I strongly urge passage of this amendment.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment by my colleagues, Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. CARNEY, which will offer some needed comfort to those of us in the sportsmen's community who seek to protect what access remains to cherished hunting and fishing opportunities on public lands. With the adoption of this amendment, I would urge all of my colleagues on the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus to vote for the underlying bill as well.

Without a doubt, the 26 million acres that constitute the National Landscape Conservation system's more than 850 individual units represent some of the very best hunting and fishing opportunities available today. These lands harbor bighorn sheep, elk, pronghorn, mule and white-tailed deer, caribou, salmon, chinook, sockeye, steelhead, redband trout, and so many more game and non-game species, not to mention spectacular landscapes unparalelled in the rest of the bureau of land management. These are the very best places the BLM has to offer, and they are very deserving of the additional recognition and institutional support H.R. 2016 will provide.

Opponents of H.R. 2016, the National Landscape Conservation System Act, have claimed that it will create a new Federal bureaucracy that will usurp private land rights, divert Federal dollars, and dilute public access. None of these claims is true. By simply codifying in law a designation that has existed through administrative action for the last eight years, H.R. 2016 will change nothing in how the BLM or Department of the Interior manages these lands. What it will do is raise the profile of these national treasures both within the department and with the public so that they are known by all as the gems of the BLM's stewardship mandate rather than mere afterthoughts subject to executive fiat.

While the underlying bill already contains a savings clause stating that all existing laws and regulations governing these lands will continue to be exercised and enforced as before, the Altmire-Carney Amendment very simply adds an explicit reminder that hunting and fishing will continue to go hand in hand with conservation. as sportsmen and women provide the primary source of funds for state and local conservation budgets, It is appropriate that hunting and fishing rights be retained in the National Landscape Conservation system.

As co-chair of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus and a member of the Natural Resources Committee, I wish to thank my friend and subcommittee chair RAÚL GRIJALVA for introducing this bill, chairman RAHALL for his invaluable support, and Representatives ALTMIRE and CARNEY for offering this important amendment. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying measure.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 110–573.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. PEARCE:

Page 4, at the end of line 23, insert the following: ''Specifically, inclusion in the National Landscape Conservation System shall not affect current grazing rights or operations.''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1084, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, today I'm offering a simple, straightforward amendment. It states, ''Specifically, inclusion in the National Landscape Conservation System shall not affect current grazing rights or operations.'' That's it.

This language is very clear. We're working to protect the ranching economies of our western States.

In the West, many of our communities depend on ranching as a traditional and an important way of economy. The West was settled by ranchers who brought with them little more than a few cattle, the clothes on their back and hope for the future. Today, America's ranchers still hold the dream of a better future.

In New Mexico and across the West, our ranchers are real conservationists and know how to protect the land they depend on every day. Their lands are often the backstop against growth, and they are the voice of preserving the rural nature of our lands.

However, in countries in the West, it's not uncommon that we find 30 percent, 18 percent, 6 percent or even 2 percent private lands. Therefore, our ranchers depend on public lands for their operations. These ranchers bring in millions of dollars of economic activity to New Mexico and the entire West. In many places, ranching is the single largest economic driver in our communities.

My amendment will ensure that nothing in this act cuts off the current operations of ranchers in the West. Without this amendment, it is entirely possible that the enactment of this bill will cut off millions of dollars in activity and devastate our western counties.

Supporters of this bill tell us that it will not stop the multiple use of our BLM lands. However, my amendment ensures that this legislation does not stop ranching.

Let me leave you with no doubt. This amendment will ensure that we do not cut off our ranchers from lands that they have used for years. In some cases, the same ranching families have administered these lands for more than 100 years.

Ranching is an important part of our economy, an important part of the history of the West, and passing this amendment will ensure that ranching has a part of the future in this West.

It's a simple amendment. It is endorsed by the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, by the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association, New Mexico Wool Growers and the New Mexico Federal Lands Council.

Mr. Chairman, I urge its passage, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Grazing is obviously allowed in the units of the NLCS where it is appropriate, and nothing in this legislation would change that. The savings clause makes that fact as clear as it could possibly be. The underlying bill makes no changes to existing grazing rights.

Were this amendment written simply as an extension of the savings clause, as many other amendments offered today have been, it would be unnecessary, but not harmful to the bill. This amendment goes much, much further, however. It is not as simple as a savings clause specific to grazing. Rather, this amendment would operate to prohibit the BLM from maintaining current standards, dictating the location and the management of grazing on these lands.

This amendment goes beyond simply saying that nothing in this act shall impact grazing, to say that the presence of these areas in the NLCS cannot affect the operation of grazing. Talk about an invitation to litigation.

Does this mean the BLM would lose the authority to manage grazing on 800 or so units in the system?

Does this mean that those NLCS units where grazing is not allowed under current law would have to be opened up, whether it was appropriate or not?

The Pearce amendment could operate to force grazing into sensitive conservation areas where it is currently prohibited, and for good reason. Arguably, this amendment's an attempt to use this simple authorization bill to undermine provisions of existing grazing law that have been on the books for years.

If the gentleman from New Mexico wants to make sweeping amendments to the grazing law, he should do so directly, not by means of an amendment on this bill.

I urge the defeat of this amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, at this time I'd like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. The amendment offered by Mr. PEARCE is critical to protecting ranchers who produce our food from the negative consequences of this bill. Without the Pearce language, ranchers would be left to the whims of future Secretaries of Interior that will diminish ranching opportunities.

Already, grazing rights are under assault on multiple fronts. There is a simple element out there that loathes grazing on public land. And our food supply is, indeed, worthy of protection and worthy of the use of our public land.

Despite opposition to this amendment in committee, I hope the other side will now recognize that granting these small protections in the legislation is, indeed, our duty. We cannot abandon our responsibility to legislate by leaving to bureaucrats the opportunity to isolate bankrupt ranchers dependent upon grazing.

We thank Mr. PEARCE for his foresight and determination to protect grazing rights now and in the future, and urge support of his amendment.

Mr. GRIJALVA. We reserve our time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I observe that we are hearing the same tired excuse that nothing in this underlying bill affects this. Yet I would simply point out to the ranchers of this land that now, under the majority, you don't rate as high as the sportsmen. You don't rate as high as those people who are concerned about border security, because we were told that same tired language that nothing in the bill affected them, but the majority's been willing to adapt the language here because they know that the underlying bill affects it. But they are not going to make one amendment in order that would protect our ranchers and protect and make sure that this language doesn't affect them.

It is really unusual that we're hearing such a diverse opinion from the sponsor of this bill right now. It says that nothing affects it. And then he reads all sorts of language in, and again for those people who are watching and listening, I would simply say again, read the very simple language: ''Specifically, inclusion in the National Landscape Conservation System shall not affect the current grazing rights or operations.''

And yet we've built all of these potentials that we have created for this language that we are, in fact, rewriting the entire way that grazing is done. Grazing is always done by cows walking out and munching on the grass. And it's a very simple operation. I think that maybe our amendment is being overcharacterized. I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona and his overcharacterization. But the truth is, we're simply trying to protect the ranchers in the West who use the public lands, and many times there are no private lands to graze off of.

I would reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, these are not tired excuses. I think my attempt has been an exercise in trying to drill the facts of the legislation into those that don't want to hear it.

□ 1500

The underlying bill makes no change to existing law regarding grazing. The amendment, in contrast, could be interpreted as expanding existing grazing into areas where it is not appropriate. We tried to work with the gentleman from New Mexico to draft his amendment more clearly, but because this amendment is unacceptably broad, it must be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. WALDEN OF OREGON

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 110–573.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. WALDEN of Oregon:

Page 3, strike lines 19 through 23.

Page 3, line 24, strike ''(B)'' and insert ''(A)''.

Page 4, line 1, strike ''(C)'' and insert ''(B)''.

Page 4, line 3, strike ''(D)'' and insert ''(C)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1084, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, almost 9 years ago, the Department of the Interior proposed designating Steens Mountain in Harney County, Oregon, as a national monument. This designation would have harmed the cooperative management and preservation successes on the mountain and would have choked the local ranching way of life while allowing little public input into the management process.

So I met with the people of Harney County out at Frenchglen, and we challenged then-Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt to let us attempt to write a plan, rather than suffer the consequences of a top-down Federal designation. That would have been a way that would not only preserve the ecological treasure of Steens Mountain but also the way of life out in that part of Oregon.

To his credit, Secretary Babbitt allowed for our request. He gave us a shot at coming up with something better, and the residents of Harney County rolled up their sleeves and we all went to work.

This effort produced an historic bipartisan, legislative success. Working with State and Federal officials, representatives from the environmental community, my colleagues in the Oregon congressional delegation, the governor and others, we crafted a unique piece of legislation that not only satisfied the environmental concerns, or ''lands legacy'' initiative, of the Clinton administration but also allowed for a way of life to continue on the mountain that has existed for more than 100 years since the first settlers started arriving in this rugged part of the West in the 1800s.

Moreover, the bipartisan legislation established an historic agreement between conservation groups and the local ranching community, implemented a unique cooperative management system with oversight by a citizens' advisory council, and among many other things, designated the first grazing-free, cow-free wilderness.

The bill was crafted with so much local and bipartisan support that it was approved by the House on voice vote and unanimously by the United States Senate. In the years since, management principles in that legislation have proven that they can work; although it has not always been easy.

Unfortunately, many in Harney County who have dedicated much to the successful implementation of the Steens Act worry that Washington, D.C., again may derail the very specific purposes and objectives laid out in that Act. Without consulting the formally recognized stakeholder groups in the region, I'm concerned the underlying legislation would include the Steens in the National Landscape Conservation System.

Given my experience in creating the historic Steens Act, I understand the delicate balance between providing additional protection for deserving areas, while also ensuring the opportunities for other, historic uses. That is why I drafted the amendment today to strike the reference of the Steens Act from H.R. 2016, the National Landscape Conservation System Act.

The problem is simple. The Steens already has a set of strongly supported, congressionally mandated management purposes and objectives from the 106th Congress. I'm concerned that the Steens Act, specifically noted in this legislation, would give the Steens a duplicative set of management principles that would prove to be bait for unproductive lawsuits.

I certainly don't want clauses in H.R. 2016 to be used to upend the delicate balance all parties, including conservation and ranching groups, achieved with the writing and passage of the Steens Act.

So, Mr. Chairman, if I might engage in a colloquy, can you assure me and the good people in Harney County that your bill, H.R. 2016, if it becomes law, will not in any way supersede, undermine, or be used as a reason to change any of the purposes established in section 1(b) or the objectives established in section 102(b) of the Steens Act, Public Law 106–399.

I yield to my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you very much.

I am very well aware of the efforts made by you and the rest of the Oregon delegation to create one of the most unique pieces of Federal land management legislation in the Steens Act. You sought a balance of land protection, multiple historic uses, citizen involvement, and the creation of the first grazing-free wilderness in the country.

I can clearly state to you that H.R. 2016 will not in any way supersede, undermine or be used as a reason to change any of the purposes established in section 1(b) or the objectives established in section 102(b) of the Steens Act, Public Law 106–399.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Chairman GRIJALVA, I appreciate your commitment to the Steens Act and recognition of all that went into its development and approval by Congress.

I thank you for your assurances here today on the floor of the House of Representatives to me and to the people of Harney County and this country.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUMMINGS) having assumed the chair, Mr. SERRANO, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2016) to establish the National Landscape Conservation System, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1625

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5724, UNITED STATES-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Ms. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110–574) on the resolution (H. Res. 1092) relating to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5724) to implement the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION SYSTEM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1084 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2016.

□ 1627

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2016) to establish the National Landscape Conservation System, and for

other purposes, with Mr. SALAZAR (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 110–573 by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 110–573 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. ALTMIRE of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. PEARCE of New Mexico.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 414, noes 0, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

AYES—414

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
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
Fattah
Feeney
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herseth Sandlin
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
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Abercrombie
Berman
Blunt
Brady (TX)
Buyer
Costa
Culberson
Diaz-Balart, L.
Faleomavaega
Ferguson
Granger
Herger
Larson (CT)
Lee
McCrery
Rothman
Rush
Shays
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Wilson (SC)

□ 1651

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 167, I was delayed due to attending the Foreign Affairs Committee hearing for Gen. David Petraeus and Ambassador Ryan Crocker, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 167, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 246, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

AYES—175

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)

Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—246

Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Petri
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Abercrombie
Berman
Buyer
Diaz-Balart, L.
Faleomavaega
Ferguson
Granger
Larson (CT)
Lee
Rothman
Rush
Shays
Sires
Smith (NJ)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1700

Messrs. WELCH of Vermont, EHLERS, RUPPERSBERGER, MEEK of Florida and HINOJOSA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 168 on H.R. 2016, I mistakenly recorded my vote as ''aye'' when I should have voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 245, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 169]

AYES—172

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Turner
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—245

Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
LaHood
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan

Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Petri
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Abercrombie
Becerra
Buyer
Diaz-Balart, L.
Faleomavaega
Ferguson
Granger
Gutierrez
Jones (OH)
Larson (CT)
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Rothman
Rush
Shays
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Tiberi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1707

Mr. BOUCHER changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, because I was questioning General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker in a hearing of the House Foreign Affairs Committee today, I missed rollcall votes numbered 167 through 169 regarding amendments to H.R. 2016, the National Landscape Conservation System Act. Had I been present, I would voted ''aye'' on the Grijalva amendment (rollcall 167); ''nay'' on the Bishop (UT) amendment No. 3 (rollcall 168); and ''nay'' on the Bishop (UT) amendment No. 4 (rollcall 169).

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 333, noes 89, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

AYES—333

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Fattah
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Waters
Watt
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—89

Ackerman
Baird
Baldwin
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Capps
Capuano
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Delahunt
Dicks
Doggett
Ehlers
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Israel
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kirk
Kucinich
Langevin
Lee
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Reyes
Roybal-Allard
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Schwartz
Sherman
Slaughter
Solis
Stark
Tauscher
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Van Hollen
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu

NOT VOTING—13

Abercrombie
Becerra
Buyer
Diaz-Balart, L.
Ferguson
Granger
Hunter
Larson (CT)
Rothman
Rush
Shays
Sires
Smith (NJ)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1717

Messrs. BERMAN, MOORE of Kansas, WEINER, BISHOP of New York, and KIRK changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. MCNERNEY, SALAZAR, and HALL of New York changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 170 on H.R. 2016, I mistakenly recorded my vote as ''aye'' when I should have voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. ALTMIRE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 416, noes 5, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

AYES—416

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

NOES—5

Honda
Kucinich
Lofgren, Zoe
McDermott
Moore (WI)

NOT VOTING—14

Abercrombie
Alexander
Becerra
Buyer
Diaz-Balart, L.
Ferguson
Granger
Larson (CT)
Peterson (MN)
Rothman
Rush
Shays
Sires
Smith (NJ)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1724

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 207, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

AYES—214

Aderholt
Akin
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costa
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Loebsack
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—207

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer

Crowley	Kagen	Price (NC)
Cummings	Kanjorski	Rahall
Davis (AL)	Kaptur	Ramstad
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Rangel
Davis (IL)	Kildee	Reyes
DeFazio	Kilpatrick	Richardson
Delahunt	Kind	Rodriguez
DeLauro	Kirk	Roybal-Allard
Dicks	Klein (FL)	Ruppersberger
Dingell	Kucinich	Sánchez, Linda T.
Doggett	Langevin	
Doyle	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Ellison	Lee	Sarbanes
Emanuel	Levin	Saxton
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Eshoo	Lipinski	Schiff
Etheridge	LoBiondo	Schwartz
Faleomavaega	Lofgren, Zoe	Scott (GA)
Farr	Lowey	Scott (VA)
Fattah	Lynch	Serrano
Filner	Mahoney (FL)	Sestak
Foster	Maloney (NY)	Shea-Porter
Frank (MA)	Markey	Sherman
Frelinghuysen	Matsui	Slaughter
Gerlach	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (WA)
Gilchrest	McCollum (MN)	Snyder
Gonzalez	McDermott	Solis
Gordon	McGovern	Spratt
Green, Al	McIntyre	Stark
Green, Gene	McNulty	Stupak
Grijalva	Meek (FL)	Sutton
Gutierrez	Meeks (NY)	Tanner
Hall (NY)	Melancon	Tauscher
Hare	Michaud	Taylor
Harman	Miller (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Hastings (FL)	Miller, George	Thompson (MS)
Higgins	Mitchell	Tierney
Hill	Mollohan	Towns
Hinchey	Moore (KS)	Tsongas
Hinojosa	Moore (WI)	Upton
Hirono	Moran (VA)	Van Hollen
Hodes	Murphy (CT)	Velázquez
Holden	Murphy, Patrick	Visclosky
Holt	Murtha	Wasserman Schultz
Honda	Nadler	
Hooley	Napolitano	Waters
Hoyer	Neal (MA)	Watson
Inslee	Oberstar	Watt
Israel	Obey	Waxman
Jackson (IL)	Olver	Weiner
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Ortiz	Welch (VT)
	Pallone	Wexler
Jefferson	Pascrell	Whitfield (KY)
Johnson (GA)	Pastor	Woolsey
Johnson (IL)	Payne	Wu
Johnson, E. B.	Petri	Wynn
Jones (OH)	Platts	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Abercrombie	Ferguson	Shays
Alexander	Granger	Sires
Becerra	Larson (CT)	Smith (NJ)
Buyer	Rothman	Weller
Diaz-Balart, L.	Rush	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1734

Mr. MCINTYRE changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. PERLMUTTER changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEINER) having assumed the chair, Mr. SALAZAR, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2016) to establish the National Landscape Conservation System, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1084, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. CANNON

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CANNON. Yes, Mr. Speaker, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Cannon moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2016, to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report back to the House promptly with the following amendment:

At the end of section 4 of the bill, add the following:

In addition, nothing in this Act shall affect the right to bear arms under the Second Amendment within the National Landscape Conservation System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we keep the second amendment protections on BLM lands. This motion to recommit will prevent the NLCS from imposing a complete ban on the right to bear arms like the National Park Service.

In 2006 the National Park Service prevented visitors from protecting themselves, and 11 individuals were murdered, 35 were raped, and 16 were kidnapped. We cannot let the NLCS become an area where the public won't go because they can't protect themselves.

There's a crisis on our Federal lands, especially along the southern border, and a National Park Service second amendment restriction will ensure only the drug traffickers, rapists, and murderers will have guns. The ability to carry firearms on these lands for personal protection is a mere lawsuit and a sympathetic judge away from being denied.

The Altmire amendment already agreed to preserve certain rights, but the vague language of this legislation leaves second amendment rights woefully unprotected. The second amendment was never meant to provide cafeteria-style rights for legislators, for us to pick and choose. The second amendment is a constitutional right which you either support or oppose. This motion to recommit will unequivocally make sure that is the case.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this motion to recommit.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, as was indicated by the gentleman from Utah, the Altmire amendment, which was endorsed by the NRA and the NRA supported the bill with the inclusion of that amendment in its present form, dealt with this issue and dealt with it effectively by reaffirming the right of gun owners and hunters in those public lands. Also in the legislation is a savings clause which guarantees that management prerogatives that are on the land now will remain on the land.

This to me is clearly a bait and switch. It's a gotcha move. These issues have been dealt with in the legislation. It is not a second amendment threat that we are talking about here. We're talking about, more importantly, the issue of public lands and their management. And it might be added that the use of the word ''promptly'' in the motion to recommit would effectively kill this legislation, a decent, well-crafted, bipartisan legislation supported by many Members in this House.

Let me just read from the letter sent out by the NRA:

''Because of our longstanding support for our hunting heritage and sportsmen's rights, the National Rifle Association will consider the vote on this amendment,'' the Altmire amendment, ''in our future candidate ratings and endorsement. If the Altmire amendment is adopted, the NRA will withdraw our current opposition to H.R. 2016.''

I repeat again, this motion to recommit is not about protecting the second amendment. This motion to recommit is a ploy to effectively kill the bill. If you cannot win arguments, it appears, through facts and through rational discussion and debate, then you try to win votes by using scare tactics and ploys. This is a ploy to kill the bill.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the motion to recommit.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 208, noes 212, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

AYES—208

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Green, Gene
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—212

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Abercrombie
Buyer
Diaz-Balart, L.
Ferguson
Granger
Larson (CT)
Paul
Rush
Shays
Sires

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1801

Messrs. COSTELLO and HODES changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. KAGEN changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 278, noes 140, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 174]

AYES—278

Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)

Wilson (OH)	Wu	Yarmuth
Woolsey	Wynn	Young (FL)

NOES—140

Aderholt	Gallegly	Musgrave
Akin	Garrett (NJ)	Myrick
Alexander	Gingrey	Neugebauer
Bachmann	Gohmert	Nunes
Bachus	Goode	Pearce
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Pence
Bartlett (MD)	Graves	Peterson (PA)
Barton (TX)	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Poe
Bishop (UT)	Hayes	Price (GA)
Blunt	Heller	Putnam
Boehner	Hensarling	Radanovich
Bonner	Herger	Rehberg
Boozman	Hoekstra	Reynolds
Boustany	Hulshof	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA)	Issa	Rohrabacher
Brown (SC)	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Burgess	Jones (NC)	Ryan (WI)
Burton (IN)	Jordan	Sali
Calvert	Keller	Schmidt
Camp (MI)	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Campbell (CA)	King (NY)	Sessions
Cannon	Kingston	Shadegg
Cantor	Kline (MN)	Shimkus
Carter	Knollenberg	Shuster
Chabot	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Coble	Latham	Smith (TX)
Cole (OK)	Latta	Souder
Conaway	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Crenshaw	Lewis (KY)	Sullivan
Cubin	Lucas	Tancredo
Culberson	Lungren, Daniel E.	Terry
Davis (KY)	Manzullo	Thornberry
Davis, David	Marchant	Tiahrt
Deal (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Turner
Doolittle	McCaul (TX)	Walberg
Drake	McCrery	Walden (OR)
Dreier	McHenry	Walsh (NY)
Duncan	McHugh	Wamp
Emerson	McKeon	Weldon (FL)
Everett	McMorris Rodgers	Westmoreland
Fallin	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Flake	Miller (FL)	Wittman (VA)
Forbes	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Fossella	Moran (KS)	Young (AK)
Foxx		
Franks (AZ)		

NOT VOTING—12

Abercrombie	Feeney	Paul
Blackburn	Ferguson	Rush
Buyer	Granger	Shays
Diaz-Balart, L.	Larson (CT)	Sires

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1810

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 3368

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 3368, a bill originally introduced by Representative Lantos of California, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON H.R. 2419, FOOD AND ENERGY SECURITY ACT OF 2007

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Agriculture, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2419) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Goodlatte moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes on the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2419 be instructed, within the scope of the conference, to—

Disagree to any provision which will result in an increase in taxes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Florida). Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Speaker, I offer this motion to instruct conferees to make clear that tax increases do not belong in a farm bill. While there are still some funding issues that need to be worked out and many policy decisions to be negotiated, these instructions are very clear in stating that tax increases cannot be used to fund the remaining elements of the farm bill.

Again I will read the actual language of the motion, which is that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes on the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2419 be instructed within the scope of the conference to disagree to any provision which will result in an increase in taxes.

These instructions are very clear in stating that tax increases cannot be used to fund the remaining elements of the farm bill. Farm bills have long enjoyed bipartisan support in this body, and it would be devastating to American agriculture to add a divisive element such as tax increases to this bill.

This conference has been a long time coming, and we are ready to put together a reform-minded farm bill that addresses a variety of issues, including conservation, nutrition, energy, rural development, fruits and vegetables, and forestry, while maintaining a strong safety net for America's farmers and ranchers so that they can continue to meet the growing demand for their products in the global market.

□ 1815

This motion is very important. I expect that there will be strong bipartisan support for this motion, and it's important because we have been down this road of attempting to pass a farm bill for quite some time.

When the bill came out of the House Agriculture Committee last summer, many of the Members on this side of the aisle expected that the amount of money that was added outside of the committee's jurisdiction would not constitute tax increases. We are very disappointed to find that it did include tax increases, and that has definitely bogged down this process for the many, many, many months since.

We have now had some very good discussions with members of other committees that are involved in making sure that we have the ability to move forward and to pay for measures that exceed the amount of money within the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Committee, and those do not include tax increases.

This is, I think, an important statement to be made here and in the other body that we can complete this work without tax increases. We do not need to repeat the mistakes that were made earlier in that regard.

I also think it's very clear that the President of the United States has been very strong in his statement that this bill would be vetoed if it included tax increases. While we continue to work with the administration on a number of other issues, we are making progress there as well.

Again, this would reaffirm, I think, the kind of bipartisan support that it takes to pass a farm bill and get it signed into law.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct.

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

Mr. HOLDEN. I want to commend the ranking member of the committee for the hard work that he has done with the chairman of the committee, who is now in a meeting with leadership, as we are trying to iron out the final details of a long process where a lot of people, particularly Chairman PETERSON and Ranking Member GOODLATTE, have put a lot of time and effort to get to this spot in the process where we are. We are hoping that we can meet our deadline of next Friday to see that we can have this conference report completed.

The ranking member has correctly evaluated the process that we have gone through as we try to get to this process, and we are in agreement. We believe that we can pass this farm bill without any tax increases.

Before I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we need a farm bill, and we need it soon. Planting season is

starting throughout the country, but I would hope that at the end of the process we get a good farm bill rather than a bad farm bill, one that recognizes current market prices and the conditions that farmers are experiencing out there. It was a little more bold on reform, especially under those title I commodity programs.

The President has made it clear that he won't find a farm bill acceptable that does call for an increase in taxes in order to pay for it. I and others who have been a part of a reform effort, especially with the commodity subsidy programs, believe that we are capable of producing a farm bill that maintains an important safety net for family farmers, but also protects the important priorities that are also a part of the farm bill.

It's based on the philosophy of let's help family farmers when they need it, let's not when they don't. Clearly with commodity prices at or near record highs in the marketplace today, part of it driven by the biofuels portion in this country, a large part of it due to the increased global demand, many of us are suspecting that these prices are going to continue. That's been great for the rural economy, and it's been great for farm income.

But let us also take this opportunity then of starting to move forward on some commonsense reasonable reforms of these commodity programs, while still maintaining a safety net in the farm bill, but without jeopardizing the conservation title or nutrition or specialty crops, rural economic development programs and renewable fuel investment.

I would hope that my colleagues support this motion to instruct. I think it's the right thing to do. I think at the end of the day, if we are going to have a bipartisan bill that the President feels comfortable in doing, one of the goals that we have to strive for is a bill that does not call for an increase in taxes in light of record high market prices.

I commend the gentleman for offering this motion and encourage support on the vote.

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

I would just say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I very much appreciate his kind words. We have worked in a very bipartisan fashion. The chairman of the committee has been very dedicated to working with us, and we very much appreciate that, as have the other members of the committee.

We now look forward to going to conference and have the opportunity to work together as we work with the other body to try to work out what are still many, many hurdles. A lot of the people have been excited that we are going to conference, and we need to make sure they understand that we are not done with this, but we do have some good ideas that we are going to be able to move forward with. I think that's very encouraging.

I would also say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I too share his desire for reform. This farm bill will contain a lot of reform, and it will result in substantial savings to the taxpayers of the country, because, in fact, that has already occurred.

The current farm bill, if it were to be perpetuated, which I do not support, but if it were to be perpetuated, would cost $58 billion less for the next 5 years than it cost for the last 5. So the fact of the matter is there is already substantial savings being achieved.

There are, nonetheless, additional reforms that I and many others support as we move to conference with this legislation, and I think the outcome will be one that maintains the safety net for America's farmers and ranchers, but makes a number of very important reforms in a number of different areas and enhances those new areas that I know the gentleman has championed and others, like conservation, which I very much join him in supporting and making sure that the nutritional needs of many in this country are met, and other purposes. We can do that without tax increases, and, as a result, I think this is a very appropriate motion to instruct to adopt today.

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

Mr. HOLDEN. I would just like to thank the ranking member for his comments and also to say to my friend from Wisconsin, who served on the committee, that he understands that we are fortunate to serve on one of the most bipartisan committees in the Congress. We do not have Democrat and Republican disagreements on agriculture, but we do have regional ones.

I believe that the final product will reflect those regional differences and also will have a significant amount of reform that all of us are going to be able to go home and talk about that we did something positive in this farm bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to instruct will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules with respect to H.R. 5489 and H.R. 5472.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 11, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 175]

YEAS—400

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer

Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—11

Blumenauer
Capuano
DeFazio
Ellison
Frank (MA)
McDermott
McGovern
Olver
Payne
Waters
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—19

Abercrombie
Bachus
Buyer
Edwards
Ferguson
Giffords
Granger
Hooley
Larson (CT)
Myrick
Peterson (PA)
Rangel
Rush
Salazar
Shays
Sires
Stark
Stearns
Waxman

□ 1847

Ms. WOOLSEY and Messrs. DEFAZIO and PAYNE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. NADLER and CLYBURN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 175, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

CONGRESSWOMAN JO ANN S. DAVIS POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5489, 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 Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5489.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 0, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 176]

YEAS—397

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Baird
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
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
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
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—33

Abercrombie
Bachus
Boehner
Boswell
Butterfield
Buyer
Cole (OK)
Edwards
Emanuel
Ferguson
Fossella
Giffords
Granger
Hooley
Hulshof
Issa
Jones (OH)
Larson (CT)
Mahoney (FL)
Marchant
McCrery
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Rangel
Reynolds
Rush
Shays
Sires
Slaughter
Stark
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain on this vote.

□ 1854

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.

JULIA M. CARSON POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5472, 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 Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5472.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

YEAS—401

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

NOT VOTING—29

Abercrombie
Bachus
Boehner
Boswell
Buyer
Coble
Dicks
Edwards
Ferguson
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Granger
Hooley
Kildee
Larson (CT)
Marchant
McCollum (MN)
McCrery
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Rangel
Rush
Shays
Sires
Slaughter
Stark
Waxman

□ 1900

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present to vote on rollcall votes 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, and 177 due to a family medical matter. Had I been present, I would have voted:

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 164 on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 1084, Providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 2016, to establish the National Landscape Conservation System, and for other purposes.

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 165 on H. Res. 1084, Providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 2016, to establish the National Landscape Conservation System, and for other purposes.

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 166 on H. Res. 1077, calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to end its crackdown in Tibet and to enter into a substantive dialogue with His Holiness the Dalai Lama to find a negotiated solution that respects the distinctive language, culture, religious identity, and fundamental freedom of all Tibetans.

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 167 on agreeing to the amendment to H.R. 2016, to reiterate that nothing in the bill shall impede efforts by the Department of Homeland Security to secure the borders of the United States.

"No" on rollcall vote No. 168 on agreeing to the amendment to H.R. 2016, to strike the purposes of the National Landscape Conservation System.

"No" on rollcall vote No. 169 on agreeing to the amendment to H.R. 2016, to strike the existing management objectives of the National Landscape Conservation System and inserts language directing the Interior Secretary to manage the system in accordance with each applicable law (including regulations) relating to each component of the system included under subsection (b).

"No" on rollcall vote No. 170 on agreeing to the amendment to H.R. 2016, to provide that nothing in the bill additionally restricts or hinders energy development within the National Landscape Conservation System.

"No" on rollcall vote No. 171 on agreeing to the amendment to H.R. 2016, to provide that the bill does not in any way limit access for hunting, fishing, trapping or recreational shooting on the 27 million acres administered by the Bureau of Land Management. It also provides that H.R. 2016 does not in any way infringe on a State's right to manage, control or regulate its hunting, fishing, trapping and recreational shooting activities on these lands.

"No" on rollcall vote No. 172 on agreeing to the amendment to H.R. 2016, to provide that inclusion in the National Landscape Conservation System does not affect existing grazing rights or operations on those Bureau of Land Management Lands.

"No" on rollcall vote No. 173 on the motion to recommit H.R. 2016.

"No" on rollcall vote No. 174 on agreeing to the passage of H.R. 2016, to establish the National Landscape Conservation System, and for other purposes.

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 175 on motion to construct the conferees on H.R. 2419, to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2012, and for other purposes.

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 176 on agreeing to the passage of H.R. 5489, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6892 Main Street in Gloucester, Virginia, as the "Congresswoman Jo Ann S. Davis Post Office" suspension bill.

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 177 on agreeing to the passage of H.R. 5472, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2650 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. St., Indianapolis, Indiana, as the "Julia M. Carson Post Office Building" suspension bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, today I missed 14 recorded votes.

I take my voting responsibility very seriously. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on recorded vote No. 164, "yea" on recorded vote No. 165, "yea" on recorded vote No. 166, "aye" on recorded vote No. 167, "no" on recorded vote No. 168, "no" on recorded vote No. 169, "aye" on recorded vote No. 170, "aye" on recorded vote No. 171, "aye" on recorded vote No. 172, "no" on recorded vote No. 173, "aye" on recorded vote No. 174, "yea" on recorded vote 175, "yea" on recorded vote No. 176, and "yea" on recorded vote No. 177.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2419, FOOD AND ENERGY SECURITY ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of the House bill (except title XII) and the Senate amendment (except secs. 12001, 12201–12601, and 12701–12808), and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. PETERSON of Minnesota, HOLDEN, MCINTYRE, ETHERIDGE, BOSWELL, BACA, CARDOZA, SCOTT of Georgia, GOODLATTE, LUCAS, MORAN of Kansas, HAYES, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

From the Committee on Education and Labor, for consideration of secs. 4303 and 4304 of the House bill, and secs. 4901–4905, 4911, and 4912 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. PLATTS.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of secs. 6012, 6023, 6024, 6028, 6029, 9004, 9005, and 9017 of the House bill, and secs. 6006, 6012, 6110–6112, 6202, 6302, 7044, 7049, 7307, 7507, 9001, 11060, 11072, 11087, and 11101–11103 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. DINGELL, PALLONE, and BARTON of Texas.

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of sec. 11310 of the House bill, and secs. 6501–6505, 11068, and 13107 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. BACHUS.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of secs. 3001–3008, 3010–3014, and 3016 of the House bill, and secs. 3001–3022, 3101–3107, and 3201–3204 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BERMAN, SHERMAN, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of secs. 11102, 11312, and 11314 of the House bill, and secs. 5402, 10103, 10201, 10203, 10205, 11017, 11069, 11076, 13102, and 13104 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CONYERS, SCOTT of Virginia, and SMITH of Texas.

From the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of secs. 2313, 2331, 2341, 2405, 2607, 2607A, 2611, 5401, 6020, 7033, 7311, 8101, 8112, 8121–8127, 8204, 8205, 11063, and 11075 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. RAHALL, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

From the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of secs. 1501 and 7109 of the House bill, and secs. 7020, 7313, 7314, 7316, 7502, 8126, 8205, and 10201 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. WAXMAN, TOWNS, and JORDAN of Ohio.

From the Committee on Science and Technology, for consideration of secs. 4403, 9003, 9006, 9010, 9015, 9019, and 9020 of the House bill, and secs. 7039, 7051, 7315, 7501, and 9001 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GORDON of Tennessee, LAMPSON, and MCCAUL of Texas.

From the Committee on Small Business, for consideration of subtitle D of title XI of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Messrs. SHULER, and CHABOT.

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of secs. 2203, 2301, 6019, and 6020 of the House bill, and secs. 2604, 6029, 6030, 6034, and 11087 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. GRAVES.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of sec. 1303 and title XII of the House bill, and secs. 12001–12601, and 12701–12808 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. RANGEL, POMEROY, and MCCRERY.

For consideration of the House bill (except title XII) and the Senate amendment (except secs. 12001, 12201–12601, and 12701–12808), and modifications committed to conference: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. PUTNAM.

There was no objection.

MR. CARTER—DON'T MEET WITH HAMAS

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Al-Hayat reported that former President Carter will visit Syria to meet with Hamas leader Khaled Meshal.

The State Department lists Hamas as a foreign terrorist organization. It is responsible for the murder of at least 26 American citizens, some of them teenagers, children, and infants, like David Applebaum of Ohio, Nava Applebaum of Ohio, Alan Beer of Ohio, Marla Bennet of California, Benjamin Blutstein of Pennsylvania, David Boim of New York, Yael Botwin of California, Dina Carta of North Carolina, Janis Ruth Coulter of Massachusetts, Sara Duker of New Jersey, Matthew Eisenfeld of Connecticut, Tzvi Goldstein of New York, Judith Greenbaum of New Jersey, David Gritz of Massachusetts, Dina Horowitz of Florida, Rabbi Eli Horowitz of Illinois, Tehilla Nathanson, age 3, of New York, Malka Roth of New York, Mordechai Reinitz of New York, Yitzhak Reinitz of New York, Leah Stern of New Jersey, Goldie Taubenfeld of New York, Shmuel Taubenfeld of New York, Nachshon Wachsman of New York, Ira Weinstein of New York, and Yitzhak Weinstock of California.

President Carter, the voices of these victims in the grave beseech you: Do not meet with the man who ordered their murders.

DO NOT REWARD COLOMBIA WITH A FAIR TRADE AGREEMENT

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

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, if I had been born in Colombia, I would probably be dead. As a former president of my labor union, my fight for higher wages, better working conditions, and secure pension could have cost me my life.

Thirty-nine trade unionists were murdered in Colombia in 2007, and they are being killed at a rate of over one per week this year. Even more alarming is only around 3 percent of cases result in convictions, illustrating the culture of violence that has existed in Colombia for decades. Inexplicably, President Bush wants to reward Colombia with a free trade agreement. Not on my watch.

The right to organize and bargain collectively is essential to human freedom and the passage of the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement would greatly diminish our Nation's reputation as a leader in the fight to end human rights abuses worldwide. We should not even consider this agreement until Colombia puts a stop to the violence against union organizers.

THE COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IS UNFAIR

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Colombia Free Trade Agreement for four main reasons. One, the agreement will flood Colombia's market with subsidized U.S. produce. This will force Colombian farmers to turn to a more profitable crop, coca, thereby fueling the drug trade and threatening U.S. national security.

Second, this agreement will aggravate Colombia's horrendous human rights record. It will take away incentives to reduce child labor or protect union members, and the movement to improve workers' rights will languish in the face of international corporations' profits.

Third, the pact will worsen the plight of the Afro-Colombians. They will continue to be forced off their territories, which are prime for oil palm and natural gas exploitation.

And fourth, this free trade agreement is harmful to American workers. Its passage will make it more profitable for U.S. companies to move their operations to Colombia where labor is cheaper and environmental standards are lower.

Everyone agrees that free trade is good but only when it's fair. The Colombia Free Trade Agreement is transparently unfair, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

HONORING THE EMPLOYEES OF THE HOMELAND SECURITY DEPARTMENT

(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, this is an interesting day. Earlier today on the floor of the House, we rose to pay tribute to the 5-year anniversary of the Department of Homeland Security and to express our appreciation for the employees for their extraordinary efforts and contributions to protect and secure our Nation. Security protection is not perfect.

And there have been challenges and, if you will, mountains to climb in preparing this Nation for its own security. Having been on the early established Homeland Security Committee and having gone to Ground Zero as the smoke was simmering, I know full well the value and purpose of all of these front-line employees.

I offer them today my greatest appreciation and would say to all of them, I would wish that all of our jobs relating to security would be extinguished, but we know that it cannot, and our task is to protect Americans. For that, we must be diligent and transparent. We must value civil liberties, but as well, we must be sure on security.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that when we bring our troops home, we will have a civilian Homeland Security Department that can truly help secure America.

DO NOT PASS THE U.S.-COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased as Speaker PELOSI decided to assert Congress' power over international trade by waiving ill-advised fast-track rules, and I hope the decision to waive the 90-day deadline for a vote on the Colombia FTA will effectively kill the agreement.

This is not a good idea at this time. Colombia has not proven that they are capable of providing the human rights that the people of Colombia so desperately need. Passage of the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement would greatly diminish our Nation's reputation as a leader in the fight to end human rights abuses worldwide. Like the Peru agreement which preceded it, the Colombia FTA is based on the flawed NAFTA–CAFTA model which also led to the outsourcing of millions of high-paying American jobs. This comes at a time when our own country is in a recession and experiencing unprecedented job loss.

All around, this is not a good idea, and I hope that we will kill this.

□ 1915

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DONNELLY). 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.

BROKEN JUSTICE IN IRAQ

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the justice system has broken down for Jamie Leigh Jones and other female contractors sexually assaulted in Iraq by their coworkers.

In June 2005, nearly 3 years ago, Jamie Leigh Jones was drugged and gang raped by her KBR coworkers in Iraq. After 2½ years and no real answers from our own government agencies, Jamie decided to go public in hopes of finding the answers and getting justice. She testified before the House Judiciary Committee in December of last year. And despite Jamie's experiences and the national attention that this issue garnered, nothing changed in Iraq. There continues to be a hostile living and working environment for female contractors that are Americans working overseas for American employers.

A ''boys will be boys'' atmosphere seems to appear where assaults occur, and then they're covered up. The Department of Justice says it has several active investigations, but it has not prosecuted any contractor for a sexual assault since the invasion of Iraq 5 years ago.

The Justice Department has over 200 employees in Baghdad. The question is, what are they doing? Why aren't they prosecuting crimes by Americans against Americans? There are 180,000 civilian workers in Iraq; not all of those people are good folks, some of them have committed crimes, but yet not one of them has been prosecuted for an assault that has occurred. These assailants remain free and unaccountable while the victims continue to suffer.

And yet there is more. This week we learned of another victim. She identified herself this morning at the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations as Dawn Lemon. Dawn Lemon's story is brutal. She went to Iraq as a KBR contractor. She was stationed in the hostile red zone as a paramedic. She awoke in January of 2008, just 3 months ago, to the sound of incoming rocket attacks. But when she woke up, she was naked in a chair, covered in blood and feces. She had feces in her mouth. She found a U.S. soldier lying naked in the bed next to her with his clothes and his gun on the floor. All she could remember was screaming at this unknown soldier that was laying on top of her. She sought help from a KBR colleague, thinking that he would save her, but he didn't. As a soldier anally raped her, her KBR colleague forced her to perform oral sex on him. And when Dawn told her KBR supervisor about the incident, she was told to be quiet. When she reported the incident to the camp's military liaison, she was told again not to say anything.

In order to leave Iraq, Dawn had to cooperate with KBR. She had to sign documents agreeing not to discuss the rape in public. She decided to send those documents via e-mail to an attorney in the United States, but 20 minutes after she sent those documents Army investigators showed up and confiscated her computer. They were obviously tracking her e-mail communications.

Before she left Iraq on leave, she was assigned to sleep guarded by two Army Criminal Investigative Division officials to keep her safe. Her alleged assailants, however, were in the same camp, but they roamed freely, doing what they wished.

As the Federal Government agencies refuse to take responsibility and implement change and as these agencies have continued to pass the buck back and forth, still, nothing has occurred in these cases. There are no jurisdictional problems. The law exists to prosecute these individuals in Iraq, and these laws have been applicable for some time. There is nothing but excuses from our government agencies for failure to prosecute these criminals.

We knew in December that Jamie Leigh Jones was not alone. Three years later, this is still occurring. Dawn Lemon now joins a growing number of female contractors who have been sexually assaulted in Iraq by their coworkers.

Justice has failed these women. Is our government hiding these crimes? Why don't companies like KBR cooperate rather than stonewall these investigations?

Mr. Speaker, we will find the answers to these questions, I assure you. Victims like Jamie Leigh Jones and Dawn are to be admired for coming forward. Our duty is to protect them and their rights. We can do no less because, Mr. Speaker, justice is the one thing we should always find, even in Iraq.

And that's just the way it is.

NATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH WEEK

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Public Health Week and to applaud the passage of legislation to address health issues that impact the quality of life of all Americans. I commend my colleagues for joining me in passing critical health care legislation to improve the lives of Americans, from the youngest to the oldest among us, by increasing their access to care.

It is fitting that we address this legislation during National Public Health Week, a time when our attention is focused on the critical need to improve public health. I think it is also fitting that we recognize this week while we remember Ryan White, who died 18 years ago yesterday. This brave young man, whose namesake, the Ryan White CARE Act, has saved so many from the ravages of HIV/AIDS, taught us all an important lesson about our personal roles in improving the public's health.

I am the sponsor of two bills that passed this week, the Early Hearing Detection & Intervention Act, which amends the Public Health Service Act regarding early detection, diagnosis and treatment of hearing loss, and the Food Allergy & Anaphylaxis Management Act, which provides schools with guidelines on how to create appropriate management and emergency plans for children with food allergies.

I also support the following bills that were adopted by the House this week:

The Wakefield Act, which amends the Public Health Service Act to improve emergency services for children who need treatment for trauma or critical care;

The Cytology Proficiency Improvement Act, which provides revised standards for quality assurance in screening and evaluation of gynecologic cytology preparations to ensure that health care professionals who screen and interpret tests for cervical cancer are skilled in today's medical technology;

Reauthorization of the Traumatic Brain Injury Act, which provides for the expansion and improvement of traumatic brain injury programs by providing grants to States to support the treatment and rehabilitation of traumatic brain injury patients.

The Safety of Seniors Act, which directs the United States Department of Health and Human Services to oversee and support education campaigns focused on reducing falls and preventing repeat falls among older Americans;

And finally, the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act, which establishes grant programs to provide for education and outreach on newborn screening and coordinated follow-up care once newborn screening has been conducted.

These bills will make great strides in ensuring the public's health and the essential mission of our Nation. Without health, children cannot grow to be all that God meant for them to be, adults cannot fulfill their role as contributing members of our society, and our elderly cannot peacefully live out their golden years.

If one were to ask any of us to list those things that might be the enemy of our destiny, we would all have to agree that poor health would be at the top of the list. For this reason, I will continue to fight for the expansion of quality health care programs to help ensure that every American can benefit from a more vibrant and productive quality of life.

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

U.S.-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT

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

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement. I rise in support of bringing this important agreement to the House floor.

Ladies and gentlemen, I come from the State of Illinois. I represent a district that's heavily dependent on exports for growing our economy. We make heavy construction equipment. We grow a lot of corn and soybeans. We export a tremendous amount of plastics and petrochemicals. This trade agreement is a big winner for States like Illinois as it is for our Nation.

You know, right now our products made in Colombia, whether farm products or manufactured goods, they enter the United States essentially duty free. The Andean Nations of Peru, Colombia, Ecuador and Bolivia, they've got the opportunity for all their products to come to the United States duty free, but our products made in America face taxes when they're exported to Colombia. In fact, the bulldozers made in my district, I have 8,000 workers, union workers who work for Caterpillar, they make the yellow bulldozers. Mining is a big industry in Colombia, we want to sell those products there, but they face 15 percent tariffs when they're exported. It makes them harder to compete with the Asians.

The corn and soybeans and livestock products produced in my district, they face tariffs today up to 40 percent, making it hard to compete with the Argentineans and Brazilians and the Colombian market, a nation of over 40 million people.

The bottom line is 80 percent of U.S. exports to Colombia will be duty free immediately once this trade agreement goes into effect. And I would note that, as we've seen, countries like Chile and the central American countries and elsewhere where we have trade agreements, we've seen 50 percent faster growth in exports in nations who have trade agreements than those who do not.

And I would note also, again, Colombian products come to the United States duty free, tariff free, but our products face barriers going in. This agreement eliminates those and makes trade a two-way street. It's an important agreement, and I urge it be brought up for a vote and I urge bipartisan support.

Those who oppose this trade agreement say Colombia hasn't done enough. And I want to begin by asking, who is the Republic of Colombia? What nation in Latin America is the oldest democracy in Latin America? It's Colombia. What nation is the second largest Spanish-speaking nation in all Latin America? Colombia. What nation is the most reliable ally of the United States, particularly when it comes to counterterrorism and counternarcotics? Colombia. And what nation has done more under its current democratically elected president to reduce violence in Latin America? It's Colombia, clearly.

Colombia is not only a friend of the United States, in fact, our enemies in Latin America identify Colombia as our best friend. And they say, you know, watch the United States, they always turn their back on their friends; watch how they treat Colombia when it comes to this trade agreement.

And those who would argue against this trade agreement say, you know, you've got to look at the labor violence, you've got to look at the violence in the country; and Colombia just has not done enough to address violence. Well, President Uribe is the most popular elected president in this entire hemisphere. This Congress today suffers from a 15 percent approval rating, President Uribe in Colombia has an 80 percent approval rating. He was elected to reduce the violence in his country, and he succeeded.

In fact, 71 percent of Colombians today say they feel more secure because of President Uribe. Seventy-three percent say President Uribe respects human rights. Homicides are down 40 percent, kidnappings are down 76 percent. Colombians feel free to drive anywhere in Colombia. And I would point out that today, the murder rate in Colombia is lower than Washington, D.C., it's lower than Baltimore. It's safer to walk the streets of Bogota, Colombia than it is in Washington, D.C., yet those who oppose this agreement say the murder rate is too high and that Colombia needs to do more. But Washington, D.C. is more violent than Colombia.

Here's the facts: When it comes to labor violence, President Uribe has made major changes. He has increased the Prosecutor General's budget by 72 percent in the last 2 years. He has added over 2,100 new posts, adding 418 new prosecutors, 445 new investigators. He has done so much that the President of the United Workers Confederation of Colombia says, ''never in the history of Colombia have we achieved something so important.'' Yet there are those who want to turn their back on President Uribe in Colombia.

And when it comes specifically to protections provided to labor leaders, and I have met with many Colombian labor leaders, and they note that in Colombia, if you're a labor activist or labor leader and you feel in danger, you can request special protection from the government.

□ 1930

And last year under President Uribe, they spent $39 million providing body guards and special protection for labor leaders and labor activists. In fact, almost 2,000 labor leaders and activists have participated in this program, and it's been so successful that no labor leader who has requested the assistance has been denied because it's provided to those who are denied it, but also no one who has ever participated has ever been a victim of violence. It's been successful. And as the Washington Post noted, and you don't want to see anyone lose their life, but the murder rate for labor activists is actually lower than the murder rate for the average citizens of Colombia. And, again, it's safer to walk the streets of Bogota than it is in Washington, D.C. from the standpoint of being a victim of violent crime or, frankly, a victim of murder.

The International Labor Organization has recognized the progress Colombia has made. In fact, they have removed Colombia from its labor watch list. And Colombia has agreed to have a permanent International Labor Organization representative in Colombia.

Just a few weeks ago, this House overwhelmingly, with bipartisan support, ratified the U.S.-Peru agreement, and Colombia has agreed to every same labor condition that was demanded of Peru. Colombia has agreed to the same. So for those who demanded it, they should be proclaiming victory.

The bottom line is Colombia is a friend of the United States. And there are those who want to kill this agreement, those what want to turn their back on Colombia. Let's remember this agreement is good for Americans, it's also good for Colombia, but our best friend in Latin America is Colombia. They deserve a vote and they deserve a ''yes'' vote, bipartisan support, for the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement.

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

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

COLOMBIA AND OIL: GET IT WHILE YOU CAN

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 Bush administration announced this week it will be sending to the Congress for approval the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. And the American people might ask, Colombia? Now? In 2008? What about the District of Columbia and getting gas prices lower here in our Nation's capital? Or what about more fairly priced student loans for the next generation who are attempting to improve their opportunities for the years ahead? Or what about dealing with mortgage foreclosures in the United States, which are at epidemic levels in places like Ohio and Michigan and Florida and California? No. The President sends us something to help another country. ''Colombia Free Trade,'' they call it.

Well, I would like to say to the American people tear the veneer off the agreement and look below it, and what you will find is crude. Oil. What this agreement really is about is more imported petroleum from one of the most undemocratic places in the world.

Colombia about 10 years ago was actually a net importer of oil. But today it is the fourth leading oil producer in South America. In fact, oil, rock/crude, has become Colombia's leading export product, and guess whom they send most of it to? You've got it right. The United States of America.

So what this Colombia Free Trade deal is all about is more imported oil, more dirty crude, more carbon emissions, more dependency of the people of the United States for energy, more living back in the 20th Century than embracing the 21st with energy independence here at home.

The oil picture in Colombia is clouded by rapidly declining production because of persistent attacks from people inside Colombia. What no one has mentioned, and the President didn't send it up here in his statement, is our country is already sending billions of dollars to Colombia to hold up the government. Why? To protect certain economic interests, including the rising export of petroleum.

This is a graph showing production levels of petroleum in Colombia back since the late 1980s, then up through 2000, when all of a sudden they started to decline because of unrest inside the country itself.

Now, it's no secret that there are 18 foreign oil companies in Colombia. Guess what. The majority of their headquarters is located right here in the United States. They have drilling operations in Colombia. California-based Occidental Petroleum launched an attempt to squeeze out of Colombia what oil remains with its discovery in 1983 of the Cano Limon field in the northeastern part of the country. The problem is that particular field produces less than a third of its total as recently as 4 years ago. Its production is going down.

British Petroleum, not to be outdone, has been drilling in the eastern plains in the Andes Mountains in the largest field in the country. However, that production has fallen by about two-thirds, and rather than 400,000 barrels a day, they produce about 170,000 barrels.

Faced with rapidly declining production, the Colombian Government has taken steps to improve the investment climate in Colombia and giving permission for foreign oil companies to own 100 percent stakes in oil ventures in Colombia. The Government of Colombia also established a lower sliding scale royalty fee, now at 8 percent on the smallest oil fields, and that set of actions have attracted an estimated $2 billion more in foreign investments since 2006. The oil industry is focusing heavily on this country.

Entering into the picture is the geopolitical position of Colombia because if we look at the United States having nearly half of their exports, Venezuela is number two, and we all know the difficulties with Venezuela. So there's a little strategic problem here related to the U.S. perception across Latin America. But it's important to tear the veneer off something called ''Colombia Free Trade'' and look at what is actually being traded out of Colombia.

While the United States continues to support the violent regime in Colombia, political unrest and political repression continue to cloud the discussion, and declining oil exports prove it. We can go back to 1988 when a car bomb outside of Occidental's nine-story Colombian headquarters in Bogota badly damaged that building. In October, 2000, a truck bomb nearly missed a bus filled with 40 Occidental secretaries and other company employees. And in April, 2001, rebels seized a bus filled with 100 Occidental oil workers.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to include in the RECORD lots of information about Occidental Petroleum, which is just one example of what's happening in Colombia, and also some of Occidental Petroleum's political influence here in Washington, in the Congress and in the White House.

OCCIDENTAL PETROLEUM CORPORATION

Occidental Petroleum Corporation is one of the largest U.S.-based oil and gas multinationals, with exploration projects in three states and nine foreign countries, including Colombia. It has operated in Colombia for more than three decades; in 1983, Occidental discovered Caño Limón, Colombia's second-largest oil field and one of only 50 billion-barrel-class fields in the world. Occidental's investment in Caño Limón paid off long ago, with its share of production yielding hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Even through years of rebel attacks and pipeline closings, Caño Limón Field continues to be a profitable venture for Occidental.

In recent years, Occidental has simplified its oil and gas operations by focusing its operations in the United States, the Middle East and Latin America. Despite drastic oil price declines in 2001, Occidental Petroleum had its second-best annual earnings ever.

Annual sales: $14 billion

Annual net income: $1.2 billion.

CEO and annual executive salary: Ray Irani, $24 million (six-year average); Forbes Magazine ranked Irani the second-worst among executives who gave shareholders the least return on their investment compared with their own pay. In 2001, Irani's compensation package included free financial planning, country club dues and a $2.6 million bonus.

Founded: 1920.

Stock: Publicly traded (OXY) on the New York Stock Exchange.

Corporate headquarters: Los Angeles.

Employees: 8,235.

Colombia operations: Occidental owns Caño Limón Field in the province of Aruaca,

operates three exploration projects elsewhere in Colombia, and, in 1998, swapped its holdings in the Philippines and Malaysia for Shell Oil's interests in several producing blocks of Colombia.

Worldwide holdings: Russia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Qatar, Oman, Ecuador, the Gulf of Mexico, the United States (Texas, California and Alaska).

Worldwide reserves: 2.17 billion barrels of oil.

Worldwide annual production: 461,000 barrels of oil per day.

Colombia annual production: 34,000 barrels of oil per day in 2002, up 79 percent from the year before.

LABOR CONDITIONS

In addition to sabotaging the physical structure of Occidental's Caño Limón Pipeline, Colombia's rebel groups have attacked, kidnapped and murdered company employees. Employees also have often been caught in the crossfire between the rebels and the military. Not unlike other multinationals in Colombia, Occidental makes it clear with its employees that it will not pay ransom in the event of their kidnapping. With few exceptions, the company hires Colombians from distant cities to work in the danger areas because they are less likely to be knowledgeable about military troop locations or security measures should they fall into the hands of guerrillas. Prospective contractors are rigorously screened by Occidental's psychologists to ferret out spies; workers must show identification cards at a half-dozen security checkpoints; and palm-reading devices restrict access to executive offices. Still, Colombia's rebels have succeeded in breaching the multinational's security on a number of occasions.

Watchdog groups have ranked Occidental poorly on human rights after the company pursued a protested oil exploration project in Colombia's cloud forest, home to 5,000 members of the U'wa tribe. In 2000, three children were killed after Occidental called on the military to break up a nonviolent U'wa blockade of the road to the drill site. After years of public pressure protesting Occidental's exploration on ancestral lands, the company announced in May 2002 that it was canceling the project. The company blamed its withdrawal on technical and economic factors, but many believe Occidental caved to negative publicity.

Occidental's stand on human rights in Colombia was also tainted after a 1998 air raid of the village of Santo Domingo near the Caño Limón Pipeline. That year, three American pilots of AirScan (a Florida-based security firm that Occidental uses to protect its oil interests from rebel attacks) marked hostile targets for the Colombian military in an antiguerilla operation. The pilots' assistance mistakenly led to the killing of 18 civilians, including nine children. Survivors from the village said the aircraft (U.S.-donated) attacked them as they ran out of their homes to a nearby road with their hands in the air. The Colombian government is still investigating.

OCCIDENTAL INFLUENCE ON CAPITOL HILL NOT NEUTRAL

Between 1996 and 2000, Occidental spent more than $8.6 million lobbying the U.S. government, including for U.S. military aid to Colombia. In the 2000 election cycle, the company gave hard and soft money totaling about $551,000, with about 60 percent going to Republican candidates and political action committees. The CEO of Occidental's chemical subsidiary, J. Roger Hirl, raised more than $100,000 in support of George W. Bush's bid for the presidency.

Occidental also has maintained links to the Democratic Party for many years, primarily through former Vice President Al Gore's father, the late Al Gore Sr., who after leaving the Senate took a $500,000-a-year job with an Occidental subsidiary, then served on the company board for 28 years.

When the younger Gore joined Clinton's ticket in 1992, Occidental loaned the Presidential Inauguration Committee $100,000 to help pay for the ceremony. And after Gore took office, the company gave nearly $500,000 in soft money to Democratic committees and causes. In late 1997, the former vice president championed a $3.65 billion sale to Occidental of the government's stake in Elk Hills Oil Field (California), representing the largest privatization of federal property in U.S. history. In 1998, when his father died, Gore inherited about $500,000 worth of Occidental stock.

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.)

COMMUNIST CHINA

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, one of our greatest Presidents was Harry Truman. And one of the reasons President Truman was held in such high regard by people, including my own father, was that he had the courage to go against conventional wisdom, especially in the area of foreign relations.

It was President Truman who had the moral courage to tell the American people that our World War II ally the Soviet Union was no longer our friend and had become a threat to the very liberty that our people had helped advance throughout the course of that conflict. This was not a message that the American people were particularly expecting. In fact, there were many who decried President Truman's analysis at the time. One of them was George F. Kennan, who is, unfortunately, often remembered as the father of the containment policy.

In fact, when faced with the rise of the Soviet Union as a strategic threat and rival model of governance, it was Mr. Kennan's position that the Soviet Union could be managed, that we should constructively engage them, that their ideology meant nothing to them, and that, in fact, they were but a different variation of the traditional Czarist order within Russia. And, besides, Mr. Kennan concluded, what did it matter? Eventually the two systems of communism and our free Republic's democratic system would merge into one.

President Truman was not as educated as Mr. Kennan. He was not as sophisticated as Mr. Kennan. And President Truman took the Soviets at their word that they were in fact communists. He took them at their word that they meant they were going to put in practice their intrinsically evil ideology. And Mr. Truman dissented from Mr. Kennan and said that the fundamental goal of the United States foreign policy to defeat the intrinsic evil of communism will be the advancement of liberty throughout our world where and when we can achieve it.

Recently I came across a picture that I had ordered from a friend of mine in the District, Mr. Doug Brown. It was from one of Mr. Truman's return trips to St. Louis. He was meeting a gentleman from his old World War I Artillery Battery. And a picture that struck me the most was this: The MC of the event that night for President Truman in Missouri was an entertainer named Ronald Reagan. And in that crystalline moment, it was clear for me to see the link in the Cold War's victory between the foundation President Truman courageously laid and the way that President Reagan courageously won it ultimately.

What we see today now is a repeat of history where we have two paths we can take. We can take the path of Mr. Kennan and the detente crowd of the Kissingerites and others that says we can manage the rise of Communist China, that we can engage them and barter with them and engage in structural diplomacy, all the while the oppression of their own people's Godgiven rights to rights to life, liberty, and dignity are repressed, while Tibet suffers under their yoke, while the Burmese and Sudanese regimes are propped up, and while they continue their stealth assaults on our national security with sleeper cells, and I could go on. Or we who profess to be the heirs of Ronald Reagan, especially within the Republican Party, can follow the path of President Truman and understand that you cannot barter with butchers. You cannot constructively manage evil nor engage it. But what you can do is unleash the liberty of people yearning to breathe free where and when you can.

The reason I bring this up is not merely the Beijing Olympics. I'm on record as opposing our President's attendance at the games. I believe it would be a betrayal of our free Republic's commitment to liberty. But I was struck by a statement in this regard by our current Secretary of State, ironically enough herself a Sovietologist. I will not make the joke that a Sovietologist is often considered diplomacy's equivalent of a Latin teacher for this has relevance. She said, ''It is important for the Chinese people to see that the United States supports their emergence onto the world's stage.''

I fundamentally differ with that assessment. I remain a Reaganite. I remain my Truman Democratic father's son. The United States, and my party in particular, exists to put communism in the ash can of history, not to usher communism onto the world's stage. If my party, as it has strayed from principle in the past, does not understand

the emancipation imperative that runs through Abraham Lincoln to Ronald Reagan and to today, we are in a sad state. I trust we wake up while there is still time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1945

OUR ONGOING MILITARY AND DIPLOMATIC MISSION IN IRAQ

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to talk about the ongoing military and diplomatic mission in Iraq and to discuss the recent testimonies given to Congress by General David Petraeus and Ambassador Ryan Crocker. Make no mistake, the situation in Iraq is the most significant issue that we, in Congress, face today. Our troops on the frontlines of the battlefield, our constituents back home, and the world look upon the actions and the debates in this body to determine our resolve.

First, let me thank the men and women serving in our Armed Forces, the diplomatic corps who are serving in that country, and our Foreign Service officers on the ground who all serve so nobly under difficult circumstances. They make our Nation great. And we owe them a debt of gratitude that can never be adequately repaid.

There are three observations that I have that drive my views and understanding of the current efforts being made in Iraq. First, the plan that was implemented about a year ago is working. General Petraeus and Ambassador Ryan Crocker are leading an effort to bring stability into Baghdad and areas throughout Iraq because they have the flexibility and the necessary resources to respond to changes on the ground. This plan is more than just simply 30,000 troops in country. The troops are placed strategically.

And we also have civilian personnel and diplomats on the ground working to help build up the political institutions from the ground up as we work with the central government so that hopefully as the two meet, we will end up with a stable Iraq that has sovereignty that can protect its borders and that can build institutions on its own and that can protect minority rights. Second, America can complete this mission successfully. Given the appropriate support and guidance, our troops and diplomats will succeed. And third, clearly, challenges remain. Both General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker outlined these challenges.

The positive trends as a result of this plan continue from last summer, and we will highlight those. But we understand many challenges remain before us, and clearly these challenges were outlined by these two gentlemen before Congress. I want to mention that failure in Iraq would have serious repercussions and dire consequences for U.S. foreign policy as well as for global security.

Most importantly, our efforts to stop terrorist organizations would be hindered. Secondly, the ability for us and others to deal with the Israeli-Palestinian peace process will become much more difficult. Thirdly, efforts to minimize Iran's dangerous mischief in this region will be diminished. And finally, stabilizing the broader Middle East will be exceedingly difficult if we fail in Iraq. Clearly, the cost and the consequences of failure are far too high.

As Members of Congress, we must listen to the professional judgments of the American leadership we have currently serving in Iraq and work with them to create and support policies that will successfully complete our mission.

Congress has a serious responsibility here. These two gentlemen and the work that they have done in Iraq has been outstanding and should be applauded. And we need to support them. And we need to have a serious debate here in Congress on what steps we need to take to continue to support this effort so that we are successful in Iraq.

Tonight, my colleagues and I will offer our thoughts on the situation there in Iraq, our reflections from recent trips and how we have moved forward. I want to encourage everyone who is listening to seek out and read the testimony of General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker. Read it carefully because it is very thoughtfully put together. They have provided an unvarnished account of what is happening on the ground, and it is the most accurate assessment of the situation. And that is what policy should be based upon. This House now has the responsibility to the American people to truthfully assess their testimonies.

At this point, I would like to pause and introduce my good friend from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY). He is a member of the Armed Services Committee. He heard the testimony this afternoon, and he'll make some comments.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana, my friend, my classmate of the Class of 2005. I am glad to be with you tonight. I did sit today through General Petraeus' testimony, as well as Ambassador Crocker's testimony, and then later in the afternoon, we heard from both General Richard Cody, as well as General Robert Magnus, Army Vice Chief, and the Marine Corps Vice Chief respectively, on the status of our current forces. And I would like to talk about kind of a combination of those conversations that we heard today.

Ambassador Crocker was asked, what does success look like in Iraq? We ought to know both sides of the equation, both sides of the coin of success and failure. He described ''success'' in Iraq as an Iraq that is developed into a

united, stable country with a democratically elected government that operates under the rule of law. And that is a path that they are on to.

Ambassador Crocker also said today that just because something is hard, as this mission is, does not make it impossible, does not mean it is hopeless simply because it is hard. We have seen some progress on the government side, the national government as well as the provincial government side, in making progress. This surge, as it has been described, was intended to reduce violence as your chart shows. It was intended to allow the government to begin to function in an atmosphere where daily death was not an issue, but they could have the conversations and the sharp disagreements from a debate standpoint on how to run that country. And they have made some progress, not nearly as much we would like, but Ambassador Crocker pointed out today that something as simple as an Iraqi flag, the Council of Representatives and the leadership have adopted a national flag that now flies throughout the country. The Kurds would not fly the flag that had flown previous to that because it had such a connection to Saddam Hussein. And so something just as simple as rallying around a single flag, and we all know how important our flag is to us in its representation to our country, they have been able to do that, and now a common Iraqi flag flies over that country.

They have executed a 2008 budget recently in September which provides for record amounts of infrastructure spending, oil revenues that they are getting from these record high oil prices that they are now plowing back into the infrastructure that every government would have to do that is in that circumstance. They have passed a pension law that addresses some of the pension issues related to people that were there. They have passed an accountability and justice law after vigorous debate on both sides because this deals with de-Baathification, in other words, that process of bringing those Iraqi citizens who had previously been Baath party members under Saddam Hussein, ferreting out those who had sold out to Saddam's thuggery and really just have to be retired, and those who simply were members of the Baath party in order to have a job, in order to be a schoolteacher, in order to be a local administrator. They passed a Provincial Powers Act which deals with the elections that are coming up in October, elections which now all major parties have endorsed and they are going to support and will come to the table including the Sunnis.

And these are not earth shattering. They are not all that they need to do. But this is a clear line of march down a path that this surge, with its sacrifices that had been made, has provided a space to get that done, and they are making progress. We all want them to make much more progress than they have made. We want them to be quicker than they have currently been.

Today, General Petraeus told us that his team on the ground seized the successes that they have had and take great comfort in that. They take great pride in what they are doing. One of the issues that comes up is continuing to replace the number of folks in our Army that we need, I'm speaking specifically of the Army. Third, he told us today the third I.D. has met its April goal for total re-enlistments already just from people serving in Iraq. General Cody participated in a re-enlistment service earlier this month in Iraq. Men who were defending their country today signed up for additional tours and additional extensions on their service to this country, which is an incredibly heartening issue.

As I said, ''hard'' does not mean hopeless. But imagine how much easier this fight would be if every American recognized enemy propaganda for what that really is and could parse that out of what we try to think about. Imagine if every American would not tolerate inaccurate reporting and biased reporting out of our media, how much easier our tasks might be. Imagine if all those Americans who oppose this war, and have every right to, would refrain from using rhetoric that is cast just to discourage our fighters, just to cause our veterans to question their service to our country.

And the easy one is imagine how much easier this fight would have been had Congress provided the funding on a timely basis through the supplemental process that we have been doing it on. We have a large supplemental that is hung up. It was requested last summer, and this Congress has sat on its fist, leaning back on its thumb for 7 months now, waiting for who knows what. I think it is waiting until next week rolls around, quite frankly.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Would the gentleman yield? I want to amplify on that. That delay really caused a lot of problems, particularly as the State Department tried to mobilize its part of the surge. It really froze their efforts for a while, and so there was a delay in getting those personnel on the ground to amplify what was being done from a security standpoint.

And I was meeting yesterday with SSG Paul Gwimes in my office. He served with the 256th in Iraq. He told me, and I have seen this when I have gone over there on two previous occasions, our men and women watch these news programs, and they watch C–SPAN, and they hear what we say. And it has an impact. We need to do everything we can to support them. I yield back to my friend.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank my colleague for that.

More on the spending issue, which is totally within the Members of this body's control, starting with the leadership of this House, dictates the pace at which that legislation should come to us. We should have already dealt with it a long time ago. But since we haven't, there are some pending consequences for not getting that done quickly.

By mid June, the military personnel account will be exhausted, and all military services will have to begin shifting money around, which, again, is just a back office accounting thing. But it delays purchasing the long lead items that are necessary to be bought out of this supplemental. This supplemental is intended not only to pay for the fight that is going on immediately, but it is also to pay for replacement of equipment and gear that is being destroyed and worn out as we fight this fight. That gear is special. You don't go down to your local Ford dealer and pick up a pickup truck. It takes long lead times to actually get that money set in place. So while we casually ignore it, we do so at the peril of our young men and women who fight this fight.

I want to recount to you a story. I've been to Iraq five times now to visit our troops and hug their necks and tell them ''thank you.'' Probably my most memorable trip was Christmas Day of 2006. I was there with IKE SKELTON and a couple of other Members of Congress. And it was particularly meaningful to be away from my family and be with men and women who are away from their families, to share that experience. I was only away from my family for about 5 or 6 days, nothing like the 15-month deployments that our men and women are enduring right now. But nevertheless, it was great to be there with them.

At Camp Victory, we went out to a perimeter fence where this particular Kentucky National Guard unit was guarding this fence for the base. And a Lieutenant Colonel Lutrell had come out, having just returned from a trip outside the wire. He had gone to a mosque. You could see the minarets just across our fence. And he had gone over there to talk to the cleric about some sort of a neighborhood watch program because of what was happening. There was an elementary school right near there that some Shia gunmen and thugs were sneaking into and using that platform to shoot at our men and women walking that wire. So this lieutenant colonel had gone to the imam, or cleric, there, because it was a Sunni neighborhood. He said, we could work out a deal. If you just give us the heads up, we will stop that. It helps you because they are just trying to force us to fire back at them into the school. And they were taking the chance of hurting their guys. So he was discussing with us about what was going on. And a young buck sergeant kind of eased up to kind of the back side of the deal. And I was standing looking at the name tags, and it was Lieutenant Colonel Lutrell and it was Sergeant Lutrell. And when I got a chance to say something, I said, you two men have the same last name. And the lieutenant colonel said, let me introduce you to

my son, Sergeant Lutrell. And my comment was, sir, your wife and his mother must be a saint to be able to endure having two very, I assume, very important men in her life in harm's way. But that is indicative of the kind of commitment to country, commitment to duty, and commitment to that flag that is played out hundreds and hundreds and thousands of times every single day over the last 6 or 7 years that we have been in the fight, good men and women stepping forward, putting education on hold, putting families on hold, putting family decisions on hold, while they went to do a job that not very many people are qualified to do, not very many people are willing to do.

So in the words of Ambassador Crocker today, our current course is hard, but it is working.

I look forward to some additional dialogue with my good colleague a little later in this hour.

□ 2000

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to now yield time to my good friend Judge CARTER from Texas. He is a member of the Appropriations Committee and the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. He knows a little bit about what is going on in Iraq. He has been there. I would love to hear what he has to say.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend for yielding, and I thank my friend for holding this special order this night where we try to lay the truth out about what is going on with our soldiers.

I have had the opportunity to go to Iraq on four different occasions and visit with soldiers. I am a blessed Congressman in that I have the very privilege and honor of representing Fort Hood, Texas. Fort Hood, Texas, is the only two division post in America, and both of those divisions are now famous for operations that have taken place in Iraq.

The 4th Infantry Division, one of the divisions at Fort Hood, captured Saddam Hussein. The 1st Calvary Division put on a free election in Baghdad. Both were major accomplishments in this war, major accomplishments in the future of Iraq, and the blood, sweat and tears that went into those projects have been brought back to central Texas on numerous occasions. So it is clearly an honor for me to be able to stand up and talk about what is going on in Iraq and why we, in my opinion, my humble opinion, and I think the opinion of those who really think about the issues, it is my opinion that we must stay the course.

What I want to be able to promise, I want to look every soldier that I see, and I see soldiers every week because I go back home every week and I go visit these soldiers, and I see them and I tell them what I want for them is I want them to come home, just like every American wants those soldiers to come home. But when the 4th Infantry Division, III Corps and the 1st Calvary Division and all those the other fine soldiers march out of Iraq, I want to see them marching out under ''The Star Spangled Banner'' and the red, white and blue, and not the white flag, and that is what they want too.

Every soldier I have spoken to, bar none, has told me they are doing a good job, they are winning, they will win, they want to stay the course. They want to finish the job they started. They say they owe it to their fallen comrades. They owe it to the effort they have put forward on behalf of humanity in Iraq.

I get real upset and tired when I hear people ragging on and insulting and writing stories about the ''evil American soldier.'' The evil American soldier that they describe doesn't exist. American soldiers are some of the closest things to sainthood that I have seen, because they are willing to stand up and fight for people, in many cases that don't even like them.

But what is really wonderful and what has changed in Iraq and what needs to be recognized by everyone is the last time I was over there in July, previous to that I was over there in May of 2006. First let me tell you, May of 2006 the weather was a lot better than the last day of July in 2007, and it was, as we say in Texas, it was hotter than a $3 pistol over there. But, seriously, when I went over this time, the difference was the interaction between ordinary Iraqi civilians and United States marines and United States soldiers. And they all talked about it at length, and I saw it demonstrated.

Prior to that time, I had never seen an Iraqi policeman anywhere. When we were in Ramadi, there was a pickup truck full of policemen on every corner and they were patrolling the streets, and people, ordinary people, were doing ordinary business in an area that had at one time been the bloodiest battlefield in Iraq, where they had pounded each other for days across this five-lane road. Now, ordinary Iraqi citizens of all ages, dressed all different ways, men and women and children, were walking, going about ordinary business there, addressing United States soldiers and United States marines, talking to them, discussing things with them, discussing things with their local politicians. It was an amazing turnaround. Amazing.

I talked to a young soldier, he couldn't have been more than about 19, a tow-headed kid, and I said, ''Tell me how it has changed?'' He said, ''Well, sir, you know, they plant these explosive devices in these streets and they plant them in the curbs and they plant them in garbage cans.'' He said, ''Boy, we used to crawl down these streets, watching everything, looking everywhere, just really concerned that the next step might blow up on us. Now we approach the streets and a member of the Friends of Iraq,'' I believe it is called, they have a belt across their chest, ''steps out and says, 'Excuse me, but don't go down this street. There is an explosive device planted in the middle of street. The arms of the other explosives are in that blue building over there. And one block over, the green front building, that is where the guys who planted it are.''' He said, ''Sir, that makes life a whole lot easier for a marine patrolling the streets here.'' You know what? That is a good story, because that is Iraqis talking to soldiers.

We visited with sheiks, and they told us that they had come to the realization when al Qaeda began to kidnap their families and try to make them take certain positions by kidnapping their families, they realized, like a revelation, who the bad guys were.

Americans had never kidnapped their families. Americans had never intimidated them in that fashion. They had never seen anything from American soldiers but trying to help, picking up the garbage, trying to make the sewer work, trying to make the electrical plant work. And then they realized these people were kidnapping their children and in many instances killing their children to try to pressure the sheiks to get their tribes to do certain things. So the sheiks said, that is it. That is it. We have had enough of this. And they went to their tribes and they told them, we are going to join the Americans.

These were Sunnis. So the first thing, of course, that we had to be concerned about was we hear so much about the difference between Sunnis and Shias, the sectarian violence. Was this going to create a rift in Iraq? We heard this story.

We have got General Funk who is a very good friend of mine who lives in my district. His son is in command in another location in Iraq. I also went to visit him while I was over there. He is a colonel. He told me that the week before, I think it was 11 or 12 Shiite sheiks came to his place where he was settled in and wanted to meet him and said, ''We have decided to join in helping the Americans get rid of al Qaeda.'' So that is the whole story.

Those of us who can remember back to the Vietnam War, we were told we were going to win the hearts and the minds of the people and that is how you won this type of war. We haven't heard that term in this war, but I remember that term. And the difference is, we never quite won the hearts and minds of the people because of mistakes that were made.

General Petraeus' plan was to capture the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people on our side, and I believe he is succeeding, and I believe, given the tools, he will continue to succeed. I can tell you one thing, he has got the best fighting force that ever walked on this Earth and the best bunch of human beings that are trying to help him do it, and we should support them in every form or fashion. That is what I think this war is all about. That is how we will walk out under the red, white and blue, and not a white flag.

So I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank my friend. That is very compelling.

I had a similar situation back in August when we went to Fallujah, and I want to pay tribute to General Walter Gaskin, because he was on the ground, a Marine general, implementing this plan through Fallujah. They used their resources strategically to reach out to these sheiks and local leaders and tribal leaders, and it made all the difference in the world.

I remember loading up in an MRAP with him in a convey. We drove into Fallujah, and it was the most remarkable thing I have done since I have been a Congressman, because just weeks before, General Gaskin told us you couldn't go down this road without hitting an IED or getting shot at.

So we drove around some of the streets of Fallujah and then we got out and walked. And we walked four or five blocks to a joint security station with our marines and with the Iraqi police. And the first marine I came up to at the security station happened to be from my district in Abbeville, and we traded stories and talked about good Cajun food and all that. But I sure was proud of him. I called his parents when I got back and we talked.

You know, it just makes you feel good knowing these young men and women are just dedicated and they are doing what they have to do, and they are the best that humanity has to offer. I agree with you, Judge.

Then we met with the precinct police colonel who was so proud of the efforts, and he showed us how much success they had had because they were implementing Iraqi solutions to the security in Fallujah. And now Fallujah is growing. The population is coming back. Businesses are opening.

I walked into a small shop and met a shopkeeper with his young son and talked with them through a translator. We handed out candy to children in the streets. We encountered a group of young children playing soccer in the streets, another group of adolescents and young men playing volleyball, and it was quite a remarkable scene to experience. So I had a similar situation, and it is really a tribute to our men and women who are down there on the ground doing this job.

Mr. CARTER. Absolutely. You know, a story I love to tell, because it was so funny, KEVIN BRADY, our colleague from Texas, was a chamber of commerce representative for a long time before he came to Congress. Of course, he worked for the local county commissioners, courts and city council and things like that.

Well, when we were in Ramadi we walked into the market, and there was this old man, and he looked like the ancient age, sitting in the chair in front of a kind of a destroyed shop. Right next door was another shop where a guy was putting wares out and getting ready to sell something. We were walking in with the general and also with the newly-elected mayor.

Well, immediately he called to have the mayor come over there, and he told the mayor, he said, ''Look,'' he said. ''You fixed his shop up. I want to know what the timetable is for fixing my shop up.'' And the mayor said, ''Oh, well, you know, we are getting the resources in. We will get it done.'' He said, ''Well, I am going to hold you to your promise, and I am going to come by the city hall and I am going to check on this, because I need my shop up so I can start operating too.''

BRADY leaned over to me and says, ''It sounds like somebody at the city council meeting in The Woodlands in Texas.''

So, you know, that is the kind of normalcy we want to see start to happen, where people are starting to think about living their life, not dodging and ducking for their life. So to me that is a good story. That is a story that says peace is breaking out in some small area anyway, because this little old man wanted his shop open. That is a great story.

Mr. BOUSTANY. That peace is breaking out because of this plan that has been implemented. And we have seen dramatic results, yet those results are still fragile and still tenuous, as both Ambassador Crocker and General Petraeus have stated. But yet it is real progress, and we have an obligation to continue on this path so that we eventually see real stability in Iraq.

Mr. CARTER. Yes, we do. Yes, we do. You know, it is very important, there has been a lot of talk about this latest fight down in Basra. Fifteen thousand Iraqis went into the fight there and there has been a lot of talk about over 1,000 of those Iraqis ran. That is kind of looking at that glass half full or half empty. Yes, maybe 1,000 or more soldiers turned and ran, but 14,000 stayed and fought.

If you went 3 years ago when I went on my second trip to Iraq and I sat down at a dinner table with a bunch of ordinary soldiers and said what are we trying to accomplish over here? And they said, sir, when they think about their units the way we think about our units, they will be a qualified fighting force over here, and we are trying to instill that in them.

I say 14,000 of them acted like soldiers, and that is something we should be proud of.

Mr. BOUSTANY. That is absolutely true and important. Not only that, Prime Minister al-Maliki made the decision to employ those troops in Basra, to take it into his own hands, and that was a huge move, because before he was afraid to confront the Jaish al-Mahdi and those insurgents. Not only that, Muqtada al-Sadr was partly responsible for helping position Maliki in as prime minister, and before he refused to take action against them when they are were doing unlawful activities.

For him to take that step was large. It was huge. And even though operationally it didn't go as smoothly as we hoped, it was a big step for them to go forward to do this, and that is a sign that things have changed. And we are seeing a change at the central level as well as what has been accomplished at the local level. As those two efforts merge, we will see a stable Iraq.

□ 2015

Mr. CARTER. That's right. I thank the gentleman for recognizing me.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Now I would like to yield some time to a good friend who has been patiently waiting here, Dr. GINGREY of Georgia, a fellow physician, a member of the Armed Services Committee who has traveled to Iraq, and we would like to hear what he has to say.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank my colleague from Louisiana, my fellow physician, for yielding. It's great to be here with two fine Texans, my classmate Judge CARTER and also Mr. CONAWAY, and talk about this important issue, because this is a very important week.

Representative CONAWAY and I both serve on the House Armed Services Committee, and my colleagues, Madam Speaker, as you, of course, know, you are a member of the committee as well, that we heard from General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker here on the House side. The Foreign Affairs Committee did as well yesterday, the same thing on the Senate side.

It was also just unbelievable the negative approach and attitude that so many members of our committee, this body, the other body, the majority party, had toward them in September, saying, you know, this surge is too little too late, the war is lost, it's a hopeless cause, there's nothing that you can do militarily, and, besides, there are all these benchmarks that the Iraqi Government has not met, and it's a failed state, we need to bring the troops home.

Well, thank God we did not bring the troops home at that time. Here we are, 10 months later, General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker returned and reported to the Congress. Almost every, indeed, every measure, every metric that you look at, they presented to us in chart form. Dr. BOUSTANY has one of those charts with him tonight in regard to the decrease in civilian deaths. He may want to talk about that later, but there is no question that in regard to security, tremendous, tremendous progress has been made. We are getting on top of this thing, and General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker both said that.

There were questions from Members, particularly on the Democratic side of the aisle, on the House Armed Services Committee, to suggest that while there was progress made militarily, there was none, no progress made politically.

These points were addressed, these questions to Ambassador Crocker, about, well, how about all these benchmarks that we asked for back in September?

Well, you know, the fact is the political surge, my colleagues, has been just about as successful as the military surge, and the progress that we have made, and Congressman CONAWAY talked about that just a little bit earlier in regard to de-Ba'athification, and he explained what is meant by that, and I know my colleagues understand that, to bring these people back in, the Sunnis that didn't have jobs, they had no way of surviving other than maybe getting paid to do bad things to our troops and to their Shia countrymen.

It was important that the Iraqi Government do that. The Iraqi Government scheduled provincial elections, which are now scheduled for October of this year, that the Iraqi Government do something in regard to oil sharing to actually have legislation in place that spells out that just because the oil in the country of Iraq happens to be located in maybe a Shia area or a Kurdish area, that the Sunnis still, as fellow Iraqis, should have a share in that revenue.

Well, de facto, they are doing that. Ambassador Crocker basically told us that of the 18 benchmarks, 12 of them have now been met, and that of the additional 6, there is significant progress on 4.

Anyone that suggests that there is not progress made politically just has to have a willing suspension of disbelief, as someone in the other body quoted, I think, last year and actually said that, too. I wonder what she would say today, based on these statistics, to ignore these metrics, would require the willing suspension of brain power. It is clear as the nose on your face, but yet certain people refuse to believe it.

What distresses me too now is those Members who want us to come home are using a different argument. They are saying not only that we've spent too much money but also making this statement, and if my colleague will bear with me for a couple of more minutes, they are making the statement that our troops are tired, they have been there too long, the equipment is wearing out and that, God forbid, there may be another conflict that's just going to break out somewhere in the world, which does occur, I guess, on average, maybe every 5 years.

They are saying that for that reason, totally ignoring what success we have achieved on the ground, that we really have victory almost in the palm of our hands. It's not there yet, it's fragile. We all admit that. But let's bring them home and prepare them for the next conflict.

Well, my colleagues, they may be, these troops that Judge CARTER, Mr. CONAWAY and Dr. BOUSTANY talked about, these personal anecdotes that they gave tonight, in talking about the enthusiasm, the morale and the patriotism of these troops, if you bring them back home when they are just on the cusp of victory, having left, then, 4,000 of their colleagues dead, men and women, and probably 25,000 severely wounded, they come home without a victory, like Judge CARTER says, with a white flag rather than Old Glory, I don't care how much you rest them, I don't care how much you re-equip them, I don't care how much you give them, more manpower or reset them, when you send them to this next contingency, I am going to ask them how hard they are going to fight. What's their morale going to be like then?

I think that's what this is all about. I think that's what the American people need to understand and that's what our colleagues in this body need to understand.

We cannot let public opinion polls and political pressure, because of an upcoming election, drive the decisions that are so important to the safety and security and the well-being of this country. I think it's clear, it was very clear to me. I had this very question written out that I wanted to ask General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker.

Unfortunately, as my colleagues know, if you are down on the lower row, Madam Speaker knows that, a lot of times they don't get to you before the clock runs out. I did submit this for the RECORD. I would like to know the answer to that question, I think the answer will be just as exactly as I expect. We can't worry about the next battle, we have got to win this one first.

I wanted to make those points to my colleagues. At this point I will yield back to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER. If you would yield for just a moment.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. CARTER. Hearing the comments of Dr. GINGREY, I was at the Vets for Freedom rally this morning, and someone read an e-mail that they had received from a captain in the field, and he said, it went something like this, I started my morning at daybreak, and I have been on three missions today. I have gotten home and I immediately went and checked the evening news, as we all do here in Iraq, to see what folks were saying back home, and I saw someone say ''I support the warriors, but I don't support the war.'' He said, ''Sir, we are the war.''

I think that's something we ought to remember. As far as they are concerned, not supporting their effort is not supporting them. We need to remember that before we hurt feelings.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Every American should remember that.

Mr. GINGREY. If the gentleman would yield just for a second, just to follow up on what Judge CARTER said, yes, this rally he was talking about was over on the Senate side in the park. JOHN MCCAIN, of course, was there and got such a round of applause and appreciation for his stance, his service, his patriotism, his service, his suffering during the Vietnam war. I stood on the dais with my fellow Members in a bipartisan way, there were Democrats there as well. I felt real proud.

I looked at these young veterans for freedom, just looking at their faces, one of them in the back had a sign, and the sign said ''General Petraeus, he is General Hooray Us,'' General Hooray Us is a take on what the New York Times did last year when General Petraeus came in anticipation of his testimony, ran that article. Of course, the New York Times didn't run the article, but it printed it. I think MoveOn.org or one of these organizations ran the article, half page, full page that said, ''General Petraeus or General Betray Us,'' a sad point in our history.

God bless these veterans for freedom.

Mr. CARTER. Amen, brother.

Mr. BOUSTANY. That's a perfect lead-in, because I want to talk a little bit about these two gentlemen who are leading this effort on the ground because I don't know if a lot of Americans really know about their background.

General Petraeus was a former commander of the 101st Airborne Division, and as many history buffs will remember, they were very famous for the first deployments behind German lines on D-Day. So that group, that division has a very illustrious history. Former Secretary of State Colin Powell was also a former commander of the 101st Airborne.

Not many people know this, but General Petraeus has a Ph.D. from Princeton University in international relations, and he is also an assistant professor of international relations at West Point.

He is a coauthor of the counter-insurgency manual that our military uses, and that's what they have actually implemented on the ground, and that's why we are seeing this great success.

Ambassador Crocker, there is a quote from his swearing in when he was sworn in as ambassador to Iraq, and I am going to quote Ambassador Crocker. He says, ''We have a historic challenge ahead of us. Terrorists, insurgents, militias continue to threaten security in Baghdad and around the country. Security is, without question, the central issue.''

In a very real sense it has been for at least the last four decades. I was here in the 1970s. There was no security. Iraqis everywhere lived in terror of the midnight knock on the door. Neighbors were afraid to talk to neighbors. It truly was the republic of fear.

Then came the savage Iran-Iraq war, Saddam Hussein's brutality to his own people, Desert Storm, and finally his overthrow in 2003. Those are all the things that the Iraqi people have had to endure in recent history.

This gentleman has a tremendous background as well. In January 2002 he was sent to Afghanistan to reopen the American embassy in Kabul. He received the Robert C. Frasure Memorial Award for ''exceptional courage and

leadership'' in Afghanistan. He was ambassador to Pakistan in 2004–2007, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs 2001–2003, and he has served as ambassador to Syria, Kuwait and Lebanon. In fact, he was at post in Lebanon in Beirut when our embassy was bombed there in 1983.

This gentleman has had tremendous experience in the Arab world, as has General Petraeus, and it's one measure of their integrity that they have provided this accurate testimony first back in September and now, to give us an accurate appraisal of what's happening in Iraq.

□ 2030

Now, let's talk a little bit about what is going on and look at a few trends.

I have a chart here that shows by different metrics, two different metrics, the Iraqi and coalition in purple, and in the blue it is coalition data. This shows the trend line. You can see how the number of civilian deaths by both tracks had gone up, particularly in the 2006 and 2007 time frame, and now as we get down to the end of these curves, you get all of the way to March of this year, and you can see the significant improvement in the security situation with regard to civilians throughout Iraq.

How many Iraqi troops do we have there out front now. Currently there are 36 battalions of national police, up from 27 a year ago; and 171 battalions of Iraqi Army up from 115 a year ago. And of those 171 battalions, 112 are taking the lead in the fight against insurgents.

When I was in Baghdad in August, I was able to witness the result of training of the elite Iraqi force that they are sending out front to deal with hostage situations and terrorists and insurgents. It is a remarkable display to watch these gentlemen in action.

Afterwards I talked to some of our Special Forces guys doing the training, and they said they are getting close. They said they will never match up to American Special Forces and Delta Team, but they are pretty good. I got to witness this. It was a sign that this training process that we struggled with on the ground is finally coming to fruition and showing real results.

Next is the chart showing Iraqi security spending. This chart shows in the blue American or U.S. spending in dollars, billions of dollars, on Iraqi security forces. You can see the trend is dropping. We had an upsurge in 2006 and 2007, which was necessary, and now it is trending downward.

In green, look at the Iraqi expenditures going up. That is a significant sign that the Iraqis were committed to this process of taking care of their own security. I think it is critically important to recognize that trend.

Now I want to address the political, economic and social situation for a moment. It is important to recognize that prior to the brutal reign of Saddam Hussein, Iraq was basically a mosaic of tribes and subtribes, and governance was largely at the local level, dictated by tribal elders, and that is what it reverted to following the takedown of Saddam Hussein. We saw sectarian violence and all the jockeying for position. But at this point as a result of the plan that was implemented a little over a year ago, significant improvements in security have resulted, enabling Iraqis to make progress with their economy. Since the so-called surge began, business registrations have increased by 9 percent. And I know from my experience when I walked through the streets of Fallujah, there were a number of shops open and families were buying goods and food products. We are seeing microlending occurring to get new businesses started.

Iraqis still have a lot of work to do with their economy, and reforms are clearly needed to transition from what was a command-and-control economy to a modern market-based economy because clearly this is a major departure from what they had before.

Centralized electricity generation is now above prewar levels, still not sufficient to meet the needs of Iraq's growing demand, but markedly improved. Other key infrastructure needs are being upgraded, especially energy pipelines and storage facilities. Unemployment is still too high, and corruption still remains a challenge, but things are improving in those areas as well.

Early in the war, the U.S. funded most of the large scale reconstruction projects in Iraq. But now, the U.S. is focusing on encouraging entrepreneurship. This is clearly having positive results. The Iraqi government is now stepping up on reconstruction projects, and they have outspent the U.S. in a recent budget 11:1. That is 11 Iraqi dollar equivalents to $1 U.S. And soon, they are expected to cover 100 percent of these expenses. This is significant progress. Ambassador Crocker pointed this out in his testimony, and it is very important for Americans out there to understand that there is a transition being made where the Iraqis are going to pay this.

The National Government has now committed $196 million to fund jobs programs so brave Iraqis who have stood up to extremists and murderers and criminals can learn skills that they need to help build a free and prosperous nation.

In July, the Asian Cup Soccer Tournament was held. This was a very important demonstration of Iraqi nationalism as the Iraqi team, known as the Lions of Two Rivers, beat the three-time champions Saudi Arabia 1–0 in their first appearance in the Asian Cup final. And there was an outpouring of nationalism and public sentiment as a result of that.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) pointed out a number of major political accomplishments: The de-Ba'athification laws that have been passed that are allowing mid-level and low-level bureaucrats to return to service; the Iraqi leaders have agreed on a budget; and revenue sharing is well underway to get funds down to the provincial local level while the permanent revenue-sharing agreement is still being worked out.

Leaders have reached agreement on provincial powers law which will allow them to hold their provincial and local elections in October. This is a very important development because as I mentioned before, to have the local development and institutions come up while central government develops, as those two efforts meet, that is where we will see stability.

When I was in Baghdad, I met with the deputy prime minister, a Sunni member of the Council of Representatives, and he told me that he felt that Americans were paying too much attention to elections at the central level. He said elections are nice, but elections are like the fruit on the tree. You have to plant the tree, let it establish its roots, and grow. He was talking about institutions that need to develop from the ground up to have long-term stability. I will never forget that metaphor because it really demonstrates what is going on and the power of this plan that is in place that General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker have implemented.

Ambassador Crocker said today, in commenting on the events in Basra, ''When viewed with a broader lens, the Iraqi decision to combat these groups in Basra has major significance. First, a Shia majority government has demonstrated its commitment to take on criminals and extremists regardless of sectarian identity.''

That is a significant development that would not have happened even a year ago.

My friend from Texas, I yield to him.

Mr. CONAWAY. As we draw to the close of this hour, I want to talk briefly about something that also came up in today's conversation. General Petraeus, you went through his resume awhile ago, something that you didn't mention was that he has been deployed overseas, away from his family 4½ years since this fight began in 2001, a significant sacrifice for his family, and in order for him to do the job that we have asked him to do.

He said he is keenly aware, personally as well as for the men and women that he leads, that the impact that multiple deployments have had, the impact of the 15-month deployment instead of the 12-month deployment is having on these troops. He said that they have answered the call every single time and have not yet one time blinked in the face of some incredible sacrifices and commitments that we are asking them to take on.

One of the problems that we face here stateside is that a remarkably small percentage of Americans have been directly involved in this fight. We have a little more than 4,000 families now

whose lives are forever changed as a result of that knock on the door saying that their loved one has been killed in action or killed in one of these two fights in Afghanistan or Iraq. We have 25,000 or so others wounded in some level of severity, some who have returned to the fight, and many who have life-altering circumstances that happened in the blink of the eye. None of them joined our services to get hurt like that; but they have, and they are now facing a different life, a different style of doing things than they ever contemplated before.

They also talked about the men and women who continue to sign up to serve their country. Men and women who know if you join our Army or our Marine Corps today, given this persistent war that we are going to be in, they will fight. This isn't your granddad's army. This is an Army and a Marine Corps that will be asked to fight.

I marvel personally at the strength and resolve and resoluteness that these families exhibit. Individually they have made incredible sacrifices. I get a tiny, little glimpse of the anxiety when I go to Afghanistan and Iraq because of the concern and worry that Suzanne, my wife, has while I am away. You and I when we go are never in harm's way. So that helps me a little bit empathize with what the families back home go through 24 hours a day, 7 days a week when they have a loved one in harm's way. While the loved one in harm's way knows whether or not something scary is going on, the folks back home think it is happening all the time and they live in dread of something bad happening.

In the face of those sacrifices and commitments that we have asked them to make, they are standing tall and reenlisting in numbers that are appropriate, and new people are coming into the system in numbers that are sufficient to grow the Marine Corps as well as grow the Army which will help shift some of the burden, spread some of the burden out across a larger number of troops.

But I stand in awe of how magnificent these warrior families are, as well as their warriors, doing a job that their Commander-in-Chief has asked them to do and that their Nation has asked them to do, and a fight that I personally believe protects America's interests and also keeps us safer at home than we otherwise would have been.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the gentleman. We all owe a great debt of gratitude to every family who has sacrificed. This is hard, and every American should care about this and be engaged in this process.

I continue to say that the men and women who put on the American uniform are the finest that humanity has to offer because of those sacrifices and what they do. Oftentimes, whether it is Iraq or Afghanistan or some other tough spot, the only American that people in these countries actually get to see are our American men and women in uniform, and they are oftentimes our finest ambassadors. And so we owe them a whole lot, a great debt of gratitude for what they have done, and we should never forget and always stand up.

I would urge folks, whenever they see someone in uniform, shake their hand and thank them for the service they have provided, and thank their families for the difficulties they have had to go through.

You know, Ambassador Crocker said today, I am going to quote one more time here, ''Last September, I said that the cumulative trajectory of political, economic and diplomatic developments in Iraq was upwards, although the slope of that line was not steep. Developments over there, the last 7 months, have strengthened my sense of a positive trend. Immense challenges remain and progress is uneven and often frustratingly slow, but there is progress. Sustaining that progress will require continuing U.S. resolve and commitment. What has been achieved is substantial, and it is also reversible.''

That really summarizes where we are today and how important it is that we have the resolve to see this through because the consequences of failure are immense. I mentioned that earlier.

Osama bin Laden himself has made statements about the importance of Iraq to these terrorist activities. I have a quote here. This is Osama bin Laden: ''A war is underway. The epicenter of these wars is Baghdad, the seat of the caliphate.'' The caliphate is what they hope to achieve, an empire, an Islamist, radical empire. ''Success in Baghdad will be success for the U.S.''

They don't want us to succeed in Baghdad. They want to drive us out.

Let me pull up the next chart.

I want to read this last one. This is in a letter from Ayman al-Zawahiri, the number two of al Qaeda, to Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, who headed up the al Qaeda effort in Iraq before we were able to eliminate him: ''Al Qaeda's stated Iraq strategy consists of three steps: Expel the Americans from Iraq; establish an Islamic authority; and extend the jihad wave to the secular countries neighboring Iraq.''

□ 2045

That's important because the countries neighboring Iraq or Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Kuwait, and their goal is to overthrow these countries. That's their stated goal over and over in their communications, and that's why it's critical that we have success in Iraq because, again, we won't have peace throughout the Middle East. It'll have dire repercussions with regard to Lebanon.

I didn't mention Iran, which also borders Iraq, and it's a fluid border. And the Iranians are definitely causing mischief, dangerous mischief in Iraq and around the region. That's what's at stake here, and that's why we must be successful in Iraq.

With that, I want to conclude. I want to thank my colleagues for participating in this. I can't help but think of a Gold Star mother back home, Yvette Burridge, who's a friend of mine who's son went to high school with my son in Lafayette, Louisiana, Marine, Private First Class, David Paul Burridge who was killed in action on September 6, 2004 at 19 years of age. And every time I see Yvette Burridge, she has pride in her eyes. She's proud of what her son did. She's proud that he gave his life for his country.

And we all have stories like that that we should commemorate, those who have given their lives and who have been wounded in this effort. But we should never forget this effort. It's critically important to success in American foreign policy and American national security.

HONORING BEN CRENSHAW

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor and pay tribute to an exceptional athlete and distinguished American, Ben Crenshaw.

Architect, historian, gentleman, all of these words correctly portray Ben Daniel Crenshaw. But perhaps the most fitting description for this great golfer is champion.

The people of Augusta, Georgia, who I represent, and golf fans around the world recognize Ben Crenshaw as one of the finest, most talented golfers on the PGA circuit.

Crenshaw has been a phenomenon on the golf course since childhood, winning his first tournament, the Casis Elementary Open, in the fourth grade. He continued to play through middle school and high school, claiming several championship titles. It was clear then that Ben Crenshaw was on his way to greatness.

He made school history during the 1970–71 academic year at the University of Texas when Crenshaw became the first freshman to capture the individual title during the NCAA tournament at the Tuscan National Golf Club. His outstanding accomplishments and victories that year earned Crenshaw the privilege to be named to the 1971 All American collegiate golf team.

Crenshaw's early achievement set the stage for an extraordinary career. His most notable achievements include being a 19-time winner on the PGA tour, captain of the 1999 U.S. Ryder Cup team whose stunning comeback is remembered as one of the most exciting competitions in that match's history.

And he's also a two-time Masters champion. Many will never forget the emotional scene that played out on the 18th green when, in 1995, Crenshaw clinched his second Masters victory and earned yet another green jacket.

In addition to these accomplishments, he has been a tremendous ambassador for the game of golf, as well as a consummate gentleman and human being.

I had the privilege of being in Augusta on April 7, 2008 before the 72nd Master's Tournament as Mayor Deke Copenhaver awarded Crenshaw a crystal ''key to the city.'' It is an honor for me to pay tribute to a great American golf legend, Ben Crenshaw.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Madam Speaker, and good job on my name pronunciation. I have a hard time with it too.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to begin the 30–Something Working Group's special order hour tonight. Speaker PELOSI has given us the privilege to come to the floor night after night to talk about the issues that are important to the American people, from our generation's perspective. And it is something that we have appreciated for a number of years because we've had an opportunity to engage the next generation of Americans, who clearly are yearning for their government to be responsive to them, to have their confidence in their government restored.

And tonight what we want to focus on, particularly because General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker came to Capitol Hill this week to talk about the so-called progress, or lack thereof, which is a better expression, in the war in Iraq, we felt it was important to highlight tonight the absolute cost of the war in Iraq and the toll that it is taking on, not just our military troops, but their families and on America as a whole.

And I think there is no more telling statement that could be made than the one that was made by General Petraeus himself in response to Senator EVAN BAYH's question, or comment, that there was much ambiguity in Iraq. And General Petraeus conceded that point.

General Petraeus stated this week, in fact I believe it was today, that in Iraq we haven't turned any corners; we haven't seen any lights at the end of the tunnel. The champagne bottle has been pushed to the back of the refrigerator, he said, referencing President Bush and former Vietnam-era General William Westmoreland's famous phrases.

It is clear that we have made virtually no progress, and that the only things that we are celebrating at this point is that there has been a reduction in violence. I wonder what that has brought us. What has that brought Americans?

Well, let's go through what the so-called progress in Iraq that was described by General Petraeus today and this week, what that's brought us.

We spend about $339 million in Iraq every single day, Madam Speaker. $339 million. And I'd like to go through the actual monetary costs of the war in a little bit. But let me just talk about what $339 million would get us and the investments that we could make in America, domestically, in the event that we were not hopelessly mired in this war in Iraq.

$339 million would get us 2,060 more Border Patrol agents that could be hired to protect our borders for a year.

18,000 more students could receive Pell Grants to help them attend college for a year with $339 million.

48,000 homeless veterans could be provided with a place to live for a year.

317,000 more children could receive every recommended vaccination for a year.

955,000 families could get help with their energy bills through the Low Income Home Energy Assistance program, that's the LIHEAP program, for a year.

Nearly 480,000 women, infants and children could receive nutritional help with the WIC program for a year.

2.6 million Americans without adequate health insurance could have access to medical and dental care at community health centers for a year for $339 million.

More than 100 local communities could make improvements to their drinking water with help from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund for a year.

I could continue on and on, Madam Speaker, listing all the important investments that we could and should be making, were we not spending $339 million in Iraq every day.

Now, let me just make that comparison again. I'm talking $339 million that we're spending in Iraq every day, and the list I just went through details what $339 million would buy for a year.

Now, I went home to my district a couple of weeks ago when we went into recess and talked to my constituents, had a lot of interaction with them. And you know, what was amazing was how top of mind the economy is.

We're less than a week from the April 15 tax deadline, and I'm sure that there are folks out there tonight that are sitting and doing their taxes while trying to figure out how they're going to write that check when they're done, and wondering how they're going to take their child to the doctor if they don't have health insurance, wondering how they're going to make sure that they can put food on the table and fill their gas tank, because now that gas is over $3 a gallon, really over $3.30 a gallon, it boggles the mind of my constituents and I know the constituents of virtually every Member, no matter what party we represent, that we are actually still, 5 years later, in Iraq, with an administration that just doesn't seem to get it; that doesn't seem to be willing to recognize that it is time to bring our troops home; that we have taken too great a toll.

The question that my constituents and that Americans are asking is, how much is too much? At what point do we say the cost is too great?

I think you have to take a look at the toll that this is taking on military families. If we're not going to say that the investments we can't make because we're spending so much money in Iraq are worth the cost, then let's look at what the military leadership is saying about the toll that this war is taking on our troops.

An Army study of mental health, and this is from an article a couple of days ago, April 6 in the New York Times, an Army study of mental health showed that 27 percent of noncommissioned officers, a critically important group, on their third or fourth tour, exhibited symptoms commonly referred to as post-traumatic stress disorders. That figure is far higher than the roughly 12 percent who exhibit those symptoms after one tour, and the 18½ percent who develop the disorders after a second deployment, according to the study which was conducted by the Army Surgeon General's mental health advisory team.

So we're not talking about organizations conducting studies examining the mental health of our troops that are outside the military process. We're talking about military organizations that are saying that the strain on our troops mentally has really reached a breaking point.

We have combat troops that have been sent to Iraq for a third and fourth time, where more than one in four, more than one in four, show signs of anxiety, depression or acute stress, according to an official Army survey of soldiers' mental health. There is an increasing alarm about the mental health of our troops and, at some point, something has to give.

Again, when do we say enough is enough? When do we say that we have to make sure that we can focus on the needs here in the United States of America?

We are struggling with an economy that is at its breaking point. Yet, the economy in Iraq seems to be thriving. The Iraqi government is actually dealing with a budget surplus, and we are facing a deficit. There's something wrong with that picture, Madam Speaker.

Let me just, I really want to turn, I think people should be given a really clear picture about the monetary cost that we are dealing with when it comes to this war, this ongoing and continuous war in Iraq.

This is from our nonpartisan Congressional Research Service report, the Cost of Iraq War Rising. Here's the breakdown of what we're spending in Iraq per year, per month, per week, per day, per hour, per minute and per second.

If you take a look at the number per year, the amount per year that we are

spending in Iraq, we're spending $123.6 billion per year.

Now, that's a hard number to maybe get your mind around. Billions and millions of dollars are very big numbers that most people aren't dealing with every day in their daily life.

So let's go down to the monthly expenditure that we're making here. That amounts to $10.3 billion.

But if we want to drill down a little bit further and deal with the weekly and daily expenditures, weekly, we're spending $2,376,923,077. Per day we're spending almost $339 million, as I described a few minutes ago.

But hourly, this is really the number, Madam Speaker, that I think will hit home with virtually all Americans. We are spending, hourly, in Iraq, and this is, again, third-party validator, the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service report on the cost of the Iraq war and its rising cost. Per hour we are spending $14,109,589 in Iraq.

I don't think it's necessary for me to go down to the minute and the second. I think the point is well made. $14 million an hour. I mean, that is just unbelievable.

□ 2100

How many is too much? When do we say that the toll that this is taking on our troops is just beyond our capacity? Since the start of the war in Iraq, we have had 4,013 brave American men and women in uniform that have been killed. We have an estimated almost 30,000 servicemembers that have been wounded in Iraq, and as of March 1, more than 31,300 have been treated for noncombat injuries and illness.

According, again, to the Army's own mental health advisory team, soldiers who are on their second, third, and fourth deployments report low morale, more mental health problems, and more stress-related work problems.

Now, Madam Speaker, these numbers right here really sent chills down my spine. An estimated three-quarters of a million troops have been discharged since the war in Iraq began, many of whom have had compromised mental and physical health. An estimated 260,000 have been treated at veterans' health facilities, nearly 100,000 have been diagnosed as having mental health conditions, and an additional 200,000 have received some level of care from walk-in facilities. That is just unbelievable.

I can tell you that I have been to Walter Reed Army Medical Center to visit our wounded troops that have come back from Iraq. I've told this story during the 30–Something Working Group in the past. I will tell it again because really, as a mom with young kids, it was so disturbing to me.

I walked into this young soldier's room to talk to him about his injury and to talk to him about what he went through, and his wife and his 6-year-old little boy were in there with him. And I had a nice chance to chat with the little boy. He was very exuberant and excited. It was really a lovely conversation. He was so excited. His dad had just come back from his third tour in Iraq, each of a year. Now remember, this little boy was 6 years old, and the father was telling me he had a stress-related mental health injury, and the father was telling me about how he was supposed to be finished with his tour in August, was still hoping to go back, by the way, which is amazing because these troops that represent the United States of America are just absolutely so committed and so patriotic, and really, I just so admire their bravery.

But what the little boy said when I had a chance to talk to him, he said he was so excited, my daddy is coming home after August. And when he said that, it occurred to me that this little boy being 6 and his father having been through three 1-year deployments in Iraq, this father had missed half of his son's life. Half of his son's life. That just was mind-boggling to me being a mom of 8-year-old twins and a 4-year-old. I just can't even imagine. I have children close to that age, and I can't imagine having missed half their life. I mean, that just takes a toll on families. It takes a toll on marriage.

Madam Speaker, even the time that myself and other parents serving in Congress here are away from our families, I know the toll that it takes on my husband when I'm here just working in Washington and not with him and leaving my kids with him to make sure that he gets them bathed and gets their dinner and the homework is done and all of the things that have to be done on a daily basis with families. It takes a toll that I am here and not with him to help him do that.

Add the stress of your family member being thousands of miles across the world in a war zone, in a war situation, not knowing whether they're going to ever come back, the not knowing when they're going to come back because the military keeps extending these tours of duty, keeps sending them back, does not give them enough rest in between the tours of duty. The Army, over the last several years, has extended the rest, extended the tours of duty from 12 months to 15 months, Madam Speaker, so now we are beyond a year for deployments. And General Petraeus said we may be able, by the end of the summer to pull back the length of the deployments from 15 months to 12 months, but we're still going to be at 140,000 troops once we draw down the amount of the surge. That means there is no difference, Madam Speaker, between where we are now and where we were before the start of the surge. How do you call that progress?

Someone is using a different dictionary than I am if that's progress. I mean, the dictionary that I use to define ''progress'' says that we see improvement, that the quality of life improves, that there's a light at the end of the tunnel, which General Petraeus clearly said we do not see right now.

I want to just quote, and in the 30–Something Working Group, we try to use third-party validators. So it is not just our words that we use to demonstrate the statements that we are making; we try to back up our words with evidence.

So let me talk about the cost to military families from military leaders' perspective.

General George Casey said recently on March 26 in the Wall Street Journal that 15-month-long deployments are impacting on their families, it's impacting on their mental health. We just can't keep going at the rate that we're going.

General Richard Cody, the Army vice chief of staff: Our readiness is being consumed as fast as we build it. Lengthy and repeated deployments with insufficient recovery time have placed incredible stress on our soldiers and our families, testing the resolve of our all-volunteer force like never before.

Let's go down to what retired Admiral William Fallon, the former commander of the U.S. Central Command said: I will certainly tell you that I think our troops are in need of a change in the deployment cycle. We've had too many, from my experience, of several of our key segments of the troop population, senior NCOs, mid- to junior officers, on multiple rotations. He said, I look at my commanders, and some of them have logged more months in Iraq in the last decade than they have at home by a significant amount.

Can you imagine? More months in Iraq over the last 10 years than they have at home. Imagine the cost, the toll that that takes on their families. Let us go beyond the toll on families.

It is pretty clear that we have had a dramatic increase in the cost of fuel and the cost of a barrel of oil just during our time in the last 5 years in the Middle East. We have gone from gas prices being a little more than $1, about $1.26 or so, to now gas prices being well over $3.30 and expected this summer to reach $4 or more.

I can tell you that I am a minivan mom, Madam Speaker, and I regularly drive my kids around our community and car pool with the best of them. The last time I filled up my tank, which was last week, it cost $65. Now, the last time I talked about how much it cost me to fill up my tank, and Mr. RYAN remembers this, I really feel like this is 30-Something redux. I mean, really. It's déjà vu all over again. You could roll back the tape to 2, 3 years ago when we were talking about the cost of the war in Iraq and the impact, and we are basically saying the exact same thing. It is just unbelievable.

But the last time I talked on the floor, spoke on the floor about how much it cost me to fill up my minivan, it was about $55. And that's really only been about a year since the last time we talked about the impact of oil prices. And what the leaders that look and examine this information have said is that any time we have extended involvement in the Middle East, you see

a dramatic rise in oil prices that coincide with that.

The price of gas and the price of oil, in this environment and in this economy, is just devastating to American families.

So you have extensions of impact and extensions of costs beyond just the toll that it takes on the troops themselves, the toll that it takes on their families. There's a toll on America. There's a toll on society. I mean, it's so disconcerting and it's so disheartening to listen to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who seem to just be in utter denial. I mean, they just keep saying the same thing over and over.

And we've been talking about the cost of this war, and I'm so glad to be joined by my good friend, Congressman TIM RYAN from the great State of Ohio who I have shared many an opportunity to speak on the floor about the things that Americans care about in the 30–Something Working Group.

It's just shocking that the administration is continuing to expect more of the same and to have there be more of the same and to expect a different result. There really is, and I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. As we've gone through this debate for years and years and years, as you said, we've been on the floor talking about this for a long time; and you start to hear these arguments, the same ones over and over and over regardless of what the facts are on the ground.

And the issue, I think, that has become most apparent, and some say the surge was a success. Some say, well, maybe it wasn't. Some say there hasn't been any political success. Some say there has been some. I think this has kind of gotten boiled down to one point. Some people are saying we need to stay. And you know what? Maybe, maybe if we accept that argument, maybe they're right. Maybe we should stay. But they're only going to stay at the expense of the future of this country. We will bankrupt this country if we continue to stay in Iraq.

And when you look at all of the great powers over time, they get too extended, too far out, too far out ahead of themselves; and what we are saying here is there is a reality on the ground that we need to deal with in order to address the issues that are facing the United States of America. This is about making sure that we are a strong country. If we are not a strong country, we are of no good to anybody else.

And the point that we are trying to make and that the Speaker is trying to make and the Democrats in the Senate are trying to make and like-minded Republicans are trying to make is that we can't sacrifice the United States of America for Iraq.

Now, we do bear some responsibility because we went in, but you can't continue to say that we are going to borrow, because we don't have this money. We are borrowing it all. $3 trillion is what the projections are now for the cost for Iraq when you factor in vets coming back and health care and what not. $3 trillion? We are going to borrow it from China and Japan and OPEC countries to fund a war that we are not having any political progress at all?

The sides are not reconciling. They're not moving forward in the political process. That's a problem.

So, even if you say we need to stay, you need to then be willing to spend enormous amounts of money, United States dollars, over the course of the next several decades and, as some people have said, over the course of the next hundred years.

And what we are trying to say is, we've got problems here at home that we need to deal with. We've got an energy crisis. We've got a health care issue that needs to be dealt with. Growing inequality. We can't afford to spend $3 trillion on this war.

Now, I don't think that's unreasonable because the strength of the country is at stake, and all we have to do is look around. We don't have this money. And this isn't just us. Joseph Stiglitz, Noble Peace Prize economist, there's no such thing as a free lunch, and there's no such thing as a free war. The Iraq adventure has severely weakened the U.S. economy whose woes go far beyond loose mortgage lending. You can't spend $3 trillion, yes, $3 trillion, on a failed war abroad and not feel the pain at home.

This is a political reality that we have to deal with in the United States of America. And we are making difficult decisions. No one is saying yank the rug out. We are saying have a responsible, planned exit in which this country and the soldiers that we have trained and the close to $1 trillion that we have spent already, that investment, allow these people to take over their country.

I think there's a little bit of a misperception that there is not going to be, like we are going to be able to just leave Iraq, whenever it is, tomorrow or 10 years from now; and if we do it right, that there is not going to be any conflict, we will just kind of sneak out and everything will just harmoniously arrange itself.

And I think we need to realize that whether we get out 6 months from now or a year from now or 8, 10 years from now, there's going to be conflict. You have got groups of people that have hated each other for thousands of years. And there is not going to be any real polite settlement of this dispute.

□ 2115

And so we need to realize that. And by realizing that, I think it helps us get to the point where we say, well, maybe we need to just get out now because this dust-up is going to happen anyway.

And when you look at what happened the other day with the Iraqi offensive onto this militia group and then a thousand Iraqi soldiers left and abandoned the mission, would they have left if we weren't there? That's a question I think we need to ask, would they have left? But they know we're there. This is part of the problem.

We're creating a welfare state. These people are in a state of dependency upon the United States, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And if we continue to be there all the time, we're never going to leave, we're always going to be here for you. You know, you see all the time, this is the equivalent of a 35-year-old person still living at home with their parents. They get into a state of dependency, and they can never be responsible.

And I understand all the dynamics. I didn't want to go into this war in the first place, I was against it from the beginning, so we've got some responsibility to bear. But haven't we made the investment? And we know at some point they've got to step up and make their own way here. So I think a lot of us are just saying, let's just do it.

I yield to my friend.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Exactly. A lot of us are saying, it's time, that it is time to begin the drawdown, to begin to bring our troops home.

Many of us that believe it is time to begin the troop withdrawal, we're not talking about precipitous withdrawal. Our friends on the other side of the aisle like to, you know, they're really excellent at using strong language and scare tactics. And it's always interesting to listen to them try to exaggerate beyond all reasonable proportion what it is we're saying instead of actually listening to what we're saying. It would be nice if they would also listen to their own constituents because I have a feeling that they're not hearing anything different than what we're hearing when we go home, particularly when they are staring down the following facts:

Nearly 1.7 million U.S. troops have been deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan since September 2001; 1.7 million U.S. troops. That's 1.7 million different individuals. More than 599,000 have been deployed more than once. More than 782,000 servicemembers, Mr. RYAN, have been deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan that are parents with one or more children. Forty percent have been deployed more than once. Nearly 35,000 troops have been separated from their children for four or more deployments. And Mr. RYAN, I talked a little bit about that 6-year-old boy that I met when I went to Walter Reed whose dad had missed half his life. And I also talked about the toll that those separations from their families take on the parent who is gone, but particularly on the parent who is home, holding the fort down, making sure that they can move their children's lives and their lives forward by themselves and the stress that that brings on a family and on a marriage. The statistics that we know about say that, according to the Center for American Progress, 20 percent of marriages of deployed troops are headed for a divorce right now based on a

survey done by the Center for American Progress. According to a report, again by the Army's Mental Health Advisory Team, work-related problems due to stress, mental health problems and marital separations generally increase with each subsequent month of the deployment. So the length of these deployments is taking its toll on families.

An estimated 2,100 troops tried to commit suicide or injure themselves last year, which is up from 350 in 2002. That's an astronomical jump. I mean, we've got the facts right under our noses. When do we say that we care about these troops as people, not as fighters, not as defenders of America, but as people? And when do we recognize that there is a limit to their ability to hold down their lives and to be able to return to a quality of life that they had before they left? The insensitivity is mind boggling, and the refusal of this administration to recognize that there is a cost and a toll that is being taken on these families, on the individual troops, on the United States of America and on our economy.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I don't know if you've had an opportunity to see the documentary, and I haven't seen the documentary, but I've seen Phil Donahue talking about the documentary that he did, it's called ''Body of War.'' And it's basically these soldiers who have come back and the injuries that they're dealing with, the folks that we see going up to Walter Reed. And talk about an eye-opening experience when you first go to Walter Reed and you see these 21, 22-year-old kids without legs, without arms, severe brain damage, brain trauma, you know, all of the gruesomeness. But I think Donahue does a good job by bringing this to life and doing a documentary, Eddie Vetter does some of the music on it, so it's really a compelling case. But it goes to the point that we're all talking, you know, we're all talking numbers, 4,013, and 29,628 injured. I mean, these are numbers, but these are families that have been ripped apart, that will never be the same.

If we have an opportunity and enough facts to stop this thing, because it's not in the best interest of, obviously, a lot of these families, but this country, and you look at the human cost, as Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ has said, is tremendous. The financial aspect of this is detrimental to the future of this country. The readiness of our own troops, the lack of readiness, to be able to address some of these problems. And this is not something that you have to believe the Democrats or believe a politician on, this is retired Major General Punaro, Commission on the National Guard and Reserve, ''we think there is an appalling gap in readiness for homeland defense because it will be the Guard and Reserve that have to respond for these things.'' Army Vice Chief of Staff Richard Cody said the Army, ''no longer has fully combat ready brigades on standby should a threat or conflict occur.'' We're not making this up. In this country, we need to be prepared to responsibly, prudently, and practically disengage ourselves.

Empower the Iraqis. We've trained them for years. You know, I hate to always fall back on this example, but it's like when you're getting ready for a football season or a basketball season or a baseball season, you go through spring training and then the game is on a certain day and the coaches are coaching you, at some point you've taught the team all you can teach them, you've practiced as much as you can, and you're not fully ready for the game, but you've got to go play. And the coaches can't go on the field for you. And that's the situation we're in.

The Iraqis are never going to be perfectly prepared, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It's never going to be perfect. There's never going to be a perfect time where all these people are trained to the tee and we're going to be able to say, now they're ready. Because you always make mistakes, you're never trained enough, you're never prepared enough, especially when you're dealing with all the cultural issues that we're dealing with.

So what we're arguing is that they're never going to be perfectly ready. And I think there would have been a better chance the other day of these thousand soldiers sticking with the mission that they had and staying there, but they knew the Americans were there, and so it became convenient to say, I'm out of here, the Americans will take over.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I think it's clear, and you're absolutely right, I think it's clear that the time has come. And this is not just our opinion, but it's clear that Americans believe that the time has come to shift our focus to the dire situation that we have with our economy.

And I can tell you, anecdotally, when I went home to my district during our recess, I had town hall meeting, and I do at least one town hall meeting every recess; when I did this last one, I actually, Mr. RYAN, had to bring Iraq up myself, otherwise the entire focus of the questions and the comments from my constituents would have been the economy. I actually had to affirmatively talk about the war in Iraq. And there was significant responsiveness on the part of my constituents, who agreed, it is long past time to bring the troops home. But really, at the top of their mind right now is the economy.

And just to illustrate that point, there was a new poll done recently by the New York Times, a CBS poll that showed 89 percent of those surveyed believe the cost of the war has contributed a lot or some to the United States' economic problems. When they were asked, from what you know, how much do you think the cost of the war in Iraq has contributed to the U.S. economic problem, a lot, some, not much, or not at all, 66 percent of people who responded to this survey said that it has affected the economy a lot. And add 22 percent more to make 88 percent who believe that it has affected the economy even at all.

Now, this week obviously it was a big deal that General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker were coming to testify in front of Congress on the progress, or lack thereof, that has been made. There were lots of newspaper headlines with pictures of the general testifying, a plea from Petraeus in the Washington Post, and ''Petraeus Urges Halt in Weighing New Cut in Force'' in the New York Times. The Washington Times, ''Petraeus Warns of Iraq Backslide.'' ''Iraq Troop Levels Left Open'' in USA Today. But arguably, the newspaper in America that most closely focuses on the economy and on the financial health of our Nation is the Wall Street Journal.

This is today's Wall Street Journal, Mr. RYAN. There is absolutely no headlines, nothing on the front page, any article related to General Petraeus's testimony. There is a little tiny entry under ''What's News'' that says ''Petraeus recommended that U.S. troop withdrawals be halted indefinitely this summer, warning that security gains in Iraq are fragile.'' I mean, that's the priority that the Wall Street Journal places on the economy versus the war in Iraq, where every other article, ''Bush to Expand Help on Mortgages,'' ''Subprime Lenders Failure Sparks Lawsuit Against Wall Street Banks,'' those are the things that we should be focusing, like a laser beam, our attention on because our constituents are suffering.

There are folks that I represent who are having their homes foreclosed on that in a million years these middle class folks would never have been in that situation financially if we were not focused somewhere halfway across the world as opposed to getting our fiscal house in order here in the United States of America.

And if folks don't believe what we're saying here, let's use the third-party validators that we always use, Mr. RYAN. I will quote Robert Reischauer, the former Director of the Congressional Budget Office, also a respected institution here that is nonpartisan. He said, contrary to the notion that war spending bolsters the economy, he said recently that the ''domestic benefits of war spending have been muted because spending is stimulating economies elsewhere, not the least being the economies of Iraq, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia.''

I alluded to these numbers earlier, and now I've found them in my notes, the price of oil and the direct correlation to our involvement in the Middle East and the skyrocketing cost of oil. The price of oil has skyrocketed since the Iraq war began. The national average price per gallon of regular gasoline

before the start of the Iraq war was $1.73. Today, it's $3.34 cents, which is an increase of more than 93 percent. And this is predictable.

In March 2003, Sung Won Sohn, then an economist for Wells Fargo Bank, not exactly a progressive think tank, noted that ''any time there is conflict in the Middle East, oil prices hit record figures.'' And he warned that the longer the war lasted, the higher prices would go.

We can't take higher prices for gas than we're facing now. We already expect this summer for them to go over $4. When is enough going to be enough?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Well, when you look at how many different ways the Iraq war is like that pressure point that you hit and it has all these different ramifications all over the country, all over the economy, all over our society in so many different ways, and this is the one issue that needs to be addressed if we are going to make any kind of headway into converting our economy over from manufacturing and basically the industrial age into a new high-tech economy that everyone benefits from it.

Now, in Youngstown, Ohio, or in Warren or Akron or Cleveland or the industrial Midwest or Pittsburgh, Detroit, whatever the case may be, if the amount of money that was spent already in Iraq, nearly $1 trillion, was invested into these communities that, for example, have been hurt by globalization, and the big debate in the Ohio and Texas primary was NAFTA, NAFTA, NAFTA, and some areas benefited and some areas didn't, and Texas did this and Ohio did that and whatnot, just think, if all the communities that were very successful 50 years ago and pumped a lot of money into this country in steel and rubber and coal and all this stuff that were hurt by globalization, the investment of $1 trillion was made into those communities in water lines, sewer lines, roads, education, community colleges, worker retraining, investments into the NIH research, investments in alternative energy, figuring out who's going to make the windmill, figuring out how biodiesel is actually going to work without having all these different adverse effects, figuring out who's going to make the solar panels and how we're going to make these investments, $1 trillion that has been spent in Iraq, and we have no real signs of success.

□ 2130

No real signs of success. So this is what we're all factoring in here: The fact that it's costing us $1 trillion already and projected to be $3 trillion; the fact that all that money is borrowed; the fact that our friends on the other side raised the debt limit five times and borrowed $3 trillion already from Japan, China, and OPEC countries; the fact that our homeland has suffered because of the Guard and Reserve, and so we are incapable now of addressing major threats to the United States; the fact that our army is not at the level it should be, all of these factor in. The lack of readiness, the money, and then the lost opportunity.

We are Americans. We think about what can be. We think about the future. We think about where we want to go, what we want to be, what we want to do. And we are stuck because we don't have the resources to make the investments that Americans have always made: canals, railroads, Internet superhighway, investments in all these research projects that bounce into the Internet and put men in spaceships and land them on the moon. That's what Americans do. So let's put ourselves in a position where we can make these investments so these kids that we talk about all the time can have a future, have an economy. When you look at the benefits of NASA and science and technology and math over the years, how many corporations benefited from all of that, that's what we're talking about doing. Let's think about the future.

And when you look at this war as missed opportunities with Afghanistan, national security alone. We have missed opportunities catching bin Laden, focusing on Afghanistan, focusing on the global war on terror, these networks. We should have been tripling and quadrupling our special forces and hiring people who speak Farsi to translate tapes that we're pulling down from the satellites. All this stuff could have been done. A missed opportunity. Economically, missed opportunity.

So, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, thank you for coming down to this floor and claiming our hour tonight, and it's been great to be with you again. And we're going to keep plugging away here.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We are.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. This is the pressure point. This is the issue facing our country, and we are going to keep speaking out on it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, what I think has been really interesting is observing the struggle that military leaders underneath General Petraeus have been going through in trying to be good soldiers and toe the party line about not being ready to withdraw and for us to leave those 140,000 troops indefinitely in Iraq, which is the decision that was clearly made before General Petraeus came to testify this week. But when they're asked specific questions about the impact on our troops, the truth comes through in their statements.

General Richard Cody, the Army Vice Chief of Staff: ''Our readiness is being consumed as fast as we build it . . . lengthy and repeated deployments with insufficient recovery time have placed incredible stress on our soldiers and our families.''

And we're not talking about retired commanders or retired military leaders, who some people might suggest are retired for a reason. We're talking about the people who are currently fully engaged in our efforts over there.

Lieutenant General Benjamin Mixon, Commanding General of the U.S. Army Pacific: ''We are going to have to change our strategy in Iraq to reduce the numbers of troops and thereby reduce the rotations and increase the dwell time that we get back here at home.'' That was January 27.

Lieutenant General Michael Rochelle, Army Deputy Chief of Staff, G1: '' . . . I should mention that it's clear that the increase in suicide, as well as other measures that we track very, very closely, are a reflection of the amount of stress that's on the force.''

And, finally, Brigadier General Michael Linnington, Deputy Commanding General of the United States Army Infantry Center: ''Money is not the issue . . . They want an opportunity to catch their breath before deploying again and to have some control over their futures. They're tired and their families are tired.''

We have got to reach a point where we focus on the things that we know we need to focus on, like Afghanistan, for example. We have shifted. When we went to war in Iraq originally with the stated notion of pursuing the weapons of mass destruction that supposedly Saddam Hussein had that he clearly never had, we shifted our attention and our focus away from Afghanistan, where we clearly were succeeding, where we clearly had the world community behind us and fully engaged, where we had the American people's full commitment. And when we did that, when we shifted our attention away from Afghanistan and focused on Iraq, we lost tremendous ground in Afghanistan.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Michael Mullen, said: ''So should we be in a position where more troops are removed from Iraq, the possibility of sending additional troops to Afghanistan, where we need them, clearly, certainly it's a possibility. But it's really going to be based on the availability of troops. We don't have troops, particularly in Brigade Combat Team size, sitting on the shelf, ready to go.''

The military is obviously stretched incredibly thin. And when I talk to constituents and groups of folks, I'll tell you that I represent a large section of the Jewish community in my State, and I am constantly being asked by members of the Jewish community leadership, What about Iran and what if we face an increasing threat from Iran? What are we going to do then, DEBBIE?

And my honest answer is, Well, we are spread so thin militarily now that it would be incredibly difficult for us to continue our efforts in Iraq, for us to maintain and not lose ground in Afghanistan, and also pursue the possibility of staving off a significant threat from Iran. And, again, that's not something that I'm saying. That's something that is backed up by military leaders.

I mean it's been 2,399 days, Madam Speaker, since the September 11 attacks, 2,399 days, and Osama bin Laden still remains free. We have gone backwards in Afghanistan since we left and shifted our focus.

In July of 2007, a de-classified version of a National Intelligence Estimate on the terrorist threat to the U.S. homeland concluded that al Qaeda in Afghanistan and the border area with Pakistan has regained its strength over the last few years and has now reached the strength it had before 9/11.

We have put ourselves in jeopardy. The administration and this President talks about the war on terror, the supposed war on terror, and how committed we are to it and how we have to fight terror in every corner of the world. Well, it is incredibly disturbing that a National Intelligence Estimate, not a progressive think tank and not the critics of the administration but our own National Intelligence Estimate on the terrorist threat to the U.S. homeland, concluded that al Qaeda in Afghanistan has reached its strength that it had before 9/11. The Director of National Intelligence, Mike McConnell, testified in February that Afghanistan's President Hamid Karzai and his government control just one-third of the country now, Madam Speaker. The remaining majority is under control of either the Taliban or local tribes.

We have got to make sure that we refocus our energy and our effort on the priorities of the American people. I know our Democratic leadership, under the leadership of our Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, is focused and determined to move an agenda that is going to improve this Nation's economy. The economic stimulus package that she was able to negotiate with Leader BOEHNER to try to inject some stimulus into this economy, checks that are going to be coming to Americans very, very soon, those are the kinds of efforts and energy that we need to be putting in to deal with the crisis situation that Americans are facing. Not continue to insist, as the administration does, that they are right and we are wrong. Not continue to say that we need to keep the same troop strength that we have where we made absolutely no progress between now and before the surge. Basically it's almost as if we have run in place. It's just incredibly frustrating.

So, Madam Speaker, I'm going to end where I began. And that is to say, the toll that this war has taken on the individual troops who are fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan, on their families, on Americans, where our administration's priorities are not focused on what they should be, which should be improving our economy and making sure that we can reduce the deficit and get our fiscal house in order and make sure that Americans have access to health care and aren't having their homes foreclosed on and the skyrocketing cost of housing, and the list just goes on and on. But at the same time, we're taking care of the needs of the people in Iraq. They have a budget surplus. Their housing needs are being taken care of. Their children's schooling is being taken care of. Yet we still have the same 140,000 troops that the administration has committed to leaving in Iraq, as opposed to trying to bring these troops home and end this hopeless war that has not made progress. And at the end of the day, as Mr. RYAN stated, we need to ensure that the Iraqi troops can stand on their own and that they don't believe for generations to come that we are going to carry them throughout history. At some point we have to let them go and stand on their own, and we have reached that time.

With that, Madam Speaker, we appreciate the opportunity in the 30–Something Working Group that the Speaker has given us to talk about the issues that are important to the American people and to our generation and from our generation's perspectives. We hope that the people who have heard this presentation tonight will go to the Speaker's Web site and click on the 30–Something Working Group address. The charts that we have shown tonight are on that Web site, and they can feel free to e-mail us and contact us with any questions they have.

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to do what I often do, spend a little time talking about health care. The hour spent in this way, I think, delivers for the Speaker and other Members of the House perhaps perspectives on health care that you wouldn't hear in any other location. I've heard the hour that I spend down here talking about health care referred to as the ''House call.'' So perhaps that's a good way to look at it.

Madam Speaker, we have got a big job ahead of us here in this Congress and the next Congress. We are going to be talking about health care from all sorts of different perspectives. And really where we ought to be focusing our efforts, where we really ought to be channeling our efforts is delivering better care at a lower cost. And you know what? The good news is there are some examples out there in the real world. There are some examples in the real world that this House can embrace and expand upon and maybe accomplish this thing that we all want to accomplish, which is delivering more care to more people in our country at a better price. But we don't need to do it at the sacrifice of freedom because freedom is the foundation of life here in America. Without our liberty, we aren't America. So unlimited options, the unlimited opportunity that people have in this country, that's what makes this country great.

I always feel a little inadequate when I go into Starbucks because all I can do is order a cup of coffee. But other people go into Starbucks and are able to order from a wide variety of menu options. Who would have believed, when I was growing up, that there can be 57 different ways to spend your money in a coffee shop all to purchase a cup of coffee?

□ 2145

Madam Speaker, innovation goes hand in hand with the ability to make choices. The combinations that are available for all of us to choose from have, in fact, engendered that market, and the young folks of today wouldn't have it any other way. And I think that is exactly as it should be. The same kind of options, the same kind of inventive technology and the same kind of innovation should be what makes health care great, as well.

And, Madam Speaker, when it comes to innovation in health care, the United States is the world's leader in health care. Now in October of 2006, in the New York Times, no less, and please don't tell anyone back in my district that I read the New York Times, but in October of 2006 in the New York Times a piece by Tyler Cowen talked about just that issue. He talked about how 17 of the last 25 Nobel prizes in medicine have been awarded to American scientists. He talked about four of the six most significant breakthroughs in the last 25 years having been developed in the United States of America, things like the CAT scan, things like neuro treatments for hypertension, statins to lower cholesterol, coronary artery bypass surgery, all the product of the inventive American mind. And, as we all know, American scientists are not done with advances in medicine. And we are now counting on the next generation of doctors and scientists, a whole new generation, to produce whole new generations of breakthroughs, things like single gene therapy, advancements in protein science, and the incredible revolution in the way information is transmitted and handled. All of that is on the threshold. All of that is just over the horizon and going to have a significant impact on the delivery of health care in this country.

And these breakthroughs occurred because there was an environment that encouraged innovation, an environment that embraced innovation, and yes, an environment that sometimes tolerated a little bit of chaos because that, after all, drove some of that creative energy. And this environment is better known as a competitive environment and one based on individual choice. Innovation and choice are the hallmarks of our health care system. But it doesn't mean that we can't make a good thing better.

Now, Madam Speaker, as someone who has spent 25 years in the practice of medicine, I do believe I have a unique perspective on some of the issues that face our Nation's physician workforce, and certainly some of the

issues that face those of us in the House of Representatives here up on Capitol Hill. But I do have the unique perspective having lived in both worlds. I have had the pleasure, the opportunity and the high honor of sitting in an examination room and talking with a patient, being in the operating room or the emergency room or the delivery room with a patient. I have filed claims. I have filed claims with private insurance companies, Medicare and Medicaid, and dealt with the almost impossible bureaucratic nightmare that those claims have become, and also discovered that with the advent of electronic submissions for claims, some clever individuals delivered about 1,300 different codes for denying those claims.

I figured out how to build my business, sometimes in an environment that was quite hostile to small business. I figured out how to pay my employees, how to keep the lights on, how to provide health insurance for my employees. Sometimes I have the burden of being the only one in my committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Health Subcommittee, the only one who has had experience with the practice of medicine, the only one who has ever picked up a pen, written a prescription, looked a patient in the eye, counseled them for risks and benefits and costs, a significant burden to carry as we go through bills like the FDA Reauthorization bill that we went through this summer.

I have also had the benefit of some very good advisors along the way, some of my professors in Medical School, Jack Pritchard, who was the head of my residency program at Parkland Hospital, and my own mother, who told me, ''don't you ever let your office put me on hold on that telephone again. And further,'' she went on to say, ''don't let me ever hear that you refused to take a Medicare patient.'' And she never did have to hear that.

But what does this experience give me? Practical knowledge is absolutely critical when you delve into trying to craft the best public policy. And this practical experience is invaluable, especially in an environment that is as rapidly changing as our health care system and the focus of so many across the country.

Now, there is widespread recognition that there is some change in the air. You can scarcely turn on the television at night and not hear the word ''change'' mentioned over and over again. In fact, I told an audience of doctors the other day that I haven't heard the word ''change'' so many times since I was an intern in the newborn nursery at Parkland Hospital. There is a widespread recognition that change is coming in health care. There are a lot of different ideas on how to accomplish it. Presidential candidates have their ideas. A lot of Members of Congress have their ideas. And somehow we are all going to have to come together with these ideas to try to get the best policy going forward.

Now one of the things that has become absolutely apparent to me as I have spent a good deal of time studying this issue is that health care, not disease, but health care, the administration of health care, begins and ends with those who actually deliver the care. That means those that actually deliver the care, the doctors, the nurses, the technicians, really are the ones who should be on the front-lines leading that transformation in health care. A lot of health care professionals don't realize the critical role that they can play and, in fact, they must play in shaping the health care debate. If the professionals who work in health care, if the doctors and nurses are not active and engaged, they are going to be forced to play by the rules that someone in this House will set for them, someone in this House who may not have a clue as to what goes on in the day-to-day practice or administration of medicine.

So every chance I have, I meet with doctors, nurses, physical therapists, technicians, either here in Washington or my district back in Texas, listen to them about what their concerns are, try to understand the problems that they are having, problems that may have changed in the few short years since I left the clinics, and try to talk to them about how to not just complain about the problems of today, but how to craft the solutions of tomorrow and how to effectively communicate that to those who are policy makers, whether it be in a Federal agency or here in a legislative body. I am firmly convinced that if our health care professionals don't lead, we are going to have to accept the prescription given to us by those in the Federal agencies and those that may be sitting in the legislature this year, next year or the year after.

Now there is no sane person who would try to conduct their own operation. Most doctors, if they have controlling sense, wouldn't try to prepare their own income tax form. Doctors and nurses, health care professionals, need to be the ones to lead this change. And I will tell you something that just makes me stop dead in my tracks is when I hear people talk about a single payer government run system. It scares me to death. Now you stop and think, where is the largest single payer government health care system in the world? And it is here in the United States. It is our Medicare and Medicaid program. This body, the United States House of Representatives, currently controls about 50 cents out of every dollar that is spent in health care in this country, and that is an enormous amount that is spent on health care, 15, 16, 17 percent of our gross domestic product, upwards of $2 trillion a year, 50 percent of that originates on the floor of this House of Representatives. So government already controls 50 percent of the market. When people talk about expanding that role, I have to stop and ask myself, well, are we doing a good job with what we are already controlling? And I don't think there is anyone who would stand up and say, yes, you are doing such a good job, we want to turn more of it over to you.

But government can play a role by encouraging coverage and helping create programs that people actually want and empowering them to choose between options. And really, we just have to go back a year or 2 or 3 to look at the experience with the part D part of the Medicare program signed into law late in 2003. The prescription benefit became available in January 2006, and now we are coming into the beginning of our third year of experience with that program. And sure, there were some bugs early on. But if you look at some of the numbers now, and probably 90 percent of eligible seniors now have some type of health care coverage, which is an incredible change from when I took office in 2003. Eighty percent are happy with the program. Well, those are numbers that I will just tell you controlling practitioner would love to have.

When we crafted that program, the smart people over at the Center for Medicaid and Medicare Services put their sharpest pencils to the program and said, okay, here it is. We can devise a program that will provide coverage for seniors for $37 a month in premiums.

Well, now the average plan costs $24 a month. So what happened on the way to that $37 a month premium? Well, I will tell you what happened. The plans were opened up for competition and bidding. And guess what? The private sector found they could do things a little cheaper, faster and safer than those in the Federal agency. And I say more power to them. They have crafted different plans. Not everyone needs the same prescription drug plan. There is the ability to buy a prescription drug plan and change it once a year if your coverage needs change. It is a phenomenal tool to put at the hands of our seniors who are covered under Medicare.

Again, who is going to argue with something that delivers more health care, lower cost and better quality? It is just too simple to argue with. That is the type of program on which we need to be focused. But you hear so many people talking about, well, people won't do the right thing if you leave them to their own devices. You have to put a mandate on it. You have to put an individual mandate, or we have to put a State mandate, or we will have to put an employer mandate where we require people to take up this coverage; as opposed to creating programs that people actually want, pricing them in a reasonable range, making them available, and helping people understand the wisdom of taking up that coverage.

There are a variety of studies that have been done on mandates. Most recently there was one in Health Affairs

in November of 2007 looking at the experience and the history with mandates. I think the title of the article was ''Consider It Done'' because it was the opinion of the article that mandates would just simply have to be the next step.

But in this country, we have 50 percent of people with no health insurance and a voluntary program. Well, you say, we could do better with mandates, couldn't we? Well, for mandates to work, you have to have, of course, a widespread dissemination of knowledge that the mandate is required. You have to have widespread dissemination of the knowledge of the penalty for not taking up the good, service or product that has been mandated, and you have got to have a pretty strict enforcement mechanism, and people have to be aware that that enforcement is going to be swift, sure, and it is going to be painful when it happens. Well, where in real life in America today is there such a system? Hey, we are coming up on April 15. How about the Internal Revenue Service, for example? With the Internal Revenue Service, there is broad understanding throughout the population that you have to pay your taxes. There is a broad understanding of what will happen to you if you don't pay your taxes. Now there may be nuances, fine nuances to the Federal law, whether it is prison term or a fine, but people do understand there are a plethora of unpleasant circumstances for those who don't pay their taxes.

And what is the take-up rate, if you will, on this generous offer from the Internal Revenue Service? Well, it is about 85 percent. You have about 15 percent of people who don't comply, even with those relatively draconian and well-known practices within the IRS if you don't comply. So it does beg the question, if we simply go up there and say, you have to buy an individual insurance policy or there are going to be consequences to that behavior which will cost you, how do we know we are going to get up-take greater than the 85 percent up-take that we have today? And indeed, some of the experience early on with some of the States who have experimented with this have found that some people look at the cost of the insurance, and since it is now required, guess what? The cost went up because it is no longer a free market where you have a willing seller and a willing buyer. You have a buyer who is being coerced to buy that product, so the price goes up. And so some people look at that and say, that is pretty costly, I will just pay the fine, thank you very much. So then we are in a very difficult situation. We have someone paying a fine for not carrying health insurance. And if they get sick on top of it, then they are still a burden on the hospital, doctor, the State, whoever has to pick up the cost for that hospitalization.

So I would just urge my colleagues to be circumspect, to be careful when we talk about mandates and also look to the experience we had with Medicare part D where then a program was created that didn't exist before, and it was created in such a way as to put something out there that people actually wanted, put something out there that people actually saw as adding value to their health care coverage, put something up there that would be useful to people.

□ 2200

Not simply putting a requirement out there, a penalty if you don't comply, and then people are constantly gauging, well, would it be better just to pay the penalty and not comply and not have the more expensive health insurance, which I, after all, don't need, because I will never get sick.

So the part D program provides us a model that we could use when we are trying to see about developing those types of programs. And in a few minutes, let me cover with you some of the other models, some of the experience that has recently been gathered from the private sector, because I think that is useful to instruct, that is useful to inform this debate as well.

But the experience of part D in Medicare showed us that sometimes the best thing that government can do for health care is just simply get out of the way and let people, providers, third-party payers, work this out between themselves. If we create the right conditions, the right environment, the right set of circumstances and let the private sector develop the innovation, sometimes the cost savings can be substantial, the quality can be increased. And, after all, isn't that what we want, more care, better quality, lower cost? Who can be against those three things?

Now, Madam Speaker, I can remember a time when I was growing up that you could only have one kind of telephone. It was black, it was tethered to the wall and had a rotary dial. Over 10 or 15 or 20 years time we saw some technical innovation. It was still black, it was still tethered to the wall, but it had push buttons instead of a rotary dial.

Then came deregulation. Then came many phone companies that were able to compete on the open market, compete for the individual phone user's business. And the story tells itself, because nowadays you have cell phones on every belt buckle and hip pocket. You have text messages. You have a whole generation of young people who know how to text better than they know how to communicate with the king's English.

So change has come to this industry, not because the government said it would be a good idea for everyone to have a cell phone on their belt buckle or a cell phone in their hip pocket. It came about because industry, the private sector, was allowed to innovate, it was allowed to experiment, it was allowed to sometimes fail, and produce these products that people actually wanted and that deliver value, real value, to people's lives.

Many, many years ago I got a pilot's license. A lot of people learned to fly in a Piper Cub. The Piper Cub is truly a marvel of engineering science. But would anyone argue that the 737, the 787 that is new this year, would anyone argue that that is not a better way to move large numbers of people from one end of the country to another, rather than having each of us fly our own individual Piper Cub?

You know, you can't help but when you have this kind of discussion recognize that the invention of the Internet really changed a lot of things. Of course, now we have the Internet, we have e-mail, we have Web sites, we have YouTube, all of which were absolutely unimaginable as short as 20 years ago.

Here is the secret. Here is the secret to that success. The private sector, with its ability to tolerate innovation, with its ability to tolerate risk and reward, its ability to tolerate a little bit of experimentation, and, again, a little bit of chaos, can deliver that kind of value. I have personally experienced this in my years practicing medicine, and I have learned more about it since I have come here and worked legislatively.

Last fall, last November, I believe, there was a big health care symposium put on downtown by the periodical Health Affairs, and the morning panel was going to be four smart people. But one of them was a CEO of a large insurance company, an insurance company, quite honestly, that I had some trouble with when I was a practicing physician. So I thought, well, I want to go hear what Dr. McClellan has to say. I want to hear what Dr. Sarhuni from the National Institutes of Health has to say. But I will probably go for coffee when this CEO gets up to talk. But the CEO gave the most important part of the talk that morning.

This particular individual talked about running his large insurance company. He talked about his 45,000 employees, 15 percent of whom were devoted to the development of information technology. If that 15 percent had been a stand-alone software company, they would have been one of the largest in the United States of America.

Well, that is a pretty powerful notion. I stopped and did a little quick mental calculation of my own and I thought about my five or six physician practice back in Louisville, Texas. We were faced with the specter of Y2K and I had to upgrade my ancient and ailing computer system, and although at the time I thought it cost an incredible amount to do that, just doing a quick back-of-the-envelope calculation, I spent about .015 percent of my annual budget on information technology. So was it any wonder that that particular insurance company could run rings around a small practice when it came to the managing, the flow of information, the speed with which they could process information?

I was very intrigued by the fact that this individual said we have learned a lot about the progress of disease and the course of disease, not by studying clinical data, but by simply analyzing the financial data available to us within our information technology system. For example, if we see A and B, we are very likely going to see C, and of those patients who have C, some are going to go on to D, and D costs a lot of money. So we are far better off intervening at A or B and not having to buy as many Ds as we might otherwise have to buy.

He gave the example, and, of course, my practice was not in taking care of heart disease, but he gave the example of a middle-aged individual suffering a myocardial infarction or heart attack. He said we know from studying our data that this individual is very likely to suffer about a bout of significant depression somewhere along the line in their recovery, and in fact that bout of depression may be so significant that it precludes that individual complying with their exercise program, their cardiorehabilitative program, and very likely puts them at risk for a second cardiac event, or perhaps even consigning them to congestive heart failure in the future, which is terribly expensive to treat within and out of the hospital and lots of expensive medications.

So he found that by intervening early on with an aggressive assessment for depression, an aggressive treatment for depression, that they were in fact able to get better compliance in their rehabilitation, and ultimately lowered their cost at the out end because of this very aggressive management program that they had developed.

Again, that is all done with financial data. They were just beginning to be able to incorporate clinical data. They have got some problems with that because of some of the constraints, regulatory constraints that we here in Congress have put on them. But, nevertheless, it told a great story about the types of things that can be done in managing information in this brave new world, where so much information is available and so much can be assembled and analyzed at a very rapid rate. We are coming up on a period of rapid learning unlike anything ever seen before in any branch of science, and certainly medicine is not going to be any stranger to that.

When I was in training in the 1970s, when I was in practice in the 1980s and 1990s and early 2000s, it was very difficult to encounter a patient late in pregnancy with an elevated blood pressure. You never knew whether this was going to go on to a much more serious condition or whether in fact this was simply a transient problem that would be self-limited and of no consequence, and you had to treat them all as if they were the most serious consequences, sometimes even requiring hospitalization for a period of observation until things got squared away.

There are tests that are just around the corner that will analyze for a couple of things in the bloodstream that have a very high predictive value as to whether or not someone will develop a condition called preeclampsia over the next 14 days. What a tremendously powerful tool to put in the hands of clinicians. And how many dollars is that going to save? It may well be an expensive test when it first comes out, but how many dollars is it going to save for unnecessary hospitalizations?

Sometimes we would have to take someone off from work, not knowing whether they had a more serious disease or whether this was going to be a benign self-limited event. But you just couldn't take a chance. You just couldn't take that risk of not counseling that patient to behave as if this was going to be the more serious of the two conditions. How great it will be for the next generation of doctors who practice my specialty of obstetrics to be able to have that test at their disposal so they can adequately counsel their patients, recommend to their patients the correct treatment course for them, and, in the process, not overtreat a large group of patients, and, very importantly, not undertreat a much smaller but potentially much more lethal condition in a smaller group of patients.

Yesterday up here on the Hill I was very fortunate to be able to host a panel with several speakers that included the former Speaker of our House, Newt Gingrich, who came up on the Hill to talk about change in health care reform and transformation in health care.

Everyone knows that former Speaker Gingrich is a real leader when it comes to health care transformation. In fact, he has made that now his life's work here in Washington. We are certainly grateful for, first off, for his service in the House, but we are very grateful that he has devoted his enthusiasm, his considerable energy, his considerable ability to generate new ideas and to recognize great ideas when they are presented to him. We are very fortunate to have his expertise in Washington. So it was really a great experience to have him involved in this panel yesterday.

Several companies came in. The whole premise of the seminar, the whole premise of the series, was, just as I started out this talk, better health, lower cost, examples from the real world. These were four individuals that came in and talked to us about real world experience and how they have been able to deliver their product, health care, in a more timely fashion, better quality, lower cost.

Let me share with you some of what I learned. It was a very action-packed hour-and-a-half that we had yesterday. But let me share with you just a little bit of what I have learned with talking to some of those innovative medical leaders.

One of the central themes that kept repeating itself over and over again was the issue of personal responsibility. It is important to have someone invested in the concept that it is a good idea to take care of their own health and to be personally invested in their own health care, and a lot of the discussion came around to a concept that is popularly called consumer-driven health care. We have talked about that a lot up here on the Hill.

The fact is that because of our third-payer system, so many people are actually anesthetized to the true cost of their health care. All they want to know is can they see the doctor when they need to, how big is the copay, and if I need an expensive test, well, is it covered by insurance? If is not, I don't want it. If it is, I will take two.

Now, my own staff tells me that when they receive an explanation of benefits, that little form, that little EOB form that you get from your insurance company after you have a medical event or an intersection with the health care system, whether it be doctor or hospital, most people take that explanation of benefits, it says on it ''this is not a bill,'' so what happens to it? It goes straight into the trash. They never look at it. They never try to assess what is or is not on it. So they are consuming the health care service, but not really are conscious as to the cost. As a consequence, there is little or no incentive for anyone to take any proactive stance on the health care that is delivered to them, the health care that is offered to them. There is very little incentive for someone to actually take an active role in that.

There is an old saying from P.J. O'Rourke, if you think health care is expensive now, just wait until it is free, and that is the concept. If it doesn't cost anything, then, again, yes, nothing but the best will do, and let's be sure we have plenty of it, and don't be too long about getting it to me.

In a consumer-driven health care system, people would be more conscious of their health care cost, more conscientious, and more likely to make wiser decisions about lifestyle choices, about things that they might do to alter a lifestyle choice, to be able to maintain their health.

There was a study take that was talked about yesterday that found that in one hospital group, the patients who were in a consumer-directed health care plan were twice as likely as patients in traditional plans to ask about the cost, and three times as likely to choose a less expensive treatment option. And this is just not for young healthy patients. Patients with chronic conditions, chronic disease states, were 20 percent more likely to follow the treatment regimen recommended to them, to follow that regimen much more carefully.

Now, there is no shortage of critics of consumer-directed health care up here on the Hill. People will argue that it will cause patients, consumers, perhaps those less wealthy, perhaps those less educated, to avoid needed and appropriate health care because of the cost

burden and the inability to make informed appropriate choices.

One of the companies yesterday that discussed this at the panel has data that they say directly contradicts that criticism. And I don't doubt that that is correct, because back in the late 1990s a comparison was done with a country that had a large component of what were then called medical savings accounts or consumer-directed health care, in contrast to the United States, which at that time had no high deductible consumer-directed health care options, no MSA options, and that was in a lead-up to the beginning of the MSA era in 1996 or 1997.

□ 2215

Experience with that country that had about a 50/50 mix of consumer directed plans and what might be called standard indemnity plans found that there was no dialing back on needed services. There was no pulling back on services that were critical for the maintenance of a person's health, but more optional types of treatments perhaps, were the ones that had a lower uptake.

Now, a Midwestern health care company introduced consumer-driven health care plans to its 8,600 employees. They also left their traditional PPO plan in place.

In the first year, 79 percent of their employees chose one of the four consumer-directed health care options. These health plans had several important features.

Preventive care is free. Now, what a concept. That means that the annual visit to the doctor, required screening exams, don't cost money. They are provided for you free of charge.

Employees also receive financial incentives to change behaviors like smoking or those who need to lose weight. They also receive financial incentives to manage chronic conditions like asthma and diabetes more carefully and become active participants in the management of their disease.

The results so far have shown that they had 7 percent of health care dollars spent on prevention compared to a national average that was about a third of that.

Nearly 40 percent of employees take an annual personal health risk assessment and earn $100 for their trouble. But a 40 percent uptake on an annual health risk assessment is a significant number. Five hundred employees have quit smoking, their employees have lost a total of 13,000 pounds through their weight management programs with appropriate monitoring, 13,000 pounds. Talk about your biggest loser or your biggest winner, clearly, that's a program that is paying off.

Now, the average claim increase of 5½ or 5.1 percent the last 2 years is compared to a national trend of over 8 percent, so there has been a 3 percent savings on the average claim. The company has, again, collected an impressive amount of data, and we could learn from their example, from their experience.

There are some other companies we can learn from as well. There was another very large health insurance company that was on the panel. Then, again, it was a health insurance company with which I used to have some differences, but they described their incentive-based benefit design. They provide or have available to their employees one of the high deductible plans. A high deductible plan with a large deductible is going to cost less than a plan with a lower deductible.

They offer a plan with a high deductible. But without an increase in premium, the individuals, the families can lower that deductible to $1,000 by changing things like weight, smoking, serial cholesterol measurements complying with annual screening exams.

A $5,000 deductible at a lower policy rate then becomes a $1,000 deductible at the same rate. It's a significant cost savings for that patient or that family, that employee, where they get the benefits of a very high deductible plan but the deductible comes to them in a much more manageable size.

We also heard about some of the very positive results driven by consumer-driven health plan options. Now, the speaker who talked about that actually took me back a little bit, because I do remember back 1976 and 1977 the MSAs first became available. They were called the Archer Medical Savings Account after Bill Archer, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee from this body who had worked so hard on that over the years.

Phil Gramm, then a Senator from Texas over on the other side of the rotunda, had worked on that on the Senate side. As part of a large bill that was passed to increase insurance portability, they got a demonstration project, a pilot project that was going to allow 750,000 so-called high deductible policies or medical savings accounts to be sold. I heard about that, and I thought I don't know if I can sign up quickly enough to be in that first 750,000.

But the reality was I needn't have worried. There were so many restrictions placed on that insurance that the uptake was, in fact, probably only one-tenth of what were available.

There weren't many insurance companies that offered it. The premiums had to be paid for with after-tax dollars. Many of the things that we now think of as being associated with a health savings account just weren't available back in those early years.

But, still, although the amount that you could put away in a medical IRA or a medical savings account wasn't nearly as large as what you could do today, still, it was a significant amount of money. I purchased one of those myself back in 1976 or 1977, keeping it until I started service here in the House of Representatives, where at that time it wasn't available.

But that chunk of dollars has sat there, and with the time value of money, earning interest, compound interest, the miracle of compound interest, year over year now is a sizeable sum of money that is available to my wife and I for health care needs. Whether it be pre-Medicare or post-Medicare age, that money is still going to be available to us as additional cash that can be spent on health problems.

The doctor that talked to us about the nuances of the newer health savings account talked about how in his experience 88 percent, that's nearly nine out of ten account holders, carried a balance from 2006 to 2007. The actual percentage of people who either did not contribute or used up all the money that they had contributed to their medical IRA or their health savings account was only about one in 10, and the average balance for people across all income levels was $597 at the end of that carryover from year to year.

Now, you have to ask yourself how many Americans, how many families are encouraged to live a healthier life, conserve their health care dollars, like these individuals have done. These guys are making personal decisions about prevention, they are making personal decisions about life-style changes, they are managing chronic conditions, actively engaged in the management of those chronic conditions. As a consequence of those behaviors, they are holding down costs.

Now, most other populations with regular private indemnity insurance are not. The key is bringing about the necessary change to effect that transition from an individual who is really indifferent as to the cost of the expenditure on health care to one that is actively managing the cost of their health care.

But there are other tools we can put in the hands of people. We hear people talk about transparency. I have, in fact, introduced legislation dealing with transparency.

We have got some good things going on back home in my home State of Texas as far as some of the web-based transparency information and data that's out there as far as hospitals are concerned. The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services has, in fact, published their own data up on the web.

So as more and more information is gathered, patients, individuals, can have access to greater and greater amounts of information detailing what is available to them as far as what if the difference between one hospital and another is substantial as far as the cost of rendering a particular service, regardless of what it is. But the ability to go on the Internet and be able to compare the cost of those two services, that's a tremendous tool to put into someone's hands.

If you can further refine that to allow an individual to put in information about their particular health insurance or their health plan, or if they are a self-pay, to make that information available, to then go on and compare between the institutions, where

would their best benefit be derived? Where can they most adequately get the type of care that they want and, of course, there does have to be quality data published alongside that.

It can't just simply be the cheapest care at the cheapest cost. You want the best care at the most reasonable cost, or, as Dr. McClellan, former administrator of Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services always talks about the four Rs, the right care for the right patient at the right time and the right price.

These are going to be critical aspects of any health care policy that we craft in this House. We simply have to keep those basic tenets in mind.

One of the speakers yesterday talked about in education the fundamentals of the three Rs, reading, writing and arithmetic. He went on to say in health care the fundamentals should be risk, responsibilities and reward, because, indeed, the risks are those that must be balanced against the possible benefit.

The patient needs to be an active participant in that. They can no longer simply be passive passengers on the journey through the health care system. They actually have to play a role in taking responsibility for their own care. The rewards, the reward aspect, the incentive aspect is often given. Well, while we are real good about being punitive in this body, we are pretty stingy when it comes to rewards or incentives. I could give you several examples of that.

One that comes to mind is the bill that was introduced late December as far as trying to encourage physicians for e-prescribing. The reward was a 1-percent increase in Medicare fees for a physician who participated in e-prescribing. The penalty 4 or 5 years later was a 10-percent reduction if they don't.

On a $100 procedure, and I will tell you there are not many office procedures under Medicare that pay $100, but let's use that number because it makes the math easy. In a $100 procedure administered in a physician's office if they utilize an e-prescribing module to administer that patient's care, they are going to get $1 extra for that $100 procedure or interaction, visit, whatever it was. That's okay, $1 is $1, and it's better than nothing.

But if you don't participate in 4 years time, 5 years time, that's going to be a 10-percent reduction. That same $100 procedure or test or interaction now will pay $90.

We are so focused on the punitive in this body, and we never focus on the front end of the problem, which is assigning the appropriate dollar amount or the appropriate incentive.

Now, go back to my earlier example of that large insurance company, and again an insurance company in the past which I have had great difficulty with, but what innovative thinking they have. They are offering a patient the ability to reduce from $5,000 to $1,000 their risk, their cost, on a deductible with no increase in premiums if they will do four simple things, lose a little weight, stop smoking, exercise regularly.

If you have asthma or diabetes you participate in a disease management program, and your deductible falls from a $5,000 deductible down to $1,000, and, oh, by the way, that premium that was less because you had a $5,000 deductible, it doesn't go up. It doesn't go up when that policy changed. That's the kind of innovative thinking I am talking about when I say we must balance the risk and rewards, because we haven't been good about doing that.

Everyone likes to quote the Rand study when they talk about information technology and programs like e-prescribing. The Rand study says that if we go to electronic prescribing in our health care system in this country, we are going to save $77 billion in 15 years, a tremendous amount of money.

Now, most of that savings is, in fact, out toward the end of that 15-year time. They don't really talk very much about who is going to pay for the cost of the implementation, putting the software, the hardware, the training, the upkeep of the software, the maintenance of the software, the time spent on the learning curve for all of these small offices across the country that have to make that investment. That's just going to be a given, but it will be worth while because we get a $77 billion savings at the end.

□ 2230

What is missed so often in this study is the last paragraph. At the end of a very large study, it talks about the incentives to make this happen, to get us to this happy place where we are saving $77 billion with e-prescribing.

The incentives have to be early. The late innovators are going to be rewarded, so you have to have the incentives arrive early, and they have to have a time limit otherwise people will wait and see if the technology doesn't improve because, after all, they know they will have to pay for the hardware, software, the training, the upkeep and maintenance of the software.

Finally, the third thing is the incentives must be substantial. And again, on both sides of the aisle, we forget that very important point. So while we hear the Rand study quoted over and over again, please remember the incentives are early, they are time limited, and they are substantial. That was the economic modeling that got them to the happy place where they were saving $77 billion in the 15th year of that study.

If we concentrate on the fundamentals, getting back to the fundamentals, focusing on the risk, talking to our patients about responsibility, that is not so hard to do; but we should obviously compensate the health care professional for their time, for counseling about that responsibility, so that we don't forget the reward for the provider, to be sure; for the patient, to be sure; for the taxpayer, the American taxpayer if it is on that 50 percent of every health care dollar that is spent in the largest single-payer, government-run health care system in the world, which is Medicare and Medicaid today.

So the right prescription for health professionals has to be focused on these three areas when it comes to providing the real direction for health care reform.

I know I am not alone when I say that I am going to use these principles as my guiding star as I continue to work on health care policy. I hope I can convince my colleagues both in committee and here in the House of Representatives to focus on those same issues as well.

IRAQ WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERLMUTTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor once again to come to the floor of the House as a representative of the landmark class of 2006 known as the majority makers, a group of 41 Democrats elected from 23 States who were sent here by the American people to change the direction of the country.

Of course one of the primary issues that was at the heart of the campaign in 2006 was our involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan. And this week that effort, national effort, has taken greater significance because we once again heard from General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker about the progress or the situation, I should say, in Iraq. They testified before two congressional committees, two Senate committees yesterday and the House committees today. Their testimony, I think, raises two issues that I want to address tonight.

Of course the first is what the situation is in Iraq and what the prospects for success are in that part of the world. And, secondly, what is the cost to the American people and to the American economy because as we all know, the costs are varied and they are significant. They rise to magnitudes that we are not used to discussing in this country, both in human cost which of course is our top priority, and also the economic cost. And then there is the future cost as well because what we are doing is incurring obligations for our future generations that are real, that are incredibly large, and that the American people need to focus on because as we go forward and try to establish policies and have a national debate about what the appropriate course of action is in Iraq, we have to discuss again not just the human costs but also the cost to future generations of the American people, juxtaposed against the benefits and potential benefits of our continued involvement.

There are two things I think we need to say from the outset that really underlie all of these discussions and that is everyone in this body, in the Congress and in the country wants the United States to be successful, wants there to be a peaceful and beneficial result in Iraq. We all want a stable Middle East. We all want a stable, peaceful world. No one in this body or anywhere else that I know of is rooting for us to be unsuccessful in Iraq.

The second thing that we need to focus on is that it is unavoidable that we have to talk about economics and it is sad that we even have to talk about money because already we have lost 4,000 American men and women in Iraq. We have had virtually 30,000 wounded, many seriously, many with life-altering injuries; and the cost to the Iraqi people, of course, is also extraordinary with 2 million people having left Iraq, hundreds of thousands of Iraqis, Iraqi civilians dying, and many more dislocated throughout the country, families torn apart and lives ruined.

So the human cost of the U.S. involvement in this effort in Iraq and also in Afghanistan cannot be minimized, and nobody is trying to. That of course is the ultimate cost. But we do have to talk about the economic cost of this war because we are looking at a situation in which we have potential exposure throughout the world. We have a military that will be called on to be deployed in other situations, not just in the Middle East. We have by almost everyone's estimation a much more serious and ominous threat in Afghanistan and Pakistan that will require continued involvement of American forces, and where it is clear to everyone that terrorists, including particularly al Qaeda, are much more active and we need to focus much more intensely on Afghanistan and our involvement in Iraq is, of course, preventing us from doing as much as we could and probably should in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

These are all of the dynamics that we face as we discuss these issues. Two things in particular concern me about the testimony of General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker yesterday. And, of course, everyone quite justifiably honors their service and their commitment to their duty, and they are certainly fulfilling their obligations well.

But two things in particular disturb me greatly, and one was when asked continuously by a number of Senators and House Members to describe the conditions under which we might be able to withdraw a substantial number of our forces from Iraq, General Petraeus basically said we will know them when we see them. He could not identify them. And he said, Well, we will look at it again in a few months. We will look at it in September. Maybe we can start withdrawing them then; maybe we can't.

What's the measure for success? He wouldn't specify. He couldn't specify. And I don't think he was being coy. I think, in fact, his unwillingness to specify or identify the conditions under which we might be able to leave was purely a function of the fact that we don't know what the conditions are, and we have never known exactly what we were trying to accomplish in that country.

The goalposts have been moved continuously. There have been dozens of different reasons for our involvement mentioned over the last 5 years. And it is, I think, quite indicative yesterday when asked on numerous occasions again what would you see, what would you have to see before you would recommend withdrawing more troops, General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker said, Well, we'll know it when we see it; it is a matter of what the conditions are.

That is an important point to make.

Another answer that he gave to a question asked by Senator BIDEN, I think, was quite revealing. When Senator BIDEN asked when you come back and make your evaluation and assessment in September of this year, at that point do you think there is any chance that we could be within 30 days of having troops withdrawal?

General Petraeus said at that point, Well, it might be that very day. Of course he went on to say it could be a month later, it could be many months later, it could be years later.

When I heard him say that it occurred to me if he was willing to say there was a possibility that we could be out, be able to start withdrawing significant numbers of troops in September, if that was a possibility, he should know what the metrics are, what the conditions he would have to be looking for in September to allow us to do that. And yet when asked what are the conditions, he couldn't identify them.

So again, I think all of these points, reading between the lines, indicate that we are not getting the full story about what we should look for as a measure of success in Iraq because the people on the ground don't know what the measures are. I think they would tell us if they knew, but I don't think they know. And that is a pretty frightening thought because we are being asked to carry the burden of an incredibly large cost as a society.

Now many of us are not asked, unfortunately, I think in many ways, we are not asked to bear any of the burden. Most of the burden is being borne directly by the military families and the soldiers who are overseas in deployment, many for several deployments. They are bearing the hardest burden; but we are also bearing a serious cost, and it mounts by the second.

As a matter of fact, every minute that I spend speaking here, we are spending, the American taxpayers are spending $230,000. Every minute, $230,000 is being spent in Iraq; $4,000 a second. That mounts up. It becomes real, real money. It becomes $14 million an hour; $340 million a day; $2.5 billion a week, $10 billion a month; and while some estimates are higher, $125 billion a year, and that is just in Iraq.

Now I know, believe me, that many people have a hard time grasping what a billion dollars is, what $120 billion are, but there are a couple of easy ways to describe it. With $120 billion in 1 year, you could give every teacher in the United States a $20,000 a year raise. Every teacher. Every one of our 6 million teachers in the United States, and I think most people agree teachers are drastically underpaid, we could give them a $20,000 a year raise with what we are spending in Iraq.

We could pay for the health care of about 16 or 17 million people every year. That 47 million people we have uninsured, we could cover 16 or 17 million of those people with that $125 billion that we are now spending in Iraq.

We all know we have huge infrastructure needs in this country, bridges to repair, highways to repair, schools to rebuild. Throughout the country we face trillions of dollars of needed repairs and new construction on our infrastructure. This would make a considerable investment in that seriously needed national agenda. But that is going overseas. And, unfortunately, it is going to where it is not an investment, it is money that is irretrievably lost.

We could also, and this is taking what we spend every day, that $340 million or so we spend every day in Iraq, we could hire 2,000 more Border Patrol agents; 18,000 more students could receive Pell Grants to help them attend college for an entire year; 48,000 homeless veterans could be provided a place to live; 317,000 more kids could receive recommended vaccinations for a year; almost a million families could get help with their energy bills. The list goes on and on. This is the cost of this war in economic terms to the American people. This is the lost opportunity, the lost opportunity for our American people.

What is even worse is it would be one thing if we had this money, but we don't have this money. We know we are running a deficit of almost $500 billion this year, so we are borrowing this money. We are not just saying we have $125 billion lying around, we can allocate this to Iraq, no problem. We are borrowing it. At least half of it we are borrowing from foreign countries. So we are having China and other nations who are financing our debt, who are actually paying for this war, but it is not free. China is going to want to get paid back some time, and that is going to be on future generations. So again, whatever we feel about this war, we have to understand the cost, and the cost is real. The American people understand that this cost is real.

A recent New York Times CBS poll, 89 percent of Americans surveyed said that the war in Iraq is a drain on the U.S. economy; 66 percent said it is a big drain, and 22 percent said it is some drain.

□ 2245

So the American people understand this. The American people understand that while we have a housing crisis, while we have a crisis in our financial markets, where we're having trouble actually making, having funds made available to make student loans, we understand that there's a connection between the economic problems we face and our involvement in Iraq.

And again, I don't think any of us would argue if this were a war where there were clearly defined goals, and if there were an existential threat to the United States, our security. But our national intelligence estimate, our 16 agencies said no, that's not the case, that we don't face an existential threat in Iraq. We are, essentially, refereeing, as we know, a sectarian dispute.

And I think what is most frustrating, again, reading between the lines, listening to General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker, is that there was never a mention that I heard of anything that we could do to change the outcome there; that the implication was we were just sitting there, and that we had to wait until they decided that they were going to make it okay for us to leave. And that's a very, very frustrating position to be in.

And I wish somebody, maybe somebody did ask that and I didn't hear it, but I wish that they had been asked that specific question; is there anything we can do to change the dynamics there to improve the conditions that would allow us to begin withdrawing our troops and to reduce this incredible cost to the American people?

So I would hope that as we go forward, and you hate to say, as we go forward, because we've been going forward, now, for 5 years, and the outlook is not any brighter. The prospects for resolution in Iraq are not any greater.

And unfortunately, listening to General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker yesterday, I think it's, unfortunately, true that the people who are in charge don't know where we're going and most importantly, why we're going.

So these are things, as the months roll by, while the cost accumulates, and while, unfortunately, we will suffer, no doubt, as we have suffered, just in the last few days, 13 new American casualties, that the American people understand and demand, both of us and the administration, that we get a clear picture of what the objectives are, what the cost is, and will be, because we have estimates, Professor Joseph Stiglitz has estimated the total cost of the war in Iraq and Afghanistan, ultimately, of $3 trillion.

But we need to understand what our goals are, what our objectives are, what the possibilities are, what the risks are, what the potential benefits are, and of course, what the costs are, because we're not playing with small numbers. We're not playing with insignificant lives. And this is the greatest challenge facing this country.

And I hope that we can have the type of dialogue, continuously, which focuses on these points, because the American people, rightfully, are looking for leadership and progress on Iraq.

So once again, I thank you, Mr. Speaker. It has been a great privilege to stand in the House and represent the freshman Democrats who came to Congress to change the direction of the country, who are, in many ways, changing the direction of the country. And I think we will continue to ask the questions that need to be asked, and try to bring a much quicker resolution in Iraq and a new direction for the American people.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of a family health matter.

Mr. BUYER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. MCHENRY, for 5 minutes, today and April 10.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, April 16.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, April 16.

Mr. WESTMORELAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONAWAY, for 5 minutes, April 10.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 550. An act to preserve existing judgeships on the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 10, 2008, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5924. A letter from the Chief, Programs and Legislation Division, Department of the Air Force, Department of Defense, transmitting Notice of the decision to conduct a standard competition of the Civil Engineer Function at Schriever Air Force Base, Colorado, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5925. A letter from the Chairman, Department of Defense, transmitting the 2008 report on vulnerability assessments for FY 2007 and military construction requirements for the FY 2007 to FY 2012 Future Years Defense Plan, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2859; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5926. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Homeland Defense and Americas' Security Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the Annual Report of the Activities of the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation for 2007, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2166(i); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5927. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Colonel Norman J. Brozenick, Jr., United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5928. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting letter on the approved retirement Admiral William J. Fallon, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5929. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement Vice Admiral John G. Morgan, Jr., United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5930. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General William E. Mortensen, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5931. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of the enclosed list of officers to wear the insignia of the next higher grade in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5932. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of the intention to convert the combined commissary and exchange store at Homestead Air Reserve Base, Florida, to an independent Army and Air Force Exchange Service (AAFES) store; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5933. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of legislative proposals as part of

the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2009; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5934. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No. 08-40 concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Turkey for defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5935. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles to the Government of Italy (Transmittal No. DDTC 018-08); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5936. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5937. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Section 804 of the PLO Commitments Compliance Act of 1989 (title VIII, Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 1990 and 1991 (Pub. L. 101-246), and Sections 603-604 (Middle East Peace Commitments Act of 2002) and 699 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 2003 (Pub. L. 107-228), including a copy of Presidential Determination No. 2008-11 on the Implementation of Sections 603 and 604 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5938. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Section 804 of the PLO Commitments Compliance Act of 1989 (title VIII, Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 1990 and 1991 (Pub. L. 101-246), and Sections 603-604 (Middle East Peace Commitments Act of 2002) and 699 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 2003 (Pub. L. 107-228), including a copy of Presidential Determination No. 2008-12 on the Implementation of Sections 603 and 604 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5939. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on assistance to Azerbaijan, pursuant to Public Law 107-115, section 907(g)(6); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5940. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 2006 Annual Report on the United States Participation in the United Nations, pursuant to Public Law 79-264, section 4(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5941. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning methods employed by the Government of Cuba to comply with the United States-Cuba September 1994 ''Joint Communique'' and the treatment by the Government of Cuba of persons returned to Cuba in accordance with the United States-Cuba May 1995 ''Joint Statement,'' together known as the Migration Accords, pursuant to Public Law 105-277, section 2245; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5942. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's determination on Vietnamese cooperation on accounting for POW/MIAs, pursuant to Public Law 110-161, 109; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5943. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on ''Tibet Negotiations,'' pursuant to Public Law 107-228, section 613(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5944. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report mandated in the Participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization Act, 2004 (Pub. L. 108-235), Section 1(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5945. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed license for the manufacture of military equipment to the Government of United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DDTC 035-08); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5946. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5947. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a draft bill, ''To authorize the United States participation in, and appropriations for the United States constribution to, the fifteenth replenishment of the resources of the International Development Association''; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5948. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a draft bill, ''To authorize the United States Participation in and appropriations for the United States contribution to, the eleventh replenishment of the resources of the African Development Fund''; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5949. A letter from the Chairman, International Fund for Ireland, transmitting a copy of the 2007 Annual Report of the Fund; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5950. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Offshore Airspace Area 1485L and Revision of Control 1485H; Barrow, AK [Docket No. FAA-2006-23872; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-9] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5951. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments Class E Airspace; Provo, UT [Docket No. FAA-2006-24234; Airspace Docket No. 06-AWP-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5952. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of High Altitude Area Navigation Routes; South Central United States [Docket No. FAA-2005-22398; Airspace Docket No. 05-ASO-7] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5953. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Low Altitude Reporting Point; AK [Docket No. FAA-2005-225010; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-17] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5954. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318, A319, A320, and A321 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24949; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-110-AD; Amendment 39-14626; AD 2006-12-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5955. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hamilton Sundstrand Model 14RF-19 Propellers [Docket No. FAA-2005-21691; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-13-AD; Amendment 39-14701; AD 2006-16-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5956. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22510; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-32-AD; Amendment 39-14600; AD 2006-10-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5957. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; EADS SOCATA Model TBM 700 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25332; Directorate Identifier 2006-CE-40-AD; Amendment 39-14808; AD 2006-22-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5958. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Tay 611-8, Tay 611-8C, Tay 620-15, Tay 650-15, and Tay 651-54 Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2007-27811; Directorate Identifier 2004-NE-11-AD; Amendment 39-15321; AD 2007-26-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5959. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Model BAe 146 and Avro 146-RJ Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0044; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-126-AD; Amendment 39-15320; AD 2007-26-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5960. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28989; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-070-AD; Amendment 39-15319; AD 2007-26-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5961. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Model 430 Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2007-28688; Directorate Identifier 2005-SW-21-AD; Amendment 39-15312; AD 2007-26-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5962. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 707 Airplanes and Model 720 and 720B Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28828; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-010-AD; Amendment 39-15258; AD 2007-23-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5963. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Model 680 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0379; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-331-AD; Amendment 39-15318; AD 2007-26-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5964. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piaggio Aero Industries S.p.A. Model P 180 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0294 Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-087-AD; Amendment 39-15365; AD 2008-03-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5965. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland Model EC135 Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2008-0165; Directorate Identifier 2007-SW-58-AD; Amendment 39-15377; AD 2008-04-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5966. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-400 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0167; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-029-AD; Amendment 39-15374; AD 2008-04-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5967. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS-365N2 and N3, SA-365C, C1 and C2, and SA-365N and NI Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2008-0164; Directorate Identifier 2007-SW-43-AD; Amendment 39-15375; AD 2008-04-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5968. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cirrus Design Corporation Models SR20 and SR22 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28246; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-048-AD; Amendment 39-15367; AD 2008-03-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5969. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DG Flugzeugbau GmbH Model DG-500MB Gliders [Docket No. FAA-2007-28843 Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-065-AD; Amendment 39-15317; AD 2007-26-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5970. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA332C, L, L1, and L2 Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2008-0044; Directorate Identifier 2007-SW-40-AD; Amendment 39-15341; AD 2008-02-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5971. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Corporation AE 3007A and AE 3007C Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2007-26966; Directorate Identifier 99-NE-01-AD; Amendment 39-15271; AD 2007-24-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5972. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757-200, -200CB, and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28990; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-033-AD; Amendment 39-15304; AD 2007-26-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5973. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-100, -200, -200C, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28942; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-093-AD; Amendment 39-15306; AD 2007-26-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5974. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777-200, -200LR, -300, and -300ER Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28854; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-109-AD; Amendment 39-15307; AD 2007-26-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5975. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-200B, 747-300, and 747-400 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0336; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-201-AD; Amendment 39-15308; AD 2007-26-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5976. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Thrush Aircraft, Inc. Model S2R Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28432; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-051-AD; Amendment 39-15303; AD 2007-26-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5977. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hartzell Propeller Inc. Compact Series Propellers [Docket No. FAA-2007-28876; Directorate Identifier 2000-NE-08-AD; Amendment 39-15311; AD 2007-26-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5978. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-200B, 747-300, 747-400, 747-400D, and 747-400F Series Airplanes Equipped with General Electric CF6-80C2 Engines [Docket No. FAA-2007-28352; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-037-AD; Amendment 39-15309; AD 2007-26-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5979. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Flight Simulation Training Device Initial and Continuing Qualification and Use [Docket No. FAA-2002-12461; Amendment Nos. 1-54, 11-52, 60-1, 121-327] (RIN: 2120-AH07) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5980. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Organization and Delegation of Powers and Duties; Secretarial Succession [Docket No. OST 2008-0103] (RIN: 2105-AD73) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5981. A letter from the Program Manager, Center for Beneficiary Choices, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — Medicare Program; Policy and Technical Changes to the Medicare Prescription Drug Benefit [CMS-4130-F] (RIN: 0938-AO74) received April 9, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

5982. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification that the Department intends to use ''no year'' IMET funds for Pakistan, pursuant to Public Law 107-115, section 515; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

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:

Ms. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1092. Resolution relating to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5724) to implement the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement (Rept. 110–574). 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. TOWNS (for himself and Mr. STEARNS):

H.R. 5734. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to study and establish a motor vehicle safety standard that provides for a means of alerting blind and other pedestrians of motor vehicle operation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. POE):

H.R. 5735. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to disclose their emergency response and evacuation procedures; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H.R. 5736. A bill to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic in Gadsden, Alabama, as the Colonel Ola Lee Mize Veterans Clinic; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER:

H.R. 5737. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a deduction for travel expenses to medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs in connection with examinations or treatments relating to service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 5738. A bill to improve the protections afforded under Federal law to consumers from contaminated seafood by directing the Secretary of Commerce to establish a program, in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies, to strengthen activities for ensuring that seafood sold or offered for sale to the public in or affecting interstate commerce is fit for human consumption; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and 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. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself and Mr. VISCLOSKY):

H.R. 5739. A bill to assure that the services of a nonemergency department physician are available to hospital patients 24-hours-a-day, seven days a week in all non-Federal hospitals with at least 100 licensed beds; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HOLT, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WEINER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WATT, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HARE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. SPACE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. CASTLE, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. SALI, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BERRY, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KIND, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHULER, Mr. REYES, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. LEE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MICA, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 5740. 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; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FARR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 5741. A bill to amend the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to improve the conservation of sharks; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. FORTUÑO):

H.R. 5742. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend eligibility under the new markets tax credit for community development entities created or organized in American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 5743. A bill to provide the Secretary of Homeland Security with the authority to procure real property and accept in-kind donations; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 5744. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend permanently the election to deduct State and local general sales taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAMPSON (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. POE):

H.R. 5745. A bill to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act to expand the definition of missing child for purposes of that Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. DENT, Mr. WYNN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 5746. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish the infrastructure foundation for the hydrogen economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California (for herself, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Ms. BEAN, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 5747. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to restrict political robocalls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 5748. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit States to exclude earned income in determining eligibility for medical assistance for individuals with extremely high prescription drug costs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5749. A bill to provide for a program of emergency unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 5750. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt certain elderly persons from demonstrating an understanding of the English language and the history, principles, and form of government of the United States as a requirement for naturalization, and to permit certain other elderly persons to take the history and government examination in a language of their choice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTOR (for himself and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 5751. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to jointly conduct a study of certain land adjacent to the Walnut Canyon National Monument in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SALI (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. RENZI, Mr. POE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. TERRY, and Ms. FALLIN):

H.R. 5752. A bill to provide for the security of United States passports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself and Mr. FOSSELLA):

H.R. 5753. A bill to prohibit the sale of kitchen ranges or ovens which do not include a design, bracket, or other device which complies with an applicable consensus product safety standard intended to prevent the product from tipping; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VISCLOSKY:

H.R. 5754. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and title 11, United State Code, to provide necessary reforms for employee pension benefit plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H. Con. Res. 325. Concurrent resolution celebrating the 50th Anniversary of the Mackinac Island State Park Commission's Historical Preservation and Museum Program, which began on June 15, 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. DENT):

H. Con. Res. 326. Concurrent resolution honoring professional surveyors and recognizing their contributions to society; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. OLVER):

H. Res. 1093. A resolution calling on the President not to attend the Opening Ceremony of the 2008 Olympic Games in Beijing

until China takes credible steps to persuade Sudan to end the genocide in Darfur and allow full deployment of the United Nations-African Union Mission in Darfur; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. CLAY):

H. Res. 1094. A resolution expressing support for designation of April as ''National Donate Life Month'' and expressing gratitude to all Americans who have communicated their intent to be organ and tissue donors; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. BACA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WATT, Mr. WYNN, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H. Res. 1095. A resolution recognizing and honoring the 40th anniversary of congressional passage of title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (the Fair Housing Act) and the 20th anniversary of the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Kansas (for himself, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H. Res. 1096. A resolution commending the University of Kansas Jayhawks for winning the 2008 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I basketball championship; 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. 78: Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 96: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 303: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 351: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 406: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. GORDON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SPACE, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DENT, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.

H.R. 436: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 471: Mr. RENZI.

H.R. 510: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, and Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

H.R. 579: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 583: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 621: Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 736: Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 741: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 748: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 769: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.

H.R. 843: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 989: Mr. SHULER.

H.R. 992: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 997: Mr. MCCARTHY of California.

H.R. 998: Mr. COHEN and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1000: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. TANNER and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 1032: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1072: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1108: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1110: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1176: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1185: Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 1264: Mr. SPACE.

H.R. 1306: Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 1308: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1322: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1359: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 1386: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1439: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. MAHONEY of Florida.

H.R. 1456: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 1472: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 1475: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1518: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1527: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1553: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1609: Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SOUDER and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1647: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 1653: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1742: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. FOXX, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SKELTON and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1781: Mr. SPACE.

H.R. 1820: Mr. BECERRA and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1881: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1973: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1983: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2042: Ms. HOOLEY and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 2073: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2114: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 2158: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 2167: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 2169: Ms. SUTTON, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 2219: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 2231: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 2267: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2471: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 2478: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2593: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 2676: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2686: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BACA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 2744: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 2762: Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 2792: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 2802: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 2809: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2905: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.

H.R. 2915: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 2942: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 3005: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 3054: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3140: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. KAGEN.

H.R. 3227: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3287: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 3334: Mr. KIRK.

H.R. 3484: Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 3609: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 3652: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 3767: Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 3865: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 3886: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 3892: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 4008: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 4018: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 4044: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 4205: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 4218: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4236: Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 4248: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 4318: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 4344: Mr. GOODE and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 4450: Mrs. CAPPS and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 4516: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 4540: Mr. RENZI.

H.R. 4900: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. REHBERG, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 4926: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. BOREN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. SPACE.

H.R. 4927: Mrs. MUSGRAVE and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 4934: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 4959: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 5134: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

H.R. 5173: Mr. SPACE, Mr. CHANDLER, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 5176: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5223: Ms. SUTTON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 5233: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 5236: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 5267: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 5405: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 5425: Mr. WALSH of New York.

H.R. 5440: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 5442: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 5443: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 5445: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. GINGREY, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 5446: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 5447: Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 5463: Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 5465: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 5466: Mr. COHEN and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 5481: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 5488: Mr. WYNN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FATTAH, and Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 5534: Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. FERGUSON, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 5541: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 5546: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 5567: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 5573: Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 5583: Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 5591: Mr. TERRY and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 5595: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 5602: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 5603: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 5609: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 5613: Mr. DENT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 5614: Mr. REHBERG and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 5626: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 5635: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
H.R. 5636: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 5637: Ms. LEE and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 5640: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 5645: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 5648: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
H.R. 5656: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 5662: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 5668: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SOUDER, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 5672: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 5685: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 5695: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 5696: Mr. HARE.
H.R. 5699: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 5700: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 5710: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.
H.R. 5716: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 5721: Mrs. CUBIN.
H.R. 5731: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.J. Res. 12: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. SPACE.
H. Con. Res. 305: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H. Con. Res. 315: Mr. STEARNS.
H. Con. Res. 317: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Con. Res. 322: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MACK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FORTUNO, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. POE, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. TANNER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. PORTER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HOLT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HARE, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. BACA, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H. Res. 49: Mr. NUNES, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DINGELL.
H. Res. 111: Mr. SALAZAR.
H. Res. 146: Mr. DELAHUNT.
H. Res. 424: Ms. LEE and Ms. DEGETTE.
H. Res. 653: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Res. 705: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. DUNCAN.
H. Res. 758: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. SAXTON.
H. Res. 896: Mr. PAYNE.
H. Res. 981: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HARE, and Ms. RICHARDSON.
H. Res. 987: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SHULER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HILL, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. ROSS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. TAYLOR.
H. Res. 1008: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. MCHUGH.
H. Res. 1011: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H. Res. 1022: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. WATSON, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. CLARKE.
H. Res. 1026: Mr. DINGELL.
H. Res. 1048: Mr. MCNULTY.
H. Res. 1054: Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. HARE.
H. Res. 1055: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H. Res. 1063: Mr. TANNER, Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H. Res. 1064: Mr. SHAYS.
H. Res. 1069: Mr. KING of New York.
H. Res. 1072: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
H. Res. 1073: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Res. 1079: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Res. 1080: Mr. HENSARLING and Mrs. DRAKE.
H. Res. 1081: Mr. WU, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. HILL, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WYNN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. OBERSTAR.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1665: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2537

OFFERED BY: MRS. MCCARTHY OF NEW YORK

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 11. PRESENCE OF PHARMACEUTICALS AND PERSONAL CARE PRODUCTS IN COASTAL RECREATION WATERS.

(a) STUDY.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with appropriate government agencies (including the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences), shall conduct a study of the presence of pharmaceuticals and personal care products (in this section referred to as ''PPCPs'') in coastal recreation waters .

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

(1) identify PPCPs that have been detected in the waters of the United States and the levels at which such PPCPs have been detected; and

(2) identify the sources of PPCPs in the waters of the United States.

(c) EXAMINATION OF WASTEWATER EFFLUENT AND RUN-OFF FROM AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.—In identifying sources of PPCPs under subsection (b)(2), the Administrator shall examine wastewater effluent and run-off from agricultural products.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, in order to provide a better understanding of the effects of PPCPs in the waters of the United States on human health, aquatic animal health, and aquatic wildlife, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under this section.

(e) PHARMACEUTICALS AND PERSONAL CARE PRODUCTS DEFINED.—In this section, the terms ''pharmaceuticals and personal care products'' and ''PPCPs'' mean products used by individuals for personal health or cosmetic reasons or used by agribusiness to enhance growth or health of livestock.

H.R. 2537

OFFERED BY: MR. FOSSELLA

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Page 2, after line 2 insert the following:

TITLE I—BEACH PROTECTION ACT OF 2007

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE II—FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978 AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2008

SEC. 100. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the ''Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 Amendments Act of 2008'' or the ''FISA Amendments Act of 2008''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this title is as follows:

Sec. 100. Short title; table of contents.
Subtitle A—Foreign Intelligence Surveillance
Sec. 101. Additional procedures regarding certain persons outside the United States.
Sec. 102. Statement of exclusive means by which electronic surveillance and interception of domestic communications may be conducted.
Sec. 103. Submittal to Congress of certain court orders under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.
Sec. 104. Applications for court orders.
Sec. 105. Issuance of an order.

Sec. 106. Use of information.
Sec. 107. Amendments for physical searches.
Sec. 108. Amendments for emergency pen registers and trap and trace devices.
Sec. 109. Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.
Sec. 110. Weapons of mass destruction.
Sec. 111. Technical and conforming amendments.

Subtitle B—Protections for Electronic Communication Service Providers

Sec. 201. Definitions.
Sec. 202. Limitations on civil actions for electronic communication service providers.
Sec. 203. Procedures for implementing statutory defenses under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.
Sec. 204. Preemption of State investigations.
Sec. 205. Technical amendments.

Subtitle C—Other Provisions

Sec. 301. Severability.
Sec. 302. Effective date; repeal; transition procedures.

Subtitle A—Foreign Intelligence Surveillance

SEC. 101. ADDITIONAL PROCEDURES REGARDING CERTAIN PERSONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking title VII; and

(2) by adding after title VI the following new title:

"TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL PROCEDURES REGARDING CERTAIN PERSONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

"SEC. 701. LIMITATION ON DEFINITION OF ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE.

''Nothing in the definition of electronic surveillance under section 101(f) shall be construed to encompass surveillance that is targeted in accordance with this title at a person reasonably believed to be located outside the United States.

"SEC. 702. DEFINITIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The terms 'agent of a foreign power', 'Attorney General', 'contents', 'electronic surveillance', 'foreign intelligence information', 'foreign power', 'minimization procedures', 'person', 'United States', and 'United States person' shall have the meanings given such terms in section 101, except as specifically provided in this title.

''(b) ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS.—

''(1) CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.—The term 'congressional intelligence committees' means—

''(A) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

''(B) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

''(2) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT; COURT.—The terms 'Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court' and 'Court' mean the court established by section 103(a).

''(3) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT OF REVIEW; COURT OF REVIEW.—The terms 'Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review' and 'Court of Review' mean the court established by section 103(b).

''(4) ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term 'electronic communication service provider' means—

''(A) a telecommunications carrier, as that term is defined in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153);

''(B) a provider of electronic communication service, as that term is defined in section 2510 of title 18, United States Code;

''(C) a provider of a remote computing service, as that term is defined in section 2711 of title 18, United States Code;

''(D) any other communication service provider who has access to wire or electronic communications either as such communications are transmitted or as such communications are stored; or

''(E) an officer, employee, or agent of an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D).

''(5) ELEMENT OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term 'element of the intelligence community' means an element of the intelligence community specified in or designated under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)).

"SEC. 703. PROCEDURES FOR TARGETING CERTAIN PERSONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES OTHER THAN UNITED STATES PERSONS.

''(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding any other law, the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence may authorize jointly, for periods of up to 1 year, the targeting of persons reasonably believed to be located outside the United States to acquire foreign intelligence information.

''(b) LIMITATIONS.—An acquisition authorized under subsection (a)—

''(1) may not intentionally target any person known at the time of acquisition to be located in the United States;

''(2) may not intentionally target a person reasonably believed to be located outside the United States if the purpose of such acquisition is to target a particular, known person reasonably believed to be in the United States, except in accordance with title I or title III;

''(3) may not intentionally target a United States person reasonably believed to be located outside the United States, except in accordance with sections 704, 705, or 706;

''(4) shall not intentionally acquire any communication as to which the sender and all intended recipients are known at the time of the acquisition to be located in the United States; and

''(5) shall be conducted in a manner consistent with the fourth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

''(c) CONDUCT OF ACQUISITION.—An acquisition authorized under subsection (a) may be conducted only in accordance with—

''(1) a certification made by the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence pursuant to subsection (f); and

''(2) the targeting and minimization procedures required pursuant to subsections (d) and (e).

''(d) TARGETING PROCEDURES.—

''(1) REQUIREMENT TO ADOPT.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall adopt targeting procedures that are reasonably designed to ensure that any acquisition authorized under subsection (a) is limited to targeting persons reasonably believed to be located outside the United States and does not result in the intentional acquisition of any communication as to which the sender and all intended recipients are known at the time of the acquisition to be located in the United States.

''(2) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—The procedures referred to in paragraph (1) shall be subject to judicial review pursuant to subsection (h).

''(e) MINIMIZATION PROCEDURES.—

''(1) REQUIREMENT TO ADOPT.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall adopt minimization procedures that meet the definition of minimization procedures under section 101(h) or section 301(4) for acquisitions authorized under subsection (a).

''(2) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—The minimization procedures required by this subsection shall be subject to judicial review pursuant to subsection (h).

''(f) CERTIFICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) REQUIREMENT.—Subject to subparagraph (B), prior to the initiation of an acquisition authorized under subsection (a), the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence shall provide, under oath, a written certification, as described in this subsection.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—If the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence determine that immediate action by the Government is required and time does not permit the preparation of a certification under this subsection prior to the initiation of an acquisition, the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence shall prepare such certification, including such determination, as soon as possible but in no event more than 7 days after such determination is made.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—A certification made under this subsection shall—

''(A) attest that—

''(i) there are reasonable procedures in place for determining that the acquisition authorized under subsection (a) is targeted at persons reasonably believed to be located outside the United States and that such procedures have been approved by, or will be submitted in not more than 5 days for approval by, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court pursuant to subsection (h);

''(ii) there are reasonable procedures in place for determining that the acquisition authorized under subsection (a) does not result in the intentional acquisition of any communication as to which the sender and all intended recipients are known at the time of the acquisition to be located in the United States, and that such procedures have been approved by, or will be submitted in not more than 5 days for approval by, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court pursuant to subsection (h);

''(iii) the procedures referred to in clauses (i) and (ii) are consistent with the requirements of the fourth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and do not permit the intentional targeting of any person who is known at the time of acquisition to be located in the United States or the intentional acquisition of any communication as to which the sender and all intended recipients are known at the time of acquisition to be located in the United States;

''(iv) a significant purpose of the acquisition is to obtain foreign intelligence information;

''(v) the minimization procedures to be used with respect to such acquisition—

''(I) meet the definition of minimization procedures under section 101(h) or section 301(4); and

''(II) have been approved by, or will be submitted in not more than 5 days for approval by, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court pursuant to subsection (h);

''(vi) the acquisition involves obtaining the foreign intelligence information from or with the assistance of an electronic communication service provider; and

''(vii) the acquisition does not constitute electronic surveillance, as limited by section 701; and

''(B) be supported, as appropriate, by the affidavit of any appropriate official in the area of national security who is—

''(i) appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate; or

''(ii) the head of any element of the intelligence community.

''(3) LIMITATION.—A certification made under this subsection is not required to identify the specific facilities, places, premises, or property at which the acquisition authorized under subsection (a) will be directed or conducted.

''(4) SUBMISSION TO THE COURT.—The Attorney General shall transmit a copy of a certification made under this subsection, and any supporting affidavit, under seal to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court as soon as possible, but in no event more than 5 days after such certification is made. Such certification shall be maintained under security measures adopted by the Chief Justice of the United States and the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence.

''(5) REVIEW.—The certification required by this subsection shall be subject to judicial review pursuant to subsection (h).

''(g) DIRECTIVES AND JUDICIAL REVIEW OF DIRECTIVES.—

''(1) AUTHORITY.—With respect to an acquisition authorized under subsection (a), the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence may direct, in writing, an electronic communication service provider to—

''(A) immediately provide the Government with all information, facilities, or assistance necessary to accomplish the acquisition in a manner that will protect the secrecy of the acquisition and produce a minimum of interference with the services that such electronic communication service provider is providing to the target; and

''(B) maintain under security procedures approved by the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence any records concerning the acquisition or the aid furnished that such electronic communication service provider wishes to maintain.

''(2) COMPENSATION.—The Government shall compensate, at the prevailing rate, an electronic communication service provider for providing information, facilities, or assistance pursuant to paragraph (1).

''(3) RELEASE FROM LIABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other law, no cause of action shall lie in any court against any electronic communication service provider for providing any information, facilities, or assistance in accordance with a directive issued pursuant to paragraph (1).

''(4) CHALLENGING OF DIRECTIVES.—

''(A) AUTHORITY TO CHALLENGE.—An electronic communication service provider receiving a directive issued pursuant to paragraph (1) may challenge the directive by filing a petition with the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, which shall have jurisdiction to review such a petition.

''(B) ASSIGNMENT.—The presiding judge of the Court shall assign the petition filed under subparagraph (A) to 1 of the judges serving in the pool established by section 103(e)(1) not later than 24 hours after the filing of the petition.

''(C) STANDARDS FOR REVIEW.—A judge considering a petition to modify or set aside a directive may grant such petition only if the judge finds that the directive does not meet the requirements of this section, or is otherwise unlawful.

''(D) PROCEDURES FOR INITIAL REVIEW.—A judge shall conduct an initial review not later than 5 days after being assigned a petition described in subparagraph (C). If the judge determines that the petition consists of claims, defenses, or other legal contentions that are not warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying, or reversing existing law or for establishing new law, the judge shall immediately deny the petition and affirm the directive or any part of the directive that is the subject of the petition and order the recipient to comply with the directive or any part of it. Upon making such a determination or promptly thereafter, the judge shall provide a written statement for the record of the reasons for a determination under this subparagraph.

''(E) PROCEDURES FOR PLENARY REVIEW.—If a judge determines that a petition described in subparagraph (C) requires plenary review, the judge shall affirm, modify, or set aside the directive that is the subject of that petition not later than 30 days after being assigned the petition, unless the judge, by order for reasons stated, extends that time as necessary to comport with the due process clause of the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Unless the judge sets aside the directive, the judge shall immediately affirm or affirm with modifications the directive, and order the recipient to comply with the directive in its entirety or as modified. The judge shall provide a written statement for the records of the reasons for a determination under this subparagraph.

''(F) CONTINUED EFFECT.—Any directive not explicitly modified or set aside under this paragraph shall remain in full effect.

''(G) CONTEMPT OF COURT.—Failure to obey an order of the Court issued under this paragraph may be punished by the Court as contempt of court.

''(5) ENFORCEMENT OF DIRECTIVES.—

''(A) ORDER TO COMPEL.—In the case of a failure to comply with a directive issued pursuant to paragraph (1), the Attorney General may file a petition for an order to compel compliance with the directive with the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, which shall have jurisdiction to review such a petition.

''(B) ASSIGNMENT.—The presiding judge of the Court shall assign a petition filed under subparagraph (A) to 1 of the judges serving in the pool established by section 103(e)(1) not later than 24 hours after the filing of the petition.

''(C) STANDARDS FOR REVIEW.—A judge considering a petition filed under subparagraph (A) shall issue an order requiring the electronic communication service provider to comply with the directive or any part of it, as issued or as modified, if the judge finds that the directive meets the requirements of this section, and is otherwise lawful.

''(D) PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW.—The judge shall render a determination not later than 30 days after being assigned a petition filed under subparagraph (A), unless the judge, by order for reasons stated, extends that time if necessary to comport with the due process clause of the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The judge shall provide a written statement for the record of the reasons for a determination under this paragraph.

''(E) CONTEMPT OF COURT.—Failure to obey an order of the Court issued under this paragraph may be punished by the Court as contempt of court.

''(F) PROCESS.—Any process under this paragraph may be served in any judicial district in which the electronic communication service provider may be found.

''(6) APPEAL.—

''(A) APPEAL TO THE COURT OF REVIEW.—The Government or an electronic communication service provider receiving a directive issued pursuant to paragraph (1) may file a petition with the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review for review of the decision issued pursuant to paragraph (4) or (5). The Court of Review shall have jurisdiction to consider such a petition and shall provide a written statement for the record of the reasons for a decision under this paragraph.

''(B) CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT.—The Government or an electronic communication service provider receiving a directive issued pursuant to paragraph (1) may file a petition for a writ of certiorari for review of the decision of the Court of Review issued under subparagraph (A). The record for such review shall be transmitted under seal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which shall have jurisdiction to review such decision.

''(h) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CERTIFICATIONS AND PROCEDURES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) REVIEW BY THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court shall have jurisdiction to review any certification required by subsection (c) and the targeting and minimization procedures adopted pursuant to subsections (d) and (e).

''(B) SUBMISSION TO THE COURT.—The Attorney General shall submit to the Court any such certification or procedure, or amendment thereto, not later than 5 days after making or amending the certification or adopting or amending the procedures.

''(2) CERTIFICATIONS.—The Court shall review a certification provided under subsection (f) to determine whether the certification contains all the required elements.

''(3) TARGETING PROCEDURES.—The Court shall review the targeting procedures required by subsection (d) to assess whether the procedures are reasonably designed to ensure that the acquisition authorized under subsection (a) is limited to the targeting of persons reasonably believed to be located outside the United States and does not result in the intentional acquisition of any communication as to which the sender and all intended recipients are known at the time of the acquisition to be located in the United States.

''(4) MINIMIZATION PROCEDURES.—The Court shall review the minimization procedures required by subsection (e) to assess whether such procedures meet the definition of minimization procedures under section 101(h) or section 301(4).

''(5) ORDERS.—

''(A) APPROVAL.—If the Court finds that a certification required by subsection (f) contains all of the required elements and that the targeting and minimization procedures required by subsections (d) and (e) are consistent with the requirements of those subsections and with the fourth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the Court shall enter an order approving the continued use of the procedures for the acquisition authorized under subsection (a).

''(B) CORRECTION OF DEFICIENCIES.—If the Court finds that a certification required by subsection (f) does not contain all of the required elements, or that the procedures required by subsections (d) and (e) are not consistent with the requirements of those subsections or the fourth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the Court shall issue an order directing the Government to, at the Government's election and to the extent required by the Court's order—

''(i) correct any deficiency identified by the Court's order not later than 30 days after the date the Court issues the order; or

''(ii) cease the acquisition authorized under subsection (a).

''(C) REQUIREMENT FOR WRITTEN STATEMENT.—In support of its orders under this subsection, the Court shall provide, simultaneously with the orders, for the record a written statement of its reasons.

''(6) APPEAL.—

''(A) APPEAL TO THE COURT OF REVIEW.—The Government may appeal any order under this section to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review, which shall have jurisdiction to review such order. For any decision affirming, reversing, or modifying an order of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, the Court of Review shall provide for the record a written statement of its reasons.

''(B) CONTINUATION OF ACQUISITION PENDING REHEARING OR APPEAL.—Any acquisitions affected by an order under paragraph (5)(B) may continue—

''(i) during the pendency of any rehearing of the order by the Court en banc; and

''(ii) if the Government appeals an order under this section, until the Court of Review enters an order under subparagraph (C).

''(C) IMPLEMENTATION PENDING APPEAL.—Not later than 60 days after the filing of an appeal of an order under paragraph (5)(B) directing the correction of a deficiency, the Court of Review shall determine, and enter a corresponding order regarding, whether all or any part of the correction order, as issued or modified, shall be implemented during the pendency of the appeal.

''(D) CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT.—The Government may file a petition for a writ of certiorari for review of a decision of the Court of Review issued under subparagraph (A). The record for such review shall be transmitted under seal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which shall have jurisdiction to review such decision.

''(i) EXPEDITED JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS.—Judicial proceedings under this section shall be conducted as expeditiously as possible.

''(j) MAINTENANCE AND SECURITY OF RECORDS AND PROCEEDINGS.—

''(1) STANDARDS.—A record of a proceeding under this section, including petitions filed, orders granted, and statements of reasons for decision, shall be maintained under security measures adopted by the Chief Justice of the United States, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence.

''(2) FILING AND REVIEW.—All petitions under this section shall be filed under seal. In any proceedings under this section, the court shall, upon request of the Government, review ex parte and in camera any Government submission, or portions of a submission, which may include classified information.

''(3) RETENTION OF RECORDS.—A directive made or an order granted under this section shall be retained for a period of not less than 10 years from the date on which such directive or such order is made.

''(k) ASSESSMENTS AND REVIEWS.—

''(1) SEMIANNUAL ASSESSMENT.—Not less frequently than once every 6 months, the Attorney General and Director of National Intelligence shall assess compliance with the targeting and minimization procedures required by subsections (e) and (f) and shall submit each such assessment to—

''(A) the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court; and

''(B) the congressional intelligence committees.

''(2) AGENCY ASSESSMENT.—The Inspectors General of the Department of Justice and of any element of the intelligence community authorized to acquire foreign intelligence information under subsection (a) with respect to their department, agency, or element—

''(A) are authorized to review the compliance with the targeting and minimization procedures required by subsections (d) and (e);

''(B) with respect to acquisitions authorized under subsection (a), shall review the number of disseminated intelligence reports containing a reference to a United States person identity and the number of United States person identities subsequently disseminated by the element concerned in response to requests for identities that were not referred to by name or title in the original reporting;

''(C) with respect to acquisitions authorized under subsection (a), shall review the number of targets that were later determined to be located in the United States and, to the extent possible, whether their communications were reviewed; and

''(D) shall provide each such review to—

''(i) the Attorney General;

''(ii) the Director of National Intelligence; and

''(iii) the congressional intelligence committees.

''(3) ANNUAL REVIEW.—

''(A) REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT.—The head of an element of the intelligence community conducting an acquisition authorized under subsection (a) shall direct the element to conduct an annual review to determine whether there is reason to believe that foreign intelligence information has been or will be obtained from the acquisition. The annual review shall provide, with respect to such acquisitions authorized under subsection (a)—

''(i) an accounting of the number of disseminated intelligence reports containing a reference to a United States person identity;

''(ii) an accounting of the number of United States person identities subsequently disseminated by that element in response to requests for identities that were not referred to by name or title in the original reporting;

''(iii) the number of targets that were later determined to be located in the United States and, to the extent possible, whether their communications were reviewed; and

''(iv) a description of any procedures developed by the head of an element of the intelligence community and approved by the Director of National Intelligence to assess, in a manner consistent with national security, operational requirements and the privacy interests of United States persons, the extent to which the acquisitions authorized under subsection (a) acquire the communications of United States persons, as well as the results of any such assessment.

''(B) USE OF REVIEW.—The head of each element of the intelligence community that conducts an annual review under subparagraph (A) shall use each such review to evaluate the adequacy of the minimization procedures utilized by such element or the application of the minimization procedures to a particular acquisition authorized under subsection (a).

''(C) PROVISION OF REVIEW.—The head of each element of the intelligence community that conducts an annual review under subparagraph (A) shall provide such review to—

''(i) the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court;

''(ii) the Attorney General;

''(iii) the Director of National Intelligence; and

''(iv) the congressional intelligence committees.

''SEC. 704. CERTAIN ACQUISITIONS INSIDE THE UNITED STATES OF UNITED STATES PERSONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

''(a) JURISDICTION OF THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court shall have jurisdiction to enter an order approving the targeting of a United States person reasonably believed to be located outside the United States to acquire foreign intelligence information, if such acquisition constitutes electronic surveillance (as defined in section 101(f), regardless of the limitation of section 701) or the acquisition of stored electronic communications or stored electronic data that requires an order under this Act, and such acquisition is conducted within the United States.

''(2) LIMITATION.—In the event that a United States person targeted under this subsection is reasonably believed to be located in the United States during the pendency of an order issued pursuant to subsection (c), such acquisition shall cease until authority, other than under this section, is obtained pursuant to this Act or the targeted United States person is again reasonably believed to be located outside the United States during the pendency of an order issued pursuant to subsection (c).

''(b) APPLICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each application for an order under this section shall be made by a Federal officer in writing upon oath or affirmation to a judge having jurisdiction under subsection (a)(1). Each application shall require the approval of the Attorney General based upon the Attorney General's finding that it satisfies the criteria and requirements of such application, as set forth in this section, and shall include—

''(A) the identity of the Federal officer making the application;

''(B) the identity, if known, or a description of the United States person who is the target of the acquisition;

''(C) a statement of the facts and circumstances relied upon to justify the applicant's belief that the United States person who is the target of the acquisition is—

''(i) a person reasonably believed to be located outside the United States; and

''(ii) a foreign power, an agent of a foreign power, or an officer or employee of a foreign power;

''(D) a statement of the proposed minimization procedures that meet the definition of minimization procedures under section 101(h) or section 301(4);

''(E) a description of the nature of the information sought and the type of communications or activities to be subjected to acquisition;

''(F) a certification made by the Attorney General or an official specified in section 104(a)(6) that—

''(i) the certifying official deems the information sought to be foreign intelligence information;

''(ii) a significant purpose of the acquisition is to obtain foreign intelligence information;

''(iii) such information cannot reasonably be obtained by normal investigative techniques;

''(iv) designates the type of foreign intelligence information being sought according to the categories described in section 101(e); and

''(v) includes a statement of the basis for the certification that—

''(I) the information sought is the type of foreign intelligence information designated; and

''(II) such information cannot reasonably be obtained by normal investigative techniques;

''(G) a summary statement of the means by which the acquisition will be conducted and whether physical entry is required to effect the acquisition;

''(H) the identity of any electronic communication service provider necessary to effect the acquisition, provided, however, that the application is not required to identify the specific facilities, places, premises, or property at which the acquisition authorized under this section will be directed or conducted;

''(I) a statement of the facts concerning any previous applications that have been made to any judge of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court involving the United States person specified in the application and the action taken on each previous application; and

''(J) a statement of the period of time for which the acquisition is required to be maintained, provided that such period of time shall not exceed 90 days per application.

''(2) OTHER REQUIREMENTS OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General may require any other affidavit or certification from any other officer in connection with the application.

''(3) OTHER REQUIREMENTS OF THE JUDGE.—The judge may require the applicant to furnish such other information as may be necessary to make the findings required by subsection (c)(1).

''(c) ORDER.—

''(1) FINDINGS.—Upon an application made pursuant to subsection (b), the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court shall enter an ex parte order as requested or as modified approving the acquisition if the Court finds that—

''(A) the application has been made by a Federal officer and approved by the Attorney General;

''(B) on the basis of the facts submitted by the applicant, for the United States person who is the target of the acquisition, there is probable cause to believe that the target is—

''(i) a person reasonably believed to be located outside the United States; and

''(ii) a foreign power, an agent of a foreign power, or an officer or employee of a foreign power;

''(C) the proposed minimization procedures meet the definition of minimization procedures under section 101(h) or section 301(4); and

''(D) the application which has been filed contains all statements and certifications required by subsection (b) and the certification or certifications are not clearly erroneous on the basis of the statement made under subsection (b)(1)(F)(v) and any other information furnished under subsection (b)(3).

''(2) PROBABLE CAUSE.—In determining whether or not probable cause exists for purposes of an order under paragraph (1), a judge having jurisdiction under subsection (a)(1) may consider past activities of the target, as well as facts and circumstances relating to current or future activities of the target. However, no United States person may be considered a foreign power, agent of a foreign power, or officer or employee of a foreign power solely upon the basis of activities protected by the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

''(3) REVIEW.—

''(A) LIMITATION ON REVIEW.—Review by a judge having jurisdiction under subsection (a)(1) shall be limited to that required to make the findings described in paragraph (1).

''(B) REVIEW OF PROBABLE CAUSE.—If the judge determines that the facts submitted under subsection (b) are insufficient to establish probable cause to issue an order under paragraph (1), the judge shall enter an order so stating and provide a written statement for the record of the reasons for such determination. The Government may appeal an order under this clause pursuant to subsection (f).

''(C) REVIEW OF MINIMIZATION PROCEDURES.—If the judge determines that the proposed minimization procedures required under paragraph (1)(C) do not meet the definition of minimization procedures under section 101(h) or section 301(4), the judge shall enter an order so stating and provide a written statement for the record of the reasons for such determination. The Government may appeal an order under this clause pursuant to subsection (f).

''(D) REVIEW OF CERTIFICATION.—If the judge determines that an application required by subsection (b) does not contain all of the required elements, or that the certification or certifications are clearly erroneous on the basis of the statement made under subsection (b)(1)(F)(v) and any other information furnished under subsection (b)(3), the judge shall enter an order so stating and provide a written statement for the record of the reasons for such determination. The Government may appeal an order under this clause pursuant to subsection (f).

''(4) SPECIFICATIONS.—An order approving an acquisition under this subsection shall specify—

''(A) the identity, if known, or a description of the United States person who is the target of the acquisition identified or described in the application pursuant to subsection (b)(1)(B);

''(B) if provided in the application pursuant to subsection (b)(1)(H), the nature and location of each of the facilities or places at which the acquisition will be directed;

''(C) the nature of the information sought to be acquired and the type of communications or activities to be subjected to acquisition;

''(D) the means by which the acquisition will be conducted and whether physical entry is required to effect the acquisition; and

''(E) the period of time during which the acquisition is approved.

''(5) DIRECTIONS.—An order approving acquisitions under this subsection shall direct—

''(A) that the minimization procedures be followed;

''(B) an electronic communication service provider to provide to the Government forthwith all information, facilities, or assistance necessary to accomplish the acquisition authorized under this subsection in a manner that will protect the secrecy of the acquisition and produce a minimum of interference with the services that such electronic communication service provider is providing to the target;

''(C) an electronic communication service provider to maintain under security procedures approved by the Attorney General any records concerning the acquisition or the aid furnished that such electronic communication service provider wishes to maintain; and

''(D) that the Government compensate, at the prevailing rate, such electronic communication service provider for providing such information, facilities, or assistance.

''(6) DURATION.—An order approved under this paragraph shall be effective for a period not to exceed 90 days and such order may be renewed for additional 90-day periods upon submission of renewal applications meeting the requirements of subsection (b).

''(7) COMPLIANCE.—At or prior to the end of the period of time for which an acquisition is approved by an order or extension under this section, the judge may assess compliance with the minimization procedures by reviewing the circumstances under which information concerning United States persons was acquired, retained, or disseminated.

''(d) EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION.—

''(1) AUTHORITY FOR EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if the Attorney General reasonably determines that—

''(A) an emergency situation exists with respect to the acquisition of foreign intelligence information for which an order may be obtained under subsection (c) before an order authorizing such acquisition can with due diligence be obtained, and

''(B) the factual basis for issuance of an order under this subsection to approve such acquisition exists,

the Attorney General may authorize the emergency acquisition if a judge having jurisdiction under subsection (a)(1) is informed by the Attorney General, or a designee of the Attorney General, at the time of such authorization that the decision has been made to conduct such acquisition and if an application in accordance with this subsection is made to a judge of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court as soon as practicable, but not more than 7 days after the Attorney General authorizes such acquisition.

''(2) MINIMIZATION PROCEDURES.—If the Attorney General authorizes such emergency acquisition, the Attorney General shall require that the minimization procedures required by this section for the issuance of a judicial order be followed.

''(3) TERMINATION OF EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION.—In the absence of a judicial order approving such acquisition, the acquisition shall terminate when the information sought is obtained, when the application for the order is denied, or after the expiration of 7 days from the time of authorization by the Attorney General, whichever is earliest.

''(4) USE OF INFORMATION.—In the event that such application for approval is denied, or in any other case where the acquisition is terminated and no order is issued approving the acquisition, no information obtained or evidence derived from such acquisition, except under circumstances in which the target of the acquisition is determined not to be a United States person during the pendency of the 7-day emergency acquisition period, shall be received in evidence or otherwise disclosed in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or political subdivision thereof, and no information concerning any United States person acquired from such acquisition shall subsequently be used or disclosed in any other manner by Federal officers or employees without the consent of such person, except with the approval of the Attorney General if the information indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person.

''(e) RELEASE FROM LIABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other law, no cause of action shall lie in any court against any electronic communication service provider for providing any information, facilities, or assistance in accordance with an order or request for emergency assistance issued pursuant to subsections (c) or (d).

''(f) APPEAL.—

''(1) APPEAL TO THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT OF REVIEW.—The Government may file an appeal with the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review for review of an order issued pursuant to subsection (c). The Court of Review shall have jurisdiction to consider such appeal and shall provide a written statement for the record of the reasons for a decision under this paragraph.

''(2) CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT.—The Government may file a petition for a writ of certiorari for review of the decision of the Court of Review issued under paragraph (1). The record for such review shall be transmitted under seal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which shall have jurisdiction to review such decision.

''SEC. 705. OTHER ACQUISITIONS TARGETING UNITED STATES PERSONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

''(a) JURISDICTION AND SCOPE.—

''(1) JURISDICTION.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court shall have jurisdiction to enter an order pursuant to subsection (c).

''(2) SCOPE.—No element of the intelligence community may intentionally target, for the purpose of acquiring foreign intelligence information, a United States person reasonably believed to be located outside the United States under circumstances in which the targeted United States person has a reasonable expectation of privacy and a warrant would be required if the acquisition were

conducted inside the United States for law enforcement purposes, unless a judge of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court has entered an order or the Attorney General has authorized an emergency acquisition pursuant to subsections (c) or (d) or any other provision of this Act.

''(3) LIMITATIONS.—

''(A) MOVING OR MISIDENTIFIED TARGETS.—In the event that the targeted United States person is reasonably believed to be in the United States during the pendency of an order issued pursuant to subsection (c), such acquisition shall cease until authority is obtained pursuant to this Act or the targeted United States person is again reasonably believed to be located outside the United States during the pendency of an order issued pursuant to subsection (c).

''(B) APPLICABILITY.—If the acquisition is to be conducted inside the United States and could be authorized under section 704, the procedures of section 704 shall apply, unless an order or emergency acquisition authority has been obtained under a provision of this Act other than under this section.

''(b) APPLICATION.—Each application for an order under this section shall be made by a Federal officer in writing upon oath or affirmation to a judge having jurisdiction under subsection (a)(1). Each application shall require the approval of the Attorney General based upon the Attorney General's finding that it satisfies the criteria and requirements of such application as set forth in this section and shall include—

''(1) the identity, if known, or a description of the specific United States person who is the target of the acquisition;

''(2) a statement of the facts and circumstances relied upon to justify the applicant's belief that the United States person who is the target of the acquisition is—

''(A) a person reasonably believed to be located outside the United States; and

''(B) a foreign power, an agent of a foreign power, or an officer or employee of a foreign power;

''(3) a statement of the proposed minimization procedures that meet the definition of minimization procedures under section 101(h) or section 301(4);

''(4) a certification made by the Attorney General, an official specified in section 104(a)(6), or the head of an element of the intelligence community that—

''(A) the certifying official deems the information sought to be foreign intelligence information; and

''(B) a significant purpose of the acquisition is to obtain foreign intelligence information;

''(5) a statement of the facts concerning any previous applications that have been made to any judge of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court involving the United States person specified in the application and the action taken on each previous application; and

''(6) a statement of the period of time for which the acquisition is required to be maintained, provided that such period of time shall not exceed 90 days per application.

''(c) ORDER.—

''(1) FINDINGS.—If, upon an application made pursuant to subsection (b), a judge having jurisdiction under subsection (a) finds that—

''(A) on the basis of the facts submitted by the applicant, for the United States person who is the target of the acquisition, there is probable cause to believe that the target is—

''(i) a person reasonably believed to be located outside the United States; and

''(ii) a foreign power, an agent of a foreign power, or an officer or employee of a foreign power;

''(B) the proposed minimization procedures, with respect to their dissemination provisions, meet the definition of minimization procedures under section 101(h) or section 301(4); and

''(C) the application which has been filed contains all statements and certifications required by subsection (b) and the certification provided under subsection (b)(4) is not clearly erroneous on the basis of the information furnished under subsection (b),

the Court shall issue an ex parte order so stating.

''(2) PROBABLE CAUSE.—In determining whether or not probable cause exists for purposes of an order under paragraph (1)(A), a judge having jurisdiction under subsection (a)(1) may consider past activities of the target, as well as facts and circumstances relating to current or future activities of the target. However, no United States person may be considered a foreign power, agent of a foreign power, or officer or employee of a foreign power solely upon the basis of activities protected by the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

''(3) REVIEW.—

''(A) LIMITATIONS ON REVIEW.—Review by a judge having jurisdiction under subsection (a)(1) shall be limited to that required to make the findings described in paragraph (1). The judge shall not have jurisdiction to review the means by which an acquisition under this section may be conducted.

''(B) REVIEW OF PROBABLE CAUSE.—If the judge determines that the facts submitted under subsection (b) are insufficient to establish probable cause to issue an order under this subsection, the judge shall enter an order so stating and provide a written statement for the record of the reasons for such determination. The Government may appeal an order under this clause pursuant to subsection (e).

''(C) REVIEW OF MINIMIZATION PROCEDURES.—If the judge determines that the minimization procedures applicable to dissemination of information obtained through an acquisition under this subsection do not meet the definition of minimization procedures under section 101(h) or section 301(4), the judge shall enter an order so stating and provide a written statement for the record of the reasons for such determination. The Government may appeal an order under this clause pursuant to subsection (e).

''(D) SCOPE OF REVIEW OF CERTIFICATION.—If the judge determines that the certification provided under subsection (b)(4) is clearly erroneous on the basis of the information furnished under subsection (b), the judge shall enter an order so stating and provide a written statement for the record of the reasons for such determination. The Government may appeal an order under this subparagraph pursuant to subsection (e).

''(4) DURATION.—An order under this paragraph shall be effective for a period not to exceed 90 days and such order may be renewed for additional 90-day periods upon submission of renewal applications meeting the requirements of subsection (b).

''(5) COMPLIANCE.—At or prior to the end of the period of time for which an order or extension is granted under this section, the judge may assess compliance with the minimization procedures by reviewing the circumstances under which information concerning United States persons was disseminated, provided that the judge may not inquire into the circumstances relating to the conduct of the acquisition.

''(d) EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION.—

''(1) AUTHORITY FOR EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision in this subsection, if the Attorney General reasonably determines that—

''(A) an emergency situation exists with respect to the acquisition of foreign intelligence information for which an order may be obtained under subsection (c) before an order under that subsection may, with due diligence, be obtained, and

''(B) the factual basis for issuance of an order under this section exists,

the Attorney General may authorize the emergency acquisition if a judge having jurisdiction under subsection (a)(1) is informed by the Attorney General or a designee of the Attorney General at the time of such authorization that the decision has been made to conduct such acquisition and if an application in accordance with this subsection is made to a judge of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court as soon as practicable, but not more than 7 days after the Attorney General authorizes such acquisition.

''(2) MINIMIZATION PROCEDURES.—If the Attorney General authorizes such emergency acquisition, the Attorney General shall require that the minimization procedures required by this section be followed.

''(3) TERMINATION OF EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION.—In the absence of an order under subsection (c), the acquisition shall terminate when the information sought is obtained, if the application for the order is denied, or after the expiration of 7 days from the time of authorization by the Attorney General, whichever is earliest.

''(4) USE OF INFORMATION.—In the event that such application is denied, or in any other case where the acquisition is terminated and no order is issued approving the acquisition, no information obtained or evidence derived from such acquisition, except under circumstances in which the target of the acquisition is determined not to be a United States person during the pendency of the 7-day emergency acquisition period, shall be received in evidence or otherwise disclosed in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or political subdivision thereof, and no information concerning any United States person acquired from such acquisition shall subsequently be used or disclosed in any other manner by Federal officers or employees without the consent of such person, except with the approval of the Attorney General if the information indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person.

''(e) APPEAL.—

''(1) APPEAL TO THE COURT OF REVIEW.—The Government may file an appeal with the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review for review of an order issued pursuant to subsection (c). The Court of Review shall have jurisdiction to consider such appeal and shall provide a written statement for the record of the reasons for a decision under this paragraph.

''(2) CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT.—The Government may file a petition for a writ of certiorari for review of the decision of the Court of Review issued under paragraph (1). The record for such review shall be transmitted under seal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which shall have jurisdiction to review such decision.

''SEC. 706. JOINT APPLICATIONS AND CONCURRENT AUTHORIZATIONS.

''(a) JOINT APPLICATIONS AND ORDERS.—If an acquisition targeting a United States person under section 704 or section 705 is proposed to be conducted both inside and outside the United States, a judge having jurisdiction under section 704(a)(1) or section 705(a)(1) may issue simultaneously, upon the

request of the Government in a joint application complying with the requirements of section 704(b) or section 705(b), orders under section 704(c) or section 705(c), as applicable.

''(b) CONCURRENT AUTHORIZATION.—If an order authorizing electronic surveillance or physical search has been obtained under section 105 or section 304 and that order is still in effect, the Attorney General may authorize, without an order under section 704 or section 705, an acquisition of foreign intelligence information targeting that United States person while such person is reasonably believed to be located outside the United States.

''SEC. 707. USE OF INFORMATION ACQUIRED UNDER TITLE VII.

''(a) INFORMATION ACQUIRED UNDER SECTION 703.—Information acquired from an acquisition conducted under section 703 shall be deemed to be information acquired from an electronic surveillance pursuant to title I for purposes of section 106, except for the purposes of subsection (j) of such section.

''(b) INFORMATION ACQUIRED UNDER SECTION 704.—Information acquired from an acquisition conducted under section 704 shall be deemed to be information acquired from an electronic surveillance pursuant to title I for purposes of section 106.

''SEC. 708. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.

''(a) SEMIANNUAL REPORT.—Not less frequently than once every 6 months, the Attorney General shall fully inform, in a manner consistent with national security, the congressional intelligence committees, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, concerning the implementation of this title.

''(b) CONTENT.—Each report made under subparagraph (a) shall include—

''(1) with respect to section 703—

''(A) any certifications made under subsection 703(f) during the reporting period;

''(B) any directives issued under subsection 703(g) during the reporting period;

''(C) a description of the judicial review during the reporting period of any such certifications and targeting and minimization procedures utilized with respect to such acquisition, including a copy of any order or pleading in connection with such review that contains a significant legal interpretation of the provisions of this section;

''(D) any actions taken to challenge or enforce a directive under paragraphs (4) or (5) of section 703(g);

''(E) any compliance reviews conducted by the Department of Justice or the Office of the Director of National Intelligence of acquisitions authorized under subsection 703(a);

''(F) a description of any incidents of noncompliance with a directive issued by the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence under subsection 703(g), including—

''(i) incidents of noncompliance by an element of the intelligence community with procedures adopted pursuant to subsections (d) and (e) of section 703; and

''(ii) incidents of noncompliance by a specified person to whom the Attorney General and Director of National Intelligence issued a directive under subsection 703(g); and

''(G) any procedures implementing this section;

''(2) with respect to section 704—

''(A) the total number of applications made for orders under section 704(b);

''(B) the total number of such orders either granted, modified, or denied; and

''(C) the total number of emergency acquisitions authorized by the Attorney General under section 704(d) and the total number of subsequent orders approving or denying such acquisitions; and

''(3) with respect to section 705—

''(A) the total number of applications made for orders under 705(b);

''(B) the total number of such orders either granted, modified, or denied; and

''(C) the total number of emergency acquisitions authorized by the Attorney General under subsection 705(d) and the total number of subsequent orders approving or denying such applications.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in the first section of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et. seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to title VII;

(2) by striking the item relating to section 701; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL PROCEDURES REGARDING CERTAIN PERSONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

''Sec. 701. Limitation on definition of electronic surveillance.
''Sec. 702. Definitions.
''Sec. 703. Procedures for targeting certain persons outside the United States other than United States persons.
''Sec. 704. Certain acquisitions inside the United States of United States persons outside the United States.
''Sec. 705. Other acquisitions targeting United States persons outside the United States.
''Sec. 706. Joint applications and concurrent authorizations.
''Sec. 707. Use of information acquired under title VII.
''Sec. 708. Congressional oversight.''.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.—

(A) SECTION 2232.—Section 2232(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''(as defined in section 101(f) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, regardless of the limitation of section 701 of that Act)'' after ''electronic surveillance''.

(B) SECTION 2511.—Section 2511(2)(a)(ii)(A) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or a court order pursuant to section 705 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978'' after ''assistance''.

(2) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.—

(A) SECTION 109.—Section 109 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1809) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) DEFINITION.—For the purpose of this section, the term 'electronic surveillance' means electronic surveillance as defined in section 101(f) of this Act regardless of the limitation of section 701 of this Act.''.

(B) SECTION 110.—Section 110 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1810) is amended by—

(i) adding an ''(a)'' before ''CIVIL ACTION'',

(ii) redesignating subsections (a) through (c) as paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively; and

(iii) adding at the end the following:

''(b) DEFINITION.—For the purpose of this section, the term 'electronic surveillance' means electronic surveillance as defined in section 101(f) of this Act regardless of the limitation of section 701 of this Act.''.

(C) SECTION 601.—Section 601(a)(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1871(a)(1)) is amended by striking subparagraphs (C) and (D) and inserting the following:

''(C) pen registers under section 402;

''(D) access to records under section 501;

''(E) acquisitions under section 704; and

''(F) acquisitions under section 705;''.

(d) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by subsections (a)(2), (b), and (c) shall cease to have effect on December 31, 2013.

(2) CONTINUING APPLICABILITY.—Section 703(g)(3) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (as amended by subsection (a)) shall remain in effect with respect to any directive issued pursuant to section 703(g) of that Act (as so amended) for information, facilities, or assistance provided during the period such directive was or is in effect. Section 704(e) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (as amended by subsection (a)) shall remain in effect with respect to an order or request for emergency assistance under that section. The use of information acquired by an acquisition conducted under section 703 of that Act (as so amended) shall continue to be governed by the provisions of section 707 of that Act (as so amended).

SEC. 102. STATEMENT OF EXCLUSIVE MEANS BY WHICH ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE AND INTERCEPTION OF DOMESTIC COMMUNICATIONS MAY BE CONDUCTED.

(a) STATEMENT OF EXCLUSIVE MEANS.—Title I of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''STATEMENT OF EXCLUSIVE MEANS BY WHICH ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE AND INTERCEPTION OF DOMESTIC COMMUNICATIONS MAY BE CONDUCTED

''SEC. 112. The procedures of chapters 119, 121, and 206 of title 18, United States Code, and this Act shall be the exclusive means by which electronic surveillance (as defined in section 101(f), regardless of the limitation of section 701) and the interception of domestic wire, oral, or electronic communications may be conducted.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in the first section of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended by adding after the item relating to section 111, the following:

''Sec. 112. Statement of exclusive means by which electronic surveillance and interception of domestic communications may be conducted.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2511(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended in paragraph (f), by striking '', as defined in section 101 of such Act,'' and inserting ''(as defined in section 101(f) of such Act regardless of the limitation of section 701 of such Act)''.

SEC. 103. SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS OF CERTAIN COURT ORDERS UNDER THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

(a) INCLUSION OF CERTAIN ORDERS IN SEMIANNUAL REPORTS OF ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Subsection (a)(5) of section 601 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1871) is amended by striking ''(not including orders)'' and inserting '', orders,''.

(b) REPORTS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ON CERTAIN OTHER ORDERS.—Such section 601 is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) SUBMISSIONS TO CONGRESS.—The Attorney General shall submit to the committees of Congress referred to in subsection (a)—

''(1) a copy of any decision, order, or opinion issued by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review that includes significant construction or interpretation of any provision of this Act, and any pleadings, applications, or memoranda of law associated with such decision, order, or opinion,

not later than 45 days after such decision, order, or opinion is issued; and

''(2) a copy of any such decision, order, or opinion, and any pleadings, applications, or memoranda of law associated with such decision, order, or opinion, that was issued during the 5-year period ending on the date of the enactment of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 and not previously submitted in a report under subsection (a).

''(d) PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, may authorize redactions of materials described in subsection (c) that are provided to the committees of Congress referred to in subsection (a), if such redactions are necessary to protect the national security of the United States and are limited to sensitive sources and methods information or the identities of targets.''.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Such section 601, as amended by subsections (a) and (b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT; COURT.—The term ''`Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court'`'' means the court established by section 103(a).

''(2) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT OF REVIEW; COURT OF REVIEW.—The term 'Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review' means the court established by section 103(b).''.

SEC. 104. APPLICATIONS FOR COURT ORDERS.

Section 104 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1804) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraphs (2) and (11);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (10) as paragraphs (2) through (9), respectively;

(C) in paragraph (5), as redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, by striking ''detailed'';

(D) in paragraph (6), as redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''Affairs or'' and inserting ''Affairs,''; and

(ii) by striking ''Senate—'' and inserting ''Senate, or the Deputy Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, if designated by the President as a certifying official—'';

(E) in paragraph (7), as redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, by striking ''statement of'' and inserting ''summary statement of'';

(F) in paragraph (8), as redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, by adding ''and'' at the end; and

(G) in paragraph (9), as redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period;

(2) by striking subsection (b);

(3) by redesignating subsections (c) through (e) as subsections (b) through (d), respectively; and

(4) in paragraph (1)(A) of subsection (d), as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection, by striking ''or the Director of National Intelligence'' and inserting ''the Director of National Intelligence, or the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency''.

SEC. 105. ISSUANCE OF AN ORDER.

Section 105 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1805) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (1) through (4), respectively;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''(a)(3)'' and inserting ''(a)(2)'';

(3) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (F);

(4) by striking subsection (d);

(5) by redesignating subsections (e) through (i) as subsections (d) through (h), respectively;

(6) by amending subsection (e), as redesignated by paragraph (5) of this section, to read as follows:

''(e)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Attorney General may authorize the emergency employment of electronic surveillance if the Attorney General—

''(A) reasonably determines that an emergency situation exists with respect to the employment of electronic surveillance to obtain foreign intelligence information before an order authorizing such surveillance can with due diligence be obtained;

''(B) resonably determines that the factual basis for issuance of an order under this title to approve such electronic surveillance exists;

''(C) informs, either personally or through a designee, a judge having jurisdiction under section 103 at the time of such authorization that the decision has been made to employ emergency electronic surveillance; and

''(D) makes an application in accordance with this title to a judge having jurisdiction under section 103 as soon as practicable, but not later than 7 days after the Attorney General authorizes such surveillance.

''(2) If the Attorney General authorizes the emergency employment of electronic surveillance under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall require that the minimization procedures required by this title for the issuance of a judicial order be followed.

''(3) In the absence of a judicial order approving such electronic surveillance, the surveillance shall terminate when the information sought is obtained, when the application for the order is denied, or after the expiration of 7 days from the time of authorization by the Attorney General, whichever is earliest.

''(4) A denial of the application made under this subsection may be reviewed as provided in section 103.

''(5) In the event that such application for approval is denied, or in any other case where the electronic surveillance is terminated and no order is issued approving the surveillance, no information obtained or evidence derived from such surveillance shall be received in evidence or otherwise disclosed in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or political subdivision thereof, and no information concerning any United States person acquired from such surveillance shall subsequently be used or disclosed in any other manner by Federal officers or employees without the consent of such person, except with the approval of the Attorney General if the information indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person.

''(6) The Attorney General shall assess compliance with the requirements of paragraph (5).''; and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

''(i) In any case in which the Government makes an application to a judge under this title to conduct electronic surveillance involving communications and the judge grants such application, upon the request of the applicant, the judge shall also authorize the installation and use of pen registers and trap and trace devices, and direct the disclosure of the information set forth in section 402(d)(2).''.

SEC. 106. USE OF INFORMATION.

Subsection (i) of section 106 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (8 U.S.C. 1806) is amended by striking ''radio communication'' and inserting ''communication''.

SEC. 107. AMENDMENTS FOR PHYSICAL SEARCHES.

(a) APPLICATIONS.—Section 303 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1823) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (9) as paragraphs (2) through (8), respectively;

(C) in paragraph (2), as redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, by striking ''detailed'';

(D) in paragraph (3)(C), as redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, by inserting ''or is about to be'' before ''owned''; and

(E) in paragraph (6), as redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''Affairs or'' and inserting ''Affairs,''; and

(ii) by striking ''Senate—'' and inserting ''Senate, or the Deputy Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, if designated by the President as a certifying official—''; and

(2) in subsection (d)(1)(A), by striking ''or the Director of National Intelligence'' and inserting ''the Director of National Intelligence, or the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency''.

(b) ORDERS.—Section 304 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1824) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (1) through (4), respectively; and

(2) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

''(e)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Attorney General may authorize the emergency employment of a physical search if the Attorney General reasonably—

''(A) determines that an emergency situation exists with respect to the employment of a physical search to obtain foreign intelligence information before an order authorizing such physical search can with due diligence be obtained;

''(B) determines that the factual basis for issuance of an order under this title to approve such physical search exists;

''(C) informs, either personally or through a designee, a judge of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court at the time of such authorization that the decision has been made to employ an emergency physical search; and

''(D) makes an application in accordance with this title to a judge of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court as soon as practicable, but not more than 7 days after the Attorney General authorizes such physical search.

''(2) If the Attorney General authorizes the emergency employment of a physical search under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall require that the minimization procedures required by this title for the issuance of a judicial order be followed.

''(3) In the absence of a judicial order approving such physical search, the physical search shall terminate when the information sought is obtained, when the application for the order is denied, or after the expiration of 7 days from the time of authorization by the Attorney General, whichever is earliest.

''(4) A denial of the application made under this subsection may be reviewed as provided in section 103.

''(5)(A) In the event that such application for approval is denied, or in any other case where the physical search is terminated and no order is issued approving the physical search, no information obtained or evidence derived from such physical search shall be received in evidence or otherwise disclosed in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or political subdivision thereof, and no information concerning any United States person acquired from such physical search shall subsequently be used or disclosed in any other manner by Federal officers or employees without the consent of such person, except with the approval of the Attorney General if the information indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person.

''(B) The Attorney General shall assess compliance with the requirements of subparagraph (A).''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 304(a)(4), as redesignated by subsection (b) of this section, by striking ''303(a)(7)(E)'' and inserting ''303(a)(6)(E)''; and

(2) in section 305(k)(2), by striking ''303(a)(7)'' and inserting ''303(a)(6)''.

SEC. 108. AMENDMENTS FOR EMERGENCY PEN REGISTERS AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICES.

Section 403 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1843) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''48 hours'' and inserting ''7 days''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1)(C), by striking ''48 hours'' and inserting ''7 days''.

SEC. 109. FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT.

(a) DESIGNATION OF JUDGES.—Subsection (a) of section 103 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803) is amended by inserting ''at least'' before ''seven of the United States judicial circuits''.

(b) EN BANC AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 103 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, is further amended—

(A) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(a)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2)(A) The court established under this subsection may, on its own initiative, or upon the request of the Government in any proceeding or a party under section 501(f) or paragraph (4) or (5) of section 703(h), hold a hearing or rehearing, en banc, when ordered by a majority of the judges that constitute such court upon a determination that—

''(i) en banc consideration is necessary to secure or maintain uniformity of the court's decisions; or

''(ii) the proceeding involves a question of exceptional importance.

''(B) Any authority granted by this Act to a judge of the court established under this subsection may be exercised by the court en banc. When exercising such authority, the court en banc shall comply with any requirements of this Act on the exercise of such authority.

''(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the court en banc shall consist of all judges who constitute the court established under this subsection.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 is further amended—

(A) in subsection (a) of section 103, as amended by this subsection, by inserting ''(except when sitting en banc under paragraph (2))'' after ''no judge designated under this subsection''; and

(B) in section 302(c) (50 U.S.C. 1822(c)), by inserting ''(except when sitting en banc)'' after ''except that no judge''.

(c) STAY OR MODIFICATION DURING AN APPEAL.—Section 103 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

''(f)(1) A judge of the court established under subsection (a), the court established under subsection (b) or a judge of that court, or the Supreme Court of the United States or a justice of that court, may, in accordance with the rules of their respective courts, enter a stay of an order or an order modifying an order of the court established under subsection (a) or the court established under subsection (b) entered under any title of this Act, while the court established under subsection (a) conducts a rehearing, while an appeal is pending to the court established under subsection (b), or while a petition of certiorari is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States, or during the pendency of any review by that court.

''(2) The authority described in paragraph (1) shall apply to an order entered under any provision of this Act.''.

(d) AUTHORITY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT.—Section 103 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803), as amended by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h)(1) Nothing in this Act shall be considered to reduce or contravene the inherent authority of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court to determine, or enforce, compliance with an order or a rule of such Court or with a procedure approved by such Court.

''(2) In this subsection, the terms 'Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court' and 'Court' mean the court established by subsection (a).''.

SEC. 110. WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) FOREIGN POWER.—Subsection (a)(4) of section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801(a)(4)) is amended by inserting '', the international proliferation of weapons of mass destruction,'' after ''international terrorism''.

(2) AGENT OF A FOREIGN POWER.—Subsection (b)(1) of such section 101 is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''or'' at the end

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''or'' at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(D) engages in the international proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or activities in preparation therefor; or

''(E) engages in the international proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or activities in preparation therefor, for or on behalf of a foreign power; or''.

(3) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION.—Subsection (e)(1)(B) of such section 101 is amended by striking ''sabotage or international terrorism'' and inserting ''sabotage, international terrorism, or the international proliferation of weapons of mass destruction''.

(4) WEAPON OF MASS DESTRUCTION.—Such section 101 is amended by inserting after subsection (o) the following:

''(p) 'Weapon of mass destruction' means—

''(1) any destructive device described in section 921(a)(4)(A) of title 18, United States Code, that is intended or has the capability to cause death or serious bodily injury to a significant number of people;

''(2) any weapon that is designed or intended to cause death or serious bodily injury through the release, dissemination, or impact of toxic or poisonous chemicals or their precursors;

''(3) any weapon involving a biological agent, toxin, or vector (as such terms are defined in section 178 of title 18, United States Code); or

''(4) any weapon that is designed to release radiation or radioactivity at a level dangerous to human life.''.

(b) USE OF INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 106(k)(1)(B) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1806(k)(1)(B)) is amended by striking ''sabotage or international terrorism'' and inserting ''sabotage, international terrorism, or the international proliferation of weapons of mass destruction''.

(2) PHYSICAL SEARCHES.—Section 305(k)(1)(B) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1825(k)(1)(B)) is amended by striking ''sabotage or international terrorism'' and inserting ''sabotage, international terrorism, or the international proliferation of weapons of mass destruction''.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 301(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1821(1)) is amended by inserting '' 'weapon of mass destruction','' after '' 'person',''.

SEC. 111. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Section 103(e) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''105B(h) or 501(f)(1)'' and inserting ''501(f)(1) or 703''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''105B(h) or 501(f)(1)'' and inserting ''501(f)(1) or 703''.

Subtitle B—Protections for Electronic Communication Service Providers

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ASSISTANCE.—The term ''assistance'' means the provision of, or the provision of access to, information (including communication contents, communications records, or other information relating to a customer or communication), facilities, or another form of assistance.

(2) CONTENTS.—The term ''contents'' has the meaning given that term in section 101(n) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801(n)).

(3) COVERED CIVIL ACTION.—The term ''covered civil action'' means a civil action filed in a Federal or State court that—

(A) alleges that an electronic communication service provider furnished assistance to an element of the intelligence community; and

(B) seeks monetary or other relief from the electronic communication service provider related to the provision of such assistance.

(4) ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term ''electronic communication service provider'' means—

(A) a telecommunications carrier, as that term is defined in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153);

(B) a provider of an electronic communication service, as that term is defined in section 2510 of title 18, United States Code;

(C) a provider of a remote computing service, as that term is defined in section 2711 of title 18, United States Code;

(D) any other communication service provider who has access to wire or electronic communications either as such communications are transmitted or as such communications are stored;

(E) a parent, subsidiary, affiliate, successor, or assignee of an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D); or

(F) an officer, employee, or agent of an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E).

(5) ELEMENT OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term ''element of the intelligence community'' means an element of the intelligence community specified in or designated under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)).

SEC. 202. LIMITATIONS ON CIVIL ACTIONS FOR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION SERVICE PROVIDERS.

(a) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a covered civil action shall not lie or be maintained in a Federal or State court, and shall be promptly dismissed, if the Attorney General certifies to the court that—

(A) the assistance alleged to have been provided by the electronic communication service provider was—

(i) in connection with an intelligence activity involving communications that was—

(I) authorized by the President during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on January 17, 2007; and

(II) designed to detect or prevent a terrorist attack, or activities in preparation for a terrorist attack, against the United States; and

(ii) described in a written request or directive from the Attorney General or the head of an element of the intelligence community (or the deputy of such person) to the electronic communication service provider indicating that the activity was—

(I) authorized by the President; and

(II) determined to be lawful; or

(B) the electronic communication service provider did not provide the alleged assistance.

(2) REVIEW.—A certification made pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be subject to review by a court for abuse of discretion.

(b) REVIEW OF CERTIFICATIONS.—If the Attorney General files a declaration under section 1746 of title 28, United States Code, that disclosure of a certification made pursuant to subsection (a) would harm the national security of the United States, the court shall—

(1) review such certification in camera and ex parte; and

(2) limit any public disclosure concerning such certification, including any public order following such an ex parte review, to a statement that the conditions of subsection (a) have been met, without disclosing the subparagraph of subsection (a)(1) that is the basis for the certification.

(c) NONDELEGATION.—The authority and duties of the Attorney General under this section shall be performed by the Attorney General (or Acting Attorney General) or a designee in a position not lower than the Deputy Attorney General.

(d) CIVIL ACTIONS IN STATE COURT.—A covered civil action that is brought in a State court shall be deemed to arise under the Constitution and laws of the United States and shall be removable under section 1441 of title 28, United States Code.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit any otherwise available immunity, privilege, or defense under any other provision of law.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.—This section shall apply to any covered civil action that is pending on or filed after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 203. PROCEDURES FOR IMPLEMENTING STATUTORY DEFENSES UNDER THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), as amended by section 101, is further amended by adding after title VII the following new title:

''TITLE VIII—PROTECTION OF PERSONS ASSISTING THE GOVERNMENT

''SEC. 801. DEFINITIONS.

''In this title:

''(1) ASSISTANCE.—The term 'assistance' means the provision of, or the provision of access to, information (including communication contents, communications records, or other information relating to a customer or communication), facilities, or another form of assistance.

''(2) ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The term 'Attorney General' has the meaning give that term in section 101(g).

''(3) CONTENTS.—The term 'contents' has the meaning given that term in section 101(n).

''(4) ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term 'electronic communication service provider' means—

''(A) a telecommunications carrier, as that term is defined in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153);

''(B) a provider of electronic communication service, as that term is defined in section 2510 of title 18, United States Code;

''(C) a provider of a remote computing service, as that term is defined in section 2711 of title 18, United States Code;

''(D) any other communication service provider who has access to wire or electronic communications either as such communications are transmitted or as such communications are stored;

''(E) a parent, subsidiary, affiliate, successor, or assignee of an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D); or

''(F) an officer, employee, or agent of an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E).

''(5) ELEMENT OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term 'element of the intelligence community' means an element of the intelligence community as specified or designated under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)).

''(6) PERSON.—The term 'person' means—

''(A) an electronic communication service provider; or

''(B) a landlord, custodian, or other person who may be authorized or required to furnish assistance pursuant to—

''(i) an order of the court established under section 103(a) directing such assistance;

''(ii) a certification in writing under section 2511(2)(a)(ii)(B) or 2709(b) of title 18, United States Code; or

''(iii) a directive under section 102(a)(4), 105B(e), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 or 703(h).

''(7) STATE.—The term 'State' means any State, political subdivision of a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and any territory or possession of the United States, and includes any officer, public utility commission, or other body authorized to regulate an electronic communication service provider.

''SEC. 802. PROCEDURES FOR IMPLEMENTING STATUTORY DEFENSES.

''(a) REQUIREMENT FOR CERTIFICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no civil action may lie or be maintained in a Federal or State court against any person for providing assistance to an element of the intelligence community, and shall be promptly dismissed, if the Attorney General certifies to the court that—

''(A) any assistance by that person was provided pursuant to an order of the court established under section 103(a) directing such assistance;

''(B) any assistance by that person was provided pursuant to a certification in writing under section 2511(2)(a)(ii)(B) or 2709(b) of title 18, United States Code;

''(C) any assistance by that person was provided pursuant to a directive under sections 102(a)(4), 105B(e), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008, or 703(h) directing such assistance; or

''(D) the person did not provide the alleged assistance.

''(2) REVIEW.—A certification made pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be subject to review by a court for abuse of discretion.

''(b) LIMITATIONS ON DISCLOSURE.—If the Attorney General files a declaration under section 1746 of title 28, United States Code, that disclosure of a certification made pursuant to subsection (a) would harm the national security of the United States, the court shall—

''(1) review such certification in camera and ex parte; and

''(2) limit any public disclosure concerning such certification, including any public order following such an ex parte review, to a statement that the conditions of subsection (a) have been met, without disclosing the subparagraph of subsection (a)(1) that is the basis for the certification.

''(c) REMOVAL.—A civil action against a person for providing assistance to an element of the intelligence community that is brought in a State court shall be deemed to arise under the Constitution and laws of the United States and shall be removable under section 1441 of title 28, United States Code.

''(d) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit any otherwise available immunity, privilege, or defense under any other provision of law.

''(e) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply to a civil action pending on or filed after the date of enactment of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008.''.

SEC. 204. PREEMPTION OF STATE INVESTIGATIONS.

Title VIII of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), as added by section 203 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 803. PREEMPTION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—No State shall have authority to—

''(1) conduct an investigation into an electronic communication service provider's alleged assistance to an element of the intelligence community;

''(2) require through regulation or any other means the disclosure of information about an electronic communication service provider's alleged assistance to an element of the intelligence community;

''(3) impose any administrative sanction on an electronic communication service provider for assistance to an element of the intelligence community; or

''(4) commence or maintain a civil action or other proceeding to enforce a requirement that an electronic communication service provider disclose information concerning alleged assistance to an element of the intelligence community.

''(b) SUITS BY THE UNITED STATES.—The United States may bring suit to enforce the provisions of this section.

''(c) JURISDICTION.—The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over any civil action brought by the United States to enforce the provisions of this section.

''(d) APPLICATION.—This section shall apply to any investigation, action, or proceeding that is pending on or filed after the date of enactment of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008.''.

SEC. 205. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

The table of contents in the first section of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of

1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), as amended by section 101(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''TITLE VIII—PROTECTION OF PERSONS ASSISTING THE GOVERNMENT

''Sec. 801. Definitions.
''Sec. 802. Procedures for implementing statutory defenses.
''Sec. 803. Preemption.''.

Subtitle C—Other Provisions

SEC. 301. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, any amendment made by this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act, any such amendments, and of the application of such provisions to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 302. EFFECTIVE DATE; REPEAL; TRANSITION PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (c), the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) REPEAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (c), sections 105A, 105B, and 105C of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1805a, 1805b, and 1805c) are repealed.

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in the first section of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended by striking the items relating to sections 105A, 105B, and 105C.

(c) TRANSITIONS PROCEDURES.—

(1) PROTECTION FROM LIABILITY.—Notwithstanding subsection (b)(1), subsection (l) of section 105B of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 shall remain in effect with respect to any directives issued pursuant to such section 105B for information, facilities, or assistance provided during the period such directive was or is in effect.

(2) ORDERS IN EFFECT.—

(A) ORDERS IN EFFECT ON DATE OF ENACTMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978—

(i) any order in effect on the date of enactment of this Act issued pursuant to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 or section 6(b) of the Protect America Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–55; 121 Stat. 556) shall remain in effect until the date of expiration of such order; and

(ii) at the request of the applicant, the court established under section 103(a) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803(a)) shall reauthorize such order if the facts and circumstances continue to justify issuance of such order under the provisions of such Act, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Protect America Act of 2007, except as amended by sections 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, and 110 of this Act.

(B) ORDERS IN EFFECT ON DECEMBER 31, 2013.—Any order issued under title VII of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as amended by section 101 of this Act, in effect on December 31, 2013, shall continue in effect until the date of the expiration of such order. Any such order shall be governed by the applicable provisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as so amended.

(3) AUTHORIZATIONS AND DIRECTIVES IN EFFECT.—

(A) AUTHORIZATIONS AND DIRECTIVES IN EFFECT ON DATE OF ENACTMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, any authorization or directive in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act issued pursuant to the Protect America Act of 2007, or any amendment made by that Act, shall remain in effect until the date of expiration of such authorization or directive. Any such authorization or directive shall be governed by the applicable provisions of the Protect America Act of 2007 (121 Stat. 552), and the amendment made by that Act, and, except as provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection, any acquisition pursuant to such authorization or directive shall be deemed not to constitute electronic surveillance (as that term is defined in section 101(f) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801(f)), as construed in accordance with section 105A of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1805a)).

(B) AUTHORIZATIONS AND DIRECTIVES IN EFFECT ON DECEMBER 31, 2013.—Any authorization or directive issued under title VII of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as amended by section 101 of this Act, in effect on December 31, 2013, shall continue in effect until the date of the expiration of such authorization or directive. Any such authorization or directive shall be governed by the applicable provisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as so amended, and, except as provided in section 707 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as so amended, any acquisition pursuant to such authorization or directive shall be deemed not to constitute electronic surveillance (as that term is defined in section 101(f) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, to the extent that such section 101(f) is limited by section 701 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as so amended).

(4) USE OF INFORMATION ACQUIRED UNDER PROTECT AMERICA ACT.—Information acquired from an acquisition conducted under the Protect America Act of 2007, and the amendments made by that Act, shall be deemed to be information acquired from an electronic surveillance pursuant to title I of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) for purposes of section 106 of that Act (50 U.S.C. 1806), except for purposes of subsection (j) of such section.

(5) NEW ORDERS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978—

(A) the government may file an application for an order under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Protect America Act of 2007, except as amended by sections 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, and 110 of this Act; and

(B) the court established under section 103(a) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 shall enter an order granting such an application if the application meets the requirements of such Act, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Protect America Act of 2007, except as amended by sections 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, and 110 of this Act.

(6) EXTANT AUTHORIZATIONS.—At the request of the applicant, the court established under section 103(a) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 shall extinguish any extant authorization to conduct electronic surveillance or physical search entered pursuant to such Act.

(7) APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—Any surveillance conducted pursuant to an order entered pursuant to this subsection shall be subject to the provisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Protect America Act of 2007, except as amended by sections 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, and 110 of this Act.

(8) TRANSITION PROCEDURES CONCERNING THE TARGETING OF UNITED STATES PERSONS OVERSEAS.—Any authorization in effect on the date of enactment of this Act under section 2.5 of Executive Order 12333 to intentionally target a United States person reasonably believed to be located outside the United States shall remain in effect, and shall constitute a sufficient basis for conducting such an acquisition targeting a United States person located outside the United States until the earlier of—

(A) the date that authorization expires; or

(B) the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 2537

OFFERED BY: MR. KUCINICH

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 3, line 3, strike ''indicators'' and insert ''indicators. If, in carrying out such source identification and tracking program, a source of pathogenic contamination is identified by such State or local government, such State or local government shall make information on the existence of such source available to the public on the Internet within 24 hours of the identification of such source.''.

H.R. 2537

OFFERED BY: MR. PETERSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Before section 1 insert the following:

TITLE I—BEACH PROTECTION

In section 1 strike ''This Act'' and insert ''This title''.

Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE II—OFFSHORE GAS DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 21. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''National Environment and Energy Development Act''.

SEC. 22. TERMINATION OF PROHIBITIONS ON EXPENDITURES FOR, AND WITHDRAWALS FROM, OFFSHORE GAS LEASING.

(a) PROHIBITIONS ON EXPENDITURES.—All provisions of Federal law that prohibit the expenditure of appropriated funds to conduct natural gas leasing and preleasing activities for any area of the Outer Continental Shelf shall have no force or effect with respect to such activities.

(b) REVOCATION WITHDRAWALS.—All withdrawals of Federal submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf from leasing, including withdrawals by the President under the authority of section 12(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1341(a)), are hereby revoked and are no longer in effect with respect to the leasing of areas for exploration for, and development and production of, natural gas.

(c) PROHIBITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS FOR OIL NOT AFFECTED.—This section does not affect—

(1) any prohibition on the expenditure of appropriated funds to conduct oil leasing or preleasing activities; and

(2) any withdrawal of Federal submerged lands from leasing for exploration for, and development and production of, oil.

SEC. 23. OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF NATURAL GAS LEASING PROGRAM.

The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 9 the following:

''SEC. 10. MORATORIA AREA AND STATE APPROVAL REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO NATURAL GAS LEASING.

''(a) BUFFER ZONE.—The Secretary may not grant any natural gas lease for any area of the outer Continental Shelf that is located within 25 miles of the coastline of a State.

''(b) STATE APPROVAL REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not issue any lease authorizing exploration for, or development of, natural gas in any area of the outer Continental Shelf that is located within 50 miles of the coastline of a State

unless the State has enacted a law approving of the issuance of such leases by the Secretary.

''(2) STATE APPROVAL PERMANENT.—Repeal of such a law by a State shall have no effect for purposes of paragraph (1).

''(c) STATE DISAPPROVAL AUTHORITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not issue any lease authorizing exploration for, or development of, natural gas in any area of the outer Continental Shelf that is located more than 50 miles and less than 100 miles from the coastline of a State if the State has enacted a law disapproving of the issuance of such leases by the Secretary.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR STATE LAW.—A law enacted by a State for purposes of paragraph (1)—

''(A) shall have no force or effect for purposes of paragraph (1) unless first enacted by the State within the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the National Environment and Energy Development Act; and

''(B) shall have no force or effect for purposes of paragraph (1) after the end of the 2-year period beginning on the date it first takes effect, unless the State, in the 2-year period preceding the application of the law for purposes of paragraph (1), enacted legislation extending the effectiveness of the law.''.

SEC. 24. SHARING OF REVENUES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8(g) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) by striking ''Notwithstanding'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (6), and notwithstanding'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (8) and (9); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

''(6) BONUS BIDS AND ROYALTIES UNDER QUALIFIED GAS LEASES.—

''(A) NEW GAS LEASES.—Of amounts received by the United States as bonus bids and royalties under any qualified gas lease on submerged lands that are located within the seaward boundaries of a State established under section 4(a)(2)(A)—

''(i) 25 percent shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury;

''(ii) 37.5 percent shall be paid to the States that are producing States with respect to those submerged lands;

''(iii) 8.0 percent shall be deposited in the Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve established by paragraph (7);

''(iv) 8.0 percent shall be deposited in the Carbon Capture and Sequestration Reserve established by paragraph (7);

''(v) 5.0 percent shall be deposited in the Chesapeake Bay Restoration Reserve established by paragraph (7);

''(vi) 5.0 percent shall be deposited in the Great Lakes Restoration Reserve established by paragraph (7);

''(vii) 3.0 percent shall be deposited in the Everglades Restoration Reserve established by paragraph (7);

''(viii) 3.0 percent shall be deposited in the Colorado River Basin Restoration Reserve established by paragraph (7);

''(ix) 3.0 percent shall be deposited in the San Francisco Bay Restoration Reserve established by paragraph (7); and

''(x) 2.5 percent shall be available, half to the Secretary of Health and Human Services for carrying out the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621, et seq.) and half to the Secretary of Energy for carrying out the Weatherization Assistance program under part A of title IV of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6861 et seq.).

''(B) LEASED TRACT THAT LIES PARTIALLY WITHIN THE SEAWARD BOUNDARIES OF A STATE.—In the case of a leased tract that lies partially within the seaward boundaries of a State, the amounts of bonus bids and royalties from such tract that are subject to subparagraph (A) with respect to such State shall be a percentage of the total amounts of bonus bids and royalties from such tract that is equivalent to the total percentage of surface acreage of the tract that lies within such seaward boundaries.

''(C) USE OF PAYMENTS TO STATES.—Amounts paid to a State under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be used by the State for one or more of the following:

''(i) Education.

''(ii) Transportation.

''(iii) Reducing taxes.

''(iv) Coastal and environmental restoration.

''(v) Energy infrastructure and projects.

''(vi) State seismic monitoring programs.

''(vii) Alternative energy development.

''(viii) Energy efficiency and conservation.

''(ix) Hurricane and natural disaster insurance programs.

''(x) Any other purpose determined by State law.

''(D) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

''(i) ADJACENT STATE.—The term 'adjacent State' means, with respect to any program, plan, lease sale, leased tract or other activity, proposed, conducted, or approved pursuant to the provisions of this Act, any State the laws of which are declared, pursuant to section 4(a)(2), to be the law of the United States for the portion of the outer Continental Shelf on which such program, plan, lease sale, leased tract, or activity appertains or is, or is proposed to be, conducted.

''(ii) ADJACENT ZONE.—The term 'adjacent zone' means, with respect to any program, plan, lease sale, leased tract, or other activity, proposed, conducted, or approved pursuant to the provisions of this Act, the portion of the outer Continental Shelf for which the laws of a particular adjacent State are declared, pursuant to section 4(a)(2), to be the law of the United States.

''(iii) PRODUCING STATE.—The term 'producing State' means an Adjacent State having an adjacent zone containing leased tracts from which are derived bonus bids and royalties under a lease under this Act.

''(iv) STATE.—The term 'State' includes Puerto Rico and the other Territories of the United States.

''(v) QUALIFIED GAS LEASE.—The term 'qualified gas lease' means a lease under this Act granted after the date of the enactment of the National Environment and Energy Development Act that authorizes development and production of natural gas and associated condensate.

''(E) APPLICATION.—This paragraph shall apply to bonus bids and royalties received by the United States after September 30, 2007.

''(7) ESTABLISHMENT OF RESERVE ACCOUNTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For budgetary purposes, there is established as a separate account to receive deposits under paragraph (6)(A)—

''(i) the Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to offset the cost of legislation enacted after the date of the enactment of the National Environment and Energy Development Act to accelerate the use of clean domestic renewable energy resources and alternative fuels; to promote the utilization of energy-efficient products and practices and conservation; and to increase research, development, and deployment of clean renewable energy and efficiency technologies.

''(ii) the Carbon Capture and Sequestration Reserve to offset the cost of legislation enacted after the date of the enactment of the National Environment and Energy Development Act to promote activities associated with carbon capture and sequestration;

''(iii) the Chesapeake Bay Restoration Reserve to offset the cost of legislation enacted after the date of the enactment of the National Environment and Energy Development Act to conduct restoration activities primarily or entirely within the Chesapeake Bay watershed that seeks to improve the overall health of the ecosystem of the Chesapeake Bay;

''(iv) the Great Lakes Restoration Reserve to offset the cost of legislation enacted after the date of the enactment of the National Environment and Energy Development Act to conduct restoration activities primarily or entirely within the the Great Lakes watershed that seeks to improve the overall health of the ecosystem of the Great Lakes;

''(v) the Everglades Restoration Reserve to offset the cost of legislation enacted after the date of the enactment of the National Environment and Energy Development Act to conduct restoration activities primarily or entirely within the Florida Everglades watershed that seeks to improve the overall health of the ecosystem of the Everglades;

''(vi) the Colorado River Basin Restoration Reserve to offset the cost of legislation enacted after the date of the enactment of the National Environment and Energy Development Act to conduct restoration activities primarily or entirely within the the Colorado River Basin watershed that seeks to improve the overall health of the ecosystem of the Colorado River Basin ; and

''(vii) the San Francisco Bay Restoration Reserve to offset the cost of legislation enacted after the date of the enactment of the National Environment and Energy Development Act to conduct restoration activities primarily or entirely within the San Francisco Bay, California, watershed that seeks to improve the overall health of the ecosystem of San Francisco Bay.

''(B) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—

''(i) BUDGET COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN.—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution, or the offering of an amendment thereto or the submission of a conference report thereon, providing funding for the purposes set forth in clause (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vi), or (vii) of subparagraph (A) in excess of the amount of the deposits under paragraph (6)(A) for those purposes for fiscal year 2007, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the applicable House of Congress shall make the adjustments set forth in clause (ii) for the amount of new budget authority and outlays in that measure and the outlays flowing from that budget authority.

''(ii) MATTERS TO BE ADJUSTED.—The adjustments referred to in clause (i) are to be made to—

''(I) the discretionary spending limits, if any, set forth in the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget;

''(II) the allocations made pursuant to the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

''(III) the budget aggregates contained in the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget as required by section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

''(iii) AMOUNTS OF ADJUSTMENTS.—The adjustments referred to in clauses (i) and (ii) shall not exceed the receipts estimated by the Congressional Budget Office that are attributable to this Act for the fiscal year in which the adjustments are made.

''(C) EXPENDITURES ONLY BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR IN CONSULTATION.—Legislation shall not be treated as legislation referred to in subparagraph (A) unless any expenditure under such legislation for a purpose referred to in that subparagraph may be made only

by the Secretary of the Interior after consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Secretary of the Army acting through the Corps of Engineers, and, as appropriate, the Secretary of State.

''(8) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT BY STATES.—The Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of Energy shall ensure that financial assistance provided to a State for any purpose with amounts made available under this subsection or in any legislation with respect to which paragraph (7) applies supplement, and do not replace, the amounts expended by the State for that purpose before the date of the enactment of the National Environment and Energy Development Act.''.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF STATE SEAWARD BOUNDARIES.—Section 4(a)(2)(A) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1333(a)(2)(A)) is amended in the first sentence by striking '', and the President'' and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting the following: ''. Such extended lines are deemed to be as indicated on the maps for each Outer Continental Shelf region entitled 'Alaska OCS Region State Adjacent Zone and OCS Planning Areas', 'Pacific OCS Region State Adjacent Zones and OCS Planning Areas', 'Gulf of Mexico OCS Region State Adjacent Zones and OCS Planning Areas', and 'Atlantic OCS Region State Adjacent Zones and OCS Planning Areas', all of which are dated September 2005 and on file in the Office of the Director, Minerals Management Service. The preceding sentence shall not apply with respect to the treatment under section 105 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (title I of division C of Public Law 109–432) of qualified outer Continental Shelf revenues deposited and disbursed under subsection (a)(2) of that section.''.

SEC. 25. NATURAL GAS LEASING.

Section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337) is further amended by adding at the end the following subsection:

''(r) NATURAL GAS LEASING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may issue leases under this section that authorize development and production of natural gas and associated condensate in accordance with regulations promulgated under paragraph (2).

''(2) REGULATIONS.—Before issuing any lease under paragraph (1), the Secretary must promulgate regulations that—

''(A) define what constitutes natural gas, condensate, and oil;

''(B) establish the lessee's rights and obligations regarding condensate produced in association with natural gas;

''(C) prescribe procedures and requirements that the lessee of a lease issued under this subsection must follow if the lessee discovers oil deposits in the course of exploration or development; and

''(D) establish such other requirements for natural gas leases as the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(3) APPLICATION OF OTHER LAWS.—All provisions of this Act or any other Federal law or regulations that apply to oil and natural gas leases for the Outer Continental Shelf shall apply to natural gas-only leases authorized under this subsection.

''(4) EXISTING LEASES.—At the request of the lessee of an oil and gas lease in effect under this section on the date of enactment of this subsection, and under the requirements prescribed in regulations promulgated under paragraph (2), the Secretary may restrict development under such a lease to natural gas and associated condensate.

''(5) OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAMS.—The Secretary may include provisions regarding issuance of natural gas leases in the outer Continental shelf leasing program that applies for the 5-year period beginning in 2007, notwithstanding any draft proposal for such program issued before the date of the enactment of this subsection.

''(6) PROHIBITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS FOR OIL NOT AFFECTED.—This subsection does not affect—

''(A) any prohibition on the expenditure of appropriated funds to conduct oil leasing or preleasing activities; and

''(B) any withdrawal of Federal submerged lands from leasing for exploration for, and development and production of, oil.''.

SEC. 26. POLICIES REGARDING BUYING AND BUILDING AMERICAN.

(a) INTENT OF CONGRESS.—It is the intent of the Congress that this title, among other things, result in a healthy and growing American industrial, manufacturing, transportation, and service sector employing the vast talents of America's workforce to assist in the development of affordable energy from the Outer Continental Shelf. Moreover, the Congress intends to monitor the deployment of personnel and material in the Outer Continental Shelf to encourage the development of American technology and manufacturing to enable United States workers to benefit from this title by good jobs and careers, as well as the establishment of important industrial facilities to support expanded access to American resources.

(b) SAFEGUARD FOR EXTRAORDINARY ABILITY.—Section 30(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1356(a)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''regulations which'' and inserting ''regulations that shall be supplemental and complimentary with and under no circumstances a substitution for the provisions of the Constitution and laws of the United States extended to the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf pursuant to section 24 of this Act, except insofar as such laws would otherwise apply to individuals who have extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, or business, which has been demonstrated by sustained national or international acclaim, and that''.

H.R. 2537

OFFERED BY: MR. KIRK

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Redesignate sections 9 and 10 of the bill as sections 10 and 11, respectively.

After section 8 of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 9. TREATMENT OF MERCURY AS PATHOGEN INDICATOR.

Section 406 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1346) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) TREATMENT OF MERCURY AS PATHOGEN INDICATOR.—For purposes of monitoring and notification programs under this section, mercury shall be treated as a pathogen indicator.''.

H.R. 2537

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 3, after line 8, insert the following:

(c) PROHIBITION ON EARMARKS.—None of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 406(i) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1346(i)) may be used for a Congressional earmark as defined in clause 9(d) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

H.R. 2537

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 9: Page 3, line 7, strike ''$40,000,000'' and insert ''$30,000,000''.

H.R. 2537

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 10: Page 10, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 11. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the Sense of Congress that—

(1) the program development and implementation grants program remain a formula-based grant program, and

(2) none of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 406(i) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1346(i)) should be used for a Congressional earmark as defined in clause 9(d) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

H.R. 2537

OFFERED BY: MS. RICHARDSON

AMENDMENT NO. 11: At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 11. NATIONAL LIST OF BEACHES.

Section 406(g)(3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1346(g)(3)) is amended by striking ''The Administrator'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''Within 12 months after the date of the enactment of the Beach Protection Act of 2008, and biennially thereafter, the Administrator shall update the list described in paragraph (1).''

H.R. 2537

OFFERED BY: MR. INSLEE

AMENDMENT NO. 12: At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 11. IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON POLLUTION OF COASTAL RECREATION WATERS.

(a) STUDY.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall conduct a study on the long-term impact of climate change on pollution of coastal recreation waters.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) INFORMATION ON POTENTIAL CONTAMINANT IMPACTS.—The report shall include information on potential contaminant impacts on ground and surface water resources as well as ecosystem and public health in coastal communities.

(3) MONITORING.—The report shall address monitoring required to document and assess changing conditions of coastal water resources, recreational waters, and ecosystems and review the current ability to assess and forecast impacts associated with long-term change.

(4) FEDERAL ACTIONS.—The report shall highlight necessary Federal actions to help advance the availability of information and tools to assess and mitigate these effects in order to protect public and ecosystem health.

(5) CONSULTATION.—In developing the report, the Administrator shall work in consultation with agencies active in the development of the National Water Quality Monitoring Network and the implementation of the Ocean Research Priorities Plan and Implementation Strategy.

H.R. 2537

OFFERED BY: MR. BILBRAY

AMENDMENT NO. 13: At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 11. USE OF MOLECULAR DIAGNOSTICS FOR MONITORING AND ASSESSING COASTAL RECREATION WATERS.

(a) STUDY.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall conduct a study to assess the benefits of using molecular diagnostics for monitoring and assessing the quality of coastal recreation waters

adjacent to beaches and similar points of access that are used by the public.

(b) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study, the Administrator shall—

(1) to the extent practicable, evaluate the full range of available rapid testing methods, as defined by section 502 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1362), and methods that meet prescribed performance standards, including—

(A) the amplified nucleic acid assay method; and

(B) the indicator organisms enterococci and E. coli; and

(2) compare the use of molecular diagnostics to culture testing of same source water, including the time for obtaining results, accuracy of results, and future applicability.

(c) PARTNERSHIPS.—Notwithstanding chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code, the Administrator may award a grant or cooperative agreement to a public or private organization to assist the Administrator in carrying out the study.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the study.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *110th* CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 2008 *No. 56*

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, a Senator from the State of Maryland.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Almighty God, most holy, in whom we live and dwell and have our being, we praise You and lift our hearts in gratitude. Hear our intercession for the Members of this body.

Lead our lawmakers as You led Your people once by a pillar of cloud through the day and a pillar of fire by night. Give our Senators more love and more self-denial. Make them kindly in thought, gentle in words, and generous in deeds. Teach them that it is better to give than to receive; better to forget themselves than to put themselves forward; better to serve than to be served. Give them the ability to discern the difference between the truth and the false as they test the issues through debates and hold fast to that which is good. Keep them close to You and open to each other as they serve You and country today. And unto You, the God of love, be all the glory and praise both now and for evermore. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN 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 legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, April 9, 2008.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, a Senator from the State of Maryland, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CARDIN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, if he chooses to make remarks, the Senate will proceed to a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators allowed to speak during that period of time for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders. The Republicans will control the first half; the majority will control the final half. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 3221, the legislative vehicle for housing.

Yesterday, cloture was invoked on the substitute amendment. If all postcloture debate time is used, debate will expire about 8:45 p.m. tonight. I will be discussing with the Republican leader how we can come to a final determination as to how we should handle the wrapup. The two managers have, I understand, about three or four germane amendments that need to be voted on, and they can be voted on now or we can wait until the time runs out. Those amendments, germane amendments that are pending, require votes. For those that have been filed and are not pending, that is not the case, unless the two managers agree that they want to bring those up. So we will work our way through this legislation as quickly as we can.

IRAQ WAR TESTIMONY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday's testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee afforded General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker the opportunity to address the two central questions of the war in Iraq. No. 1: Has the troop surge brought us closer to the day when our troops can come home? Second, is the war in Iraq making America safer? By all accounts, the answer to both questions is no.

While General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker both deserve our gratitude for their hard work—and this is hard work under extraordinarily difficult circumstances—their testimony gave our country no reason to believe the strategy will change. President Bush himself described the purpose of the surge as giving the Iraqi Government and its people the space to achieve reconciliation. Recent violence and the intensifying struggle between al-Maliki and al-Sadr proved beyond any doubt the window we provided may be closing.

President Bush clings to his talking points that the surge is working, but he called his plan a return on success, meaning that if the surge worked, our troops could return home. If we have the success he claims, where is the return?

Since Monday, we have had 12 American soldiers killed in Iraq. We are stuck in the ''Twilight Zone'' in Iraq. When violence is up, the President says we can't bring our troops home. When violence is down, the President says we can't bring our troops home.

So it is long past time for the President to be honest with the American people: Under what circumstances

Printed on recycled paper.

could our troops come home? Under what scenario could this war end? Based on everything we have heard, we can reach only one conclusion with 160,000 courageous American troops serving in Iraq. President Bush has an exit strategy for one person—and that is himself—on January 20 of next year.

Here is what three Senators had to say during yesterday's hearings. One Senator said:

I think Osama bin Laden is sitting back right now looking at this thing and saying, in effect, ''We're kinda bankrupting this country.''

Another Senator said:

I think people want a sense of what the end is going to look like.

A third Senator said:

Our patience is not unlimited.

All three of these questions were from Republican Senators yesterday.

To my Republican friends I say: Let's work together. We had the opportunity to change course in Iraq last summer, but Republicans who were willing to criticize the war proved unwilling to break with President Bush by voting against it. But it is not too late. Neither side is looking for a hasty withdrawal that would put our troops or the Iraqi people at undue risk. We want a smarter, more sustainable strategy that addresses all the national security challenges our Nation faces—from Osama bin Laden's al-Qaida safe haven in Pakistan, to winning the peace in Afghanistan, to rebuilding full combat readiness of our ground forces.

If we work together, Democrats and Republicans, we can set a new course that takes us responsibly out of Iraq and would focus on the global challenges that have gone overlooked for far too long.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

CONGRATULATING GENERAL PETRAEUS AND AMBASSADOR CROCKER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let me say briefly, I wish to offer my congratulations, along with those of others, to both General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker for their astonishingly good work over the last 9 to 12 months. In virtually every measurable way that you can look at Iraq, conditions have dramatically improved. That is a direct result of the smart military strategy that has put Iraq in a position where it can realistically aspire to be a relatively normal country by the standards of the Middle East and certainly an ally on the war on terror, which is extremely important.

I also think it is important for all of us to remember we have not been attacked here at home for almost 7 years—a direct result of the strategy of getting on the offense and pushing back against those who would attack us here at home, which we have done both in Afghanistan and in Iraq.

So it was an opportunity, with the appearance of the general and the ambassador, to congratulate them for their outstanding work over the last year. We look forward to going forward in Iraq in a way that leaves behind a stable country that can make a positive contribution to the security of the United States here at home and in the Middle East.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, 71 percent of the American people believe that invasion of Iraq was a mistake, a foreign policy blunder, some say the worst this country has ever done, the worst foreign policy blunder—71 percent. During that poll, there were a few percentage points where people had no opinion. So about 15 percent of the people think the invasion of Iraq was the right decision. We must get our troops home. The sooner we do that, the better off we are.

I look forward to General Petraeus's and Ambassador Crocker's hearing today before the two relevant committees in the House. When this is all over and done with, we will be able to assess when we can have a better opportunity of bringing our troops home. As we indicated earlier today, it seems difficult—when the violence is up, we need more troops and when it is down we need more troops. We can't have it both ways.

The military is at a breaking point. I am not saying that; I am repeating what others have said. General Cody, who is a four-star general on Active Duty, has said he has never seen our military in such a state of disrepair as it is now. So things aren't glowingly good. We have to work together to try to rebuild our military, and one way we can do that is focus on getting the right number of troops to Afghanistan and rebuilding our military, which is, as General Cody said, in very bad shape.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the troops are coming home in an orderly way. Precipitous withdrawal we know would lead to a new haven for terrorists with the opportunity to attack us here at home. I think, clearly, we will debate this issue in the fall. The American people have this on their minds, obviously. They also have on their minds the economy, health care, and other matters. They are interested in their future. I think the American people are not interested in having additional attacks on the homeland in the future. That is something we will debate not only in the Senate but out on the campaign trail this fall.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, one of the things that will be debated this fall is whether our troops need to be in Iraq for another 50 or 100 years. I think that will be a pivotal part of the debate that takes place in the Presidential elections.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, of course, no one has said that, and my dear friend, the majority leader, knows it. That is a swipe at Senator MCCAIN, who was talking about troop deployments overseas, not the continued engagement in warfare. The mainstream media—which has not been particularly friendly to the war—has hammered those who have accused Senator MCCAIN of saying we were going to have a 100-year war in Iraq.

This is a deliberate misrepresentation of what he has said. Anybody who looks at the entire exchange, which occurred in a town meeting in New Hampshire back in January, knows precisely what he was saying. He was talking about having troops deployed overseas, which we have had in Germany and Japan and South Korea for many years. He was talking about a situation under which they are not under attack, not being killed or wounded but deployed overseas, not only to protect our security interests but also to reassure our allies. That is what Senator MCCAIN was talking about. No one I know is suggesting—and it is almost laughable to suggest—that we are talking about that kind of lengthy military engagement.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if one of the Democratic hopefuls had said it, I would also be trying to spin it in a way that looked good. The fact is, you can't spin what Senator MCCAIN said at that town hall meeting in a favorable light. His record speaks for itself as to how he feels about the war in Iraq.

My friend always talks about the fact the American people don't want attacks here. Of course, they don't want attacks here at home. Of course, they don't. Everyone should understand, though, that prior to the invasion of Iraq, there was not a terrorist in Iraq, and now, of course, there are lots of them. We need to focus on Osama bin Laden, on his safe haven he has in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and as General Casey—also an active member of the military—said, we need to get more troops into Afghanistan. We can't do that when we have 140,000 troops this July in Iraq.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, one other thing. One thing we do agree on—in trying to end this exchange with something we do agree on—I think both the Democrats and Republicans agree the size of the Marines and Army is insufficient. I think there is bipartisan support in the Congress to increase the size of both the Army and the Marines. I think that is something we can agree on. Hopefully, that will be achieved in the coming years.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the

Senate will proceed to a period of morning business for 60 minutes, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

56TH ANNUAL NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, in light of the fact that a few minutes ago we opened the Senate in prayer, I want to say that last month I had the privilege of cochairing with the Senator from Colorado, Senator SALAZAR, the 56th Annual National Prayer Breakfast, held here in our Nation's Capital. This annual gathering is hosted by Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, who have weekly prayer breakfast groups. Once again, we were honored to have the 56th consecutive participation of our President and the First Lady. Presidents since Dwight Eisenhower have spoken at the annual prayer breakfast. We were encouraged and inspired by the remarks shared by Ward Brehm. Unfortunately, a transcript doesn't give the superb pauses and delivery that we who attended got to enjoy, but it is a superb message I want to share.

This year, we hosted a gathering of over 3,500 individuals from all walks of life in all 50 States and from many countries around the world. So that all may benefit from this time together, on behalf of the Congressional Committee for the National Prayer Breakfast, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the transcript of the 2008 proceedings be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my speech.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, this is an example of what we do in our weekly prayer breakfast, with little exception, and the presenters at our weekly prayer breakfast are always Senators or former Senators. It is a chance for us to get to know each person in this body as they present.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

56TH NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST,

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2008,

HILTON WASHINGTON HOTEL,

WASHINGTON, DC

Co-Chairs: U.S. Senator Mike Enzi and U.S. Senator Ken Salazar

U.S. Senator Mike Enzi: I would bet that some of you are wondering, ''How did I get here?'' and ''What kind of an outfit is this?'' We will try to explain a little bit. Ken and I are part of a very small breakfast group made up entirely of Senators that has met every Wednesday that the Senate has been in session since the middle part of the Truman administration. That was in the late 1940's. We share with each other, we eat, we pray and we discuss things that really matter.

I am reminded of a time I was in South Africa meeting with their parliament for a breakfast and I suggested that our Senate prayer breakfast could pray for their issues. A parliamentarian named Paul brought me up short and said, ''Don't pray for the issues, pray for the people and the people will solve the issues.'' And that is what we do at our weekly prayer breakfast. That is what we will be doing here.

Now once a year we hold our weekly meeting in a slightly bigger room and we invite 4,000 people from around the world to come along for the ride. Welcome to our prayer breakfast. (Applause)

U.S. Senator Ken Salazar: We count it a privilege to serve in the United States Senate but frankly it is not always an easy job. President Truman once said that if you want to have a friend in Washington, buy a dog. We see that all the time. Our breakfast in the U.S. Senate is an attempt to put back into all of us what the job takes out from all of us and gives us a reason to have trusting relationships, to find wisdom and to reconcile our differences.

For me, I don't need to buy a dog in Washington, D.C. because I have a friend named Mike Enzi. (Laughter) Mike Enzi brings his common sense, compassion and approach to the issues that face our nation and it makes him a key leader in the United States Senate. That helps us get to results by putting the public purpose above the politics which sometimes so confines this town.

Washington, in my view, does not need a lot more speeches. It needs people who need to seek and listen and to understand. More people like Mike and his wife Diana, who is here with us this morning. It has been my honor and pleasure to serve with Mike Enzi for the last three years in the U.S. Senate.

Senator Enzi: I have enjoyed getting to know Ken and the deep wealth of heritage and caring that he brings to the Senate. His family has lived in Colorado for 150 years—longer than there has been a Colorado. Our connection began personally and now we are able to talk about things that Republicans and Democrats do not talk about together. And what do you know? We have figured some things out. We are a couple of guys from the high plains, Colorado and Wyoming, who are trying to keep things on a higher plane in our jobs. We have been working on this breakfast for many months now and we hope you enjoy it. A lot of prayer has gone into it and we hope it somehow scratches where you itch.

One special note, folks, Dr. Billy Graham attended the Breakfast and was the main speaker for the first few years. He sent a special word to us last night that he would be with us in spirit this morning and is praying for us at this very moment from his home in North Carolina. Thank you for your prayers and a lifetime of spiritual leadership, Billy. (Applause)

Senator Salazar: 155 nations are represented here this morning in Washington, D.C. I now want to introduce to all of you the distinguished heads of state who have joined us from other lands today: The Chairman of the Council of the Ministers of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Prime Minister Nicola Spiric; The President of the Republic of Burundi, Pierre Nkurunziza; The President of the Republic of El Salvador, Elias Antonio Saca Gonzalez, and the First Lady; The President of the Republic of Honduras, Jose Manuel Zelaya Rosales; The President of the Federated States of Micronesia, Immanuel Mori; and The Prime Minister of the Independent State of Samoa, Prime Minister Tuila'epa Lupesoliai Sailele Malielegaoi. (Applause)

You are all most welcome. Thank you for giving that warm welcome to our guests here to the United States of America. We live with human borders but we are one family across the face of the earth. Thank you for the honor of your presence and the chance to get to know you as friends and fellow travelers in search of truth and a better world.

Senator Enzi: When one of our members heard that our singer was Michael W. Smith he said, ''Well that's worth getting out of bed early for.'' Michael is here with his wife, Debbie, this morning. He has been recording faithful music for more than two decades and won countless awards but he does not want the focus to be on him. He has always encouraged his fans, young and old, that faith is not a spectator sport. He has encouraged tens of thousands to sponsor children all over the world. We are happy to have two selections from him this morning. The first is ''Above All.''

Mr. Michael W. Smith: (sings) [''Above all powers above all kings''] (Applause)

Senator Enzi: Oh, how faith shines. Thank you, Michael. Everybody in life needs role models, including Senators. Senator Dianne Feinstein is that for many of the new members of the Senate. She personifies dignity and excellence in doing the people's work. She did that as the Mayor of San Francisco and she is certainly doing that in the Senate. To present a reading, our friend and colleague, Senator Dianne Feinstein of California.

U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein: Thank you very much Senator Enzi. Mr. President, Mrs. Bush, ladies and gentlemen.

Religion is a very personal thing to me. I have been privileged to draw on two of the world's great religions—one being Judaism, and the other, Catholicism. I went to a Catholic convent while I was going to a Jewish Sunday school. Some people would say that left me very confused. But nonetheless it was a very special experience. A very young rabbi wrote what I am going to read. It is now part of Reformed Judaism's prayer book and is used in the High Holy Day services. I would like to share it with you.

''Birth is a beginning, and death a destination and life is a journey: From childhood to maturity, and youth to age. From innocence to awareness, and ignorance to knowing. From foolishness to discretion and then perhaps to wisdom. From weakness to strength or strength to weakness and often back again. From health to sickness and back we pray to health again. From offense to forgiveness. From loneliness to love. From joy to gratitude. From pain to compassion and grief to understanding. From fear to faith. From defeat to defeat, to defeat until looking backward or ahead we see that victory lies not at some high place along the way but in having made the journey stage by stage a sacred pilgrimage. Birth is a beginning and death a destination and life is a journey, a sacred pilgrimage to life everlasting.''

Thank you. (Applause)

U.S. Representative Bart Stupak: I am Bart Stupak, co-chair of the House Prayer Breakfast. In my sixteen years in the house this is the second time that I have had the honor to address you from the dais. Some things never change—the National Prayer Breakfast remains heavy on prayer and light on breakfast. (Laughter) As we join in fellowship, filled with the Holy Spirit, I ask that you remember two House members who were devoted to the Prayer Breakfast and who are no longer with us, Congresswoman Jo Ann Davis and Congresswoman Julia Carson. We miss them. Now let me turn the podium over to my co-chair, friend and colleague, Gresham Barrett of South Carolina.

U.S. Representative J. Gresham Barrett: Good morning. Two things—number one, we

will not take up a love offering today and number two, we are here to feed your soul. If you want to feed the body with ham and grits and eggs we are going to the Waffle House after this, OK? I do concur with Bart on that. It is an honor to be here. Bart told me that being from South Carolina I tend to speak a little bit slowly, but if I speak any slower it will take all day so I will speed up just a little bit.

I want to tell you a little bit about what we do in the House during our Prayer Breakfast. It is a bi-partisan meeting. We meet every Thursday at 8 o'clock. We talk amongst ourselves with fellowship, with food, with laughter. We pray for one another, we pray for folks that we don't know. It is open to members and former members, sometimes we have foreign dignitaries. But the biggest thing of all is to be an encouragement to each other. That is a little bit about how we do it. The question is ''Why do we do it?'' And I can sum it up the best in Paul's letter to the Corinthians. I Corinthians 13:13: ''And now abideth faith, hope and love, these three, but the greatest is love.'' We meet together because we love each other, we love our families, we love what we do, we love this nation and I believe that the one thing we can do that is stronger than anything is to love. If you don't take anything away from this Prayer Breakfast this morning, remember this: someone in this room loves you. And more important than that, someone up above has given us the greatest gift of love. Thank you for being here this morning and have a blessed day.

Senator Salazar: Thank you, Congressman Stupak and Congressman Barrett. Part of what we try and celebrate here as well is our nation's government and to pray for our nation's government. Certainly the judiciary is very much a part of our government and our democracy. This morning I am honored to introduce my great friend and one of the most distinguished jurists in the United States of America, the Honorable Judge Carlos Lucero of the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals. Judge Lucero practiced law in my native, beautiful San Luis Valley in Colorado and like my family Judge Lucero's family helped found the city of Santa Fe, New Mexico, the city of Holy Faith, back in 1598. For the last 12 years he has served with distinction on the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals. To lead us in prayer for our national leaders help me welcome Judge Carlos Lucero.

The Honorable Carlos E. Lucero: Good morning, Mr. President and Mrs. Bush. As Ken says, our families go way back and these early pioneers were sustained in their travels to what was to them the new world by this deep abiding faith and great sense of belief and commitment. Some of my earliest memories of my grandfather were before there was electrification—his sitting next to a window reading the Bible and caring deeply about his prayer. My parents hauling us children, as I am sure Ken's parents did as well, to go to these early old adobe churches of southern Colorado and northern New Mexico for their Te Deums. And it is really the parents of the United States, the great families who inculcate their children with a belief in God and with a belief in values and in prayer that are the genuine heroes of the United States. Back in the earliest of days the faith of these pioneers carried them. There was an early territorial governor of New Mexico who is said to have prayed at one time, ''pobre Nuevo Mexico, poor little New Mexico'' he said, ''so far from heaven, so close to Texas.'' (Laughter)

As public officials all of us take the oath of office to support and defend the constitution of the United States. The American history flows back to those images of the President raising his arm and stating his oath. The rest of us too are required, constitutionally, to take our oath of office or affirmation, the constitution allows both, to support the constitution of the United States. My prayer today relates to seeking God's help in asking that the leaders of our country faithfully discharge our obligations and that we might have the providence of God, the Creator, in aiding us to do so.

Dear God, as each of us may worship you in the many creeds represented here today, my prayer is that you bless our country, our government, the President of the United States and his family, the members of the United States Senate, the United States House of Representatives, the Justices of the United States Supreme Court and the members of the federal judiciary and all of our families. I ask the blessings of God on the governors of the states, the state legislatures and judges, the mayors of our cities, the members of our city councils throughout the United States and all those who serve in public service, most especially on the officers and the men and women of the United States military who serve our beloved country and our beloved constitution so faithfully.

May the Almighty grant us the wisdom and sound judgment to discharge our constitutional oath with the clearest of conscience and that our every action on behalf of the people of the United States be true and loyal and faithful to you and to this document. I pray that the citizens of our country may be blessed with your Spirit and citizens of all races and creeds may forge a common bond in true harmony, to banish hatred and replace it with love, to banish bigotry and replace it with understanding and to safeguard the ideals of free institutions that are the pride and glory of our country and of this world. I pray that this land under your providence may be an influence for good throughout the world, uniting all people in peace and in freedom. I have a very brief reading from the Old Testament today that I would like to conclude my prayer with. One word of explanation in speaking to friends of many denominations in preparing for today's prayer—I learned that in the earliest days of the history of the Old Testament when the tribes went forth, there were no kings or leaders as such but the judges governed, so a rabbi tells me. Don't think that I am getting any ideas. I know those of us in the judiciary know what is buzzed about us but you have to have that understanding to have a deeper understanding of what the Old Testament means as it speaks of judgment because of the special ethics and requirements that were imposed on these earliest leaders. From the book of Deuteronomy chapter 1 verses 15–17:

''So I took the leading men of your tribes, wise and respected men, and appointed them to have authority over you—as commanders of thousands, of hundreds, of fifties and of tens and as tribal officials. And I charged your judges at that time: Hear the disputes between your brothers and judge fairly, whether the case is between brother Israelites or between one of them and an alien. Do not show partiality in judging; hear both small and great alike. Do not be afraid of any man, for judgment belongs to God.''

And from chapter 6 verse 8 of the book of Micah:

''He has showed you, O man, what is good; and what does the Lord require of you but to act justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with your God.'' Amen.

Senator Enzi: Historically, we have been honored to have a member of the United States military be a part of our leadership of this breakfast and today we go all the way to the top of the chain of command—Admiral Michael Mullen is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He is joined this morning by his wife, Deborah. He was born in Los Angeles, graduated from the Naval Academy and has served our nation all over the world. To present our second reading from the Holy Scriptures, Admiral Michael Mullen.

Admiral Michael Mullen: Mr. President and Mrs. Bush, good morning everyone. It is great to see all of you and join you in worship this morning. I testified before Congress yesterday so believe me I know the value of prayer. (Laughter) The verse I would like to read is from the book of Philippians. It is short, powerful, poetic and concise. It reminds me daily in this time of war and great uncertainty of the things of which we must always remain certain. It speaks to me of the nobility of service to one another, to the nation and to a cause greater than one's self and it calls to mind the sacrifices of those who serve and of the families and loved ones who wait and worry and support those men and women in uniform who serve this noble cause. Philippians 4: 8,9 ''. . . whatever things are true, whatever things are noble, whatever things are just, whatever things are pure, whatever things are lovely, whatever things are of good report, if there is any virtue and if there is anything praiseworthy, think on these things. Those things, which you have learned, and received, and heard and seen in me, do; and the God of peace shall be with you.'' Thank you.

Senator Salazar: I am delighted to introduce my good friend from Minnesota, Senator Amy Klobuchar. Her husband, John Bessler is with her this morning. In her short time as a member of the United States Senate she has become one of the stars of our Senate. With the values of the Iron Range and the sharp mind and tongue of a prosecutor she is the champion of the people of Minnesota. To lead us in prayer for world leaders, Senator Amy Klobuchar.

U.S. Senator Amy Klobuchar: Thank you, Senator Salazar, President Bush, Mrs. Bush, members of Congress, friends. It is an honor to be here today to share a prayer for our world leaders. Like so many who are gathered here today, my faith came from those before me. Their worlds did not stretch the globe like the leaders for whom we will pray today instead they lived in much simpler, humbler circumstances but they still had the courage to believe. My grandpa worked 1,500 feet underground in the mines in Ely, Minnesota and never graduated from high school but he saved money in a coffee can in the basement to send my dad to college. Up in Iron Range there is a rollicking collision of ethnic cultures from the Slovenians to the Serbs to the Croatians and to the Finns. My grandma and grandpa were Catholic and you could worship up on the range at polka masses held by an entrepreneurial polka priest, named Father Frank Perkovich. He did so well that he has been last heard of as a priest on a Caribbean cruise line. Prayer is needed everywhere. But my faith also comes from my mom who never learned to drive until I was in high school but who was bound and determined to get our family to church. Once a week she would load us into a cab, which was quite a sight in a middle class Minnesota suburb on a Sunday morning, and it was my job to say at the end of the drive to the driver, ''add 50 cents please.'' I would be so nervous that I would forget to say this and deny the driver his tip that the entire way to church I would say in my head, ''add 50 cents, please, add 50 cents, please.'' Today I can never go to church without thinking, 'add 50 cents please'. That I got from my mom. And, finally, my faith comes from my dad who became a popular newspaper columnist and an avid adventurer. He climbed mountains the world over but his faith was

tested time and time again through his own battle with alcoholism. I watched him climb the highest peaks, but at times slip in the lowest valleys. He finally overcame it when in his own words, he was pursued by grace.

We bow our heads today, God, to pray that our world leaders may also be pursued by grace. God, in the Himalayas of Nepal there is a simple greeting that today we share as a simple blessing for our world leaders. When the Nepalese see a friend they bow their heads and clasp their hands and say, Namaste, which in its most spiritual translation means, ''I praise the God that lives within you.'' God, in this time of year when an English poet once described it as the bleak mid-winter, we are experiencing world events that too often match that somber description. We pray that when our world leaders are confronted by religion used to divide us, they will find the God that lives within them to guide them to common ground in peace. God, we pray that our leaders find the God that lives within them to work together across borders to cure disease, confront hunger and poverty and offer hope to the children of the world. God, as the icebergs melt and the seas flood we ask that our world leaders listen to you and answer your call to care for your creation, to treasure the changing of the seasons and to remember the philosophy of the Ojibwe Indians that great leaders' decisions are not always made for today but for children seven generations from now. And, God, we know that leadership is sometimes a lonely place, wisdom is often illusive and making the right choice can be hard but we pray that when burdened with difficult decisions our leaders will heed the God that lives within them and find the best that is in our humanity, draw from the best of our history and instincts and enlist the energy of our young. To all our world leaders we praise the God that lives within you. Namaste. Amen.

Senator Enzi: I am proud now to introduce our speaker, Ward Brehm. I knew him before I ever met him. I was involved in the United States AIDS bill and was headed to Africa to see what could be done. I was given a copy of a book called ''White Man Walking,'' written by Ward, telling of his effort to get to know the people of a continent face to face, step by step. As I read about how the Lord used Africa to change his life it changed mine. Ward serves as the chair of the board of the United States Africa Development Fund, a small agency with a very big job—that of making micro investments across Africa that build people up through emerging private enterprise. Ward's wife, Chris, is here with us at the head table as well. After I read his book I got to work with his confirmation in the Senate. I then got to work with him to increase the agency's budget. He encouraged and was successful in getting countries to match the monies. He found customers for products made in Africa without going through middlemen. He has traveled to Africa more than 30 times. Each time he has a prayer and a scripture for each day of his journey and several of us join him in prayer from the United States as he makes a difference in Africa. Did you ever wonder what would happen if you allowed the Lord to really get a hold of your life and use you for His purposes? Here is a pretty good example of what happens when a great God gets a chance to use a regular person like you and me. Ladies and gentlemen, my friend, Ward Brehm.

Mr. Ward Brehm: Thank you, Senator Enzi. I am deeply humbled by your introduction and proud to be able to call you my friend.

Most of you were probably surprised when you picked up your program and saw a speaker you have never heard of before. I want to tell you, you are not alone. One month ago, I sent in my registration to this breakfast and I was just hoping for a good seat. (Laughter)

My thanks also to the members of the Senate group for this opportunity. A good friend emailed me last night and said that if God was going to speak through me, I did not need to be nervous . . . God is the one who should be nervous! (Laughter)

My wife read to me from Scriptures last night that Jesus said when two or more gather in His name, He will be there. That is good enough for me!

My work has given me the high privilege of serving you, Mr. President, the American people, and above all, the poor in Africa.

The best way to help the poor is to help them not be poor anymore. The only way I know how to do that is through job creation, and the very best form of sustainable development is a steady paycheck.

It has been said that if you give a man a fish, you feed him for a day; teach a man to fish, and you feed him for a lifetime. But that is not the full story. If you want to eat for a lifetime, you need to own the pond.

So a bit of background . . . Despite that eloquent introduction, I am a recovering Type-A controlling businessman. I have been described even by people who like me as someone who is often wrong but seldom in doubt. I was a bit of a problem child growing up. In fact, my pastor since childhood, Arthur Rouner, recently referred to me as a ministerial long shot!

They say that if God wants to get your attention he will toss a little pebble into your life. If that doesn't work, He will throw a rock. As a last resort, He will heave a brick!

Africa was my brick. In 1994, Africa was not on my personal radar screen. In fact, the only significant thing on that radar screen was ME!

In the Los Angeles airport I bought a copy of Stephen Covey's book, The Seven Habits for Highly Effective People. I didn't buy it to learn anything, but just wanted to make sure that he got them all right. (Laughter)

I was intrigued by Covey's notion of paradigms: identical sets of facts can mean something totally different because of your world view.

Somalia was in the news at the time, and countless numbers of Africans were dying from starvation. I felt no real connection to this humanitarian crisis. My radar screen was full.

Paradigms usually change because of shock or trauma, but I wondered if it might be possible for someone to change their paradigm on purpose. I supposed that if I were to see people starving, it would change that paradigm and perhaps much more. The thought left me as quickly as it came.

But God sent me a reminder . . . One week later, I made one of my occasional stops at church . . . and my pastor, out of the blue, took me aside and said, ''Ward, I'm going to Africa in two months, and I would like you to go with me.''

I told him I couldn't believe the coincidence of his invitation given my recent reflections on Somalia. Then I said . . . ''No!'' (Laughter)

He looked at me in a strange way, and he said, ''Would you at least pray about it?'' I looked at him and said, ''You're the pastor; YOU pray about it. I will THINK about it but suspect my answer will be.'' (Laughter)

He must have prayed hard . . . because two months later, I found myself in the Minneapolis airport with a ticket to Ethiopia in my hand. I was surrounded by (for the lack of a better word) church ladies. (Laughter) And they were hugging me . . . (Laughter) Then someone suggested that we pray before we departed, so I found myself outside Gate 8A, holding hands with a group of strangers. And as I stand here before the National Prayer Breakfast, I can honestly say I uttered my first heartfelt and sincere prayer . . . ''Lord, don't let any of my clients see me!'' (Laughter)

And then we flew twelve thousand miles to Africa, and a million miles from my comfort zone. I had the high privilege of having my heart broken. I saw poverty on an obscene level. Children with flies on their eyes and for the lack of a 50 cent medicine doomed to blindness, the emaciated faces of famine, families shattered by civil war. In Masaka, Uganda I held the hand of a 22-year-old mother as she died of AIDS and then turned to look directly into the faces of four brand new orphans.

I was an eyewitness. It put a face on the statistics. I always believed that those statistics were true, but now they become real. It got personal. . . .

More recently, I took a long walk with a warrior turned pastor friend, Lodinyo, deep into an unknown wilderness along the northern Rift Valley that divides northwest Kenya with Uganda. He took me to where they had never seen a person with white skin. When they first spotted me, they thought I was a ghost . . . a dead man walking. For a while, I thought they would be right.

I fasted for five days on this walk to experience real hunger, but had brought along protein bars in case of (as Lodinyo put it) an ''emergency''. At the end of this walk, I collapsed in a borrowed sleeping hut. When I awoke 13 hours later, I saw a little boy peeking through the door. While he was initially terrified, curiosity eventually got the best of him, and I noticed he was concentrating more on my stash of power bars than he was on me. He succeeded in snatching a bar, and immediately ran away. ''Kids are the same everywhere,'' I thought, until I stepped outside the hut, and I found that little boy kneeling over his two-year old sister with a terribly distended stomach, feeding her tiny pieces of protein. . . .

Three months later, I was to learn that she died . . . another paradigm shift.

Now after more than 30 trips to Africa, the question that I have been asked more than any other by my African friends is ''What do you pray for?''

Most of us among the affluent have too many things. Too much food, multiple cars, great health care, retirement, insurance . . .

It is only when things fall apart completely, and we are totally out of control that we feel totally dependent, and thus closest to God. Death, cancer, business failure, addiction, divorce, crises; these are the things that truly drop us to our knees.

All across the world, including America, things are continuously falling apart for the truly poor . . . They are always out of control, constantly living in crises mode, and thus dependent and faithful to God's own commandment that we love Him with all of our hearts. God is often all the poor have.

The leaders that God anoints are their only hope. And despite the often-horrific conditions that they live in, the poor are thankful for their very existence.

Scripture asks, ''Hasn't God chosen those who are poor in the eyes of the world to be rich in faith and to inherit the Kingdom?'' Yes, He has. I have seen it with my own eyes.

The question that I am asked by most of my American friends is, ''Why cross an ocean to help people when you need only cross the street, to help your own?'' It is a great question, and the answer is, of course, that we need to do both.

Solzhenitsyn said that disaster is defined by two things: magnitude and distance. So a small disaster close to home or a huge disaster faraway, results in what he describes

as ''bearable disasters of bearable proportion.'' We have become too good at ''bearing.'' Our hearts should be broken by the things that break the heart of God.

Specifically in Africa, there are many faraway disasters of epic proportions. In 1994, in Rwanda, a country the size of Maryland, the political genocide claimed over 800,000 lives: 9,000 lives per day for 90 days. That is two World Trade Center disasters per day for three months.

Today, in Darfur, Sudan, 1.5 million homeless. Thousands terrorized, raped and killed. AIDS is killing 4,400 people per day in Africa, and even more are dying from curable malaria. Epic disasters of epic proportions, far from home for most of us. We have hundreds today right here in this room from all around the world, our neighbors this morning, who experience these epic disasters close to home.

I do want to say while I have the chance with the President sitting right here. Very few people are aware that due to President Bush's commitment and the resulting partnership with Congress there has been an absolutely historic four-fold increase in American assistance to fight poverty and AIDS in Africa.

In 2003 there were 50,000 Africans on Anti-Viral medication and today there are over 1.5 million. I have not met a SINGLE person who hasn't agreed with this high calling.

Proverbs the book of Wisdom says ''speak up for those who can not speak for themselves and defend the rights of the poor and destitute.'' You have been that voice and on behalf of the ''least of these'' in Africa as well as the collective American conscience, I want to say . . .''Thank you Mr. President.'' (Applause)

Do you remember when Jesus was talking to His disciples, and asked them when He was hungry, why they didn't give Him any food, and when He was naked, why they didn't give Him any clothes? And the disciples said something like, ''Lord, we never did any of those things to You.'' I always thought (like most folks) that Jesus replied ''Whenever you did this to the least of these, you did this unto Me.''

Except that's not what He said. What He said was, ''When ever you did this to one of the least of these, you did this unto Me.''

How often do we forget the word ''one.''

It changes the meaning of what Jesus said completely. In our quest to be helpful, we can rob the poor of their dignity. In order to be of any help to the poor, we need to understand them, we need to know them, and we need to love them. They are not a group. The poor is not a species. They are identical to us in their hopes and dreams. They love their families and long for a better life. The only difference is that they are poor.

And people don't suffer and die in groups. It is one at a time. And each one of those deaths leaves an identical wake of agony to what you and I and our families would experience.

So what are we supposed to do with all this? How does this fit with our world, so different and so far away? Frankly, I am not sure, but we do have some clues. Jesus said, ''The poor will always be with you.'' What an odd thing to say, especially coming from Him!

Jesus also said, ''To whom much has been given, much will be expected.'' So maybe this is a test of sorts. If so . . . how are we doing?

I have heard stories similar to mine of peoples' lives being changed: from orphanages in Russia to inner-city schools in Minneapolis, from the slums of Calcutta to remote medical clinics in the mountains of Afghanistan, from the streets of Washington, D.C., to wretched prisons in East Asia. Indeed, all across the world people are answering Jesus' question, ''Who is my neighbor?'' And these people are finding themselves changed, engaged, and discovering meaning and relevance by being involved in things much bigger than themselves.

I believe that, deep down, most people would love to have God change their lives. Here's the thing: If asked, He will, every time, guaranteed. And while these changes may initially seem scary, they ultimately lay a foundation for a life lived on purpose rather than by default.

I will forever be indebted to Africa. Africa awakened me when I didn't even know I was asleep. I pray that everyone who seeks one will find a similar path.

I pray that each of you will find your own Africa. . . .

A few years ago my friend, Gary Haugen, asked me the most important question of all . . .

For those four orphans I was with in Uganda who watched their mother die of AIDS and were suddenly and completely on their own . . . For a twelve year old girl kidnapped and sold into slavery in rural India . . . For a single mom evicted and homeless on the streets of Washington, D.C. . . . For each one of them: What is God's strategy for letting them know that He's good?

For the mother in Ethiopia who sees her baby die of malnutrition—Why would she think God is good? And what is God's strategy for allowing her to know that He loves her?

The answer is astounding. The answer is . . . US!

Even more astonishing . . . He has no plan B. . . .

God bless you one and all. (Applause)

Senator Salazar: Thank you, Ward Brehm, for that inspirational message. Ladies and gentlemen and guests from around the world, it is my honor to introduce to all of you the President of our United States. We are delighted to see with President Bush his lovely and wonderful wife, Laura. (Applause)

For all of us gathered here today in Washington, D.C. we know that this is a funny town. If you only read the papers you would think the Democrats and Republicans simply never work together. The truth is since I first met the President several years ago we have had a friendship that has helped us work on issues that are important to our nation, including the issues of renewable energy and the issues of immigration reform. It is a friendship that is rooted in our shared love for our nation, our faith and our reverence for family. The President and I have spoken several times about the powerful impact that our fathers have had on our lives. Our dad's stories show how the American experience can send different people down different paths to fulfill truly the American dream. World War II inspired both of our fathers to don the uniform of their country. The American West inspired their love for open spaces and for the ranching traditions of our states. Their love of God inspired them to work long days in service to generations to come. And so here we are today, the President of the United States and a United States Senator from Colorado, bound by our service to our country, by our faith in humanity, and by our hope that we too will be heroes to our daughters as our fathers were to all of us.

Ladies and Gentlemen, the President of the United States of America. (Applause)

The President of the United States: Thank you all. Gracias, mi amigo. Thank you, friend. Laura and I are honored to join you all here for the 56th National Prayer Breakfast. There are a lot of reasons to pray and one of course is to strengthen us against temptation—particularly this morning, the temptation to stay in bed. (Laughter)

Obviously there are a lot of prayerful people here and I appreciate your warm welcome.

We have a lot of distinguished guests here today, members of Congress, military leaders, captains of industry. Yet at this annual gathering we are reminded of an eternal truth, when we lift our hearts to God we are all equal in His sight. We are all equally precious; we are all equally dependant on His grace. It is fitting that we gather each year to approach our Creator in fellowship and to thank Him for the many blessings He has bestowed upon our families and our nation. It is fitting that we gather in prayer because we recognize a prayerful nation is a stronger nation.

I appreciate Senators Salazar and Enzi. Thank you for putting this event on.

Madame Speaker, Leader Hoyer, Leader Blunt, thank you for being here.

I welcome the members of Congress. I appreciate the Heads of State who are here. Welcome to America, again.

I thank the members of the Diplomatic Corps who joined us. I appreciate the distinguished dignitaries, all the members of my cabinet—don't linger, get back to work. (Laughter) Admiral, thank you for your leadership. I am always proud to be with the members of the United States military. I thank the state and local officials. Ward, thanks for your remarks. Those were awesome. I guess that is a presidential word. I am proud to be here with Michael W. and Debbie, long time friends of our family. Thank you for lending your beautiful voice. Judge, I am not going to hold the Texas thing against you. (Laughter)

Every President since Dwight Eisenhower has attended the National Prayer Breakfast—and I am really proud to carry on this tradition. It is an important tradition, and I am confident Presidents who follow me will do the same. The people in this room come from many different walks of faith. Yet we share one clear conviction: We believe that the Almighty hears our prayers—and answers those who seek Him. That is what we believe; otherwise, why come? That through the miracle of prayer, we believe he listens—if we listen to his voice and seek His presence in our lives, our hearts will change. And in so doing, in seeking God, we grow in ways that we could never imagine.

And in prayer we grow in gratitude and thanksgiving. When we spend time with the Almighty we realize how much he has bestowed upon us and our hearts are filled with joy. We give thanks for our families, we give thanks for the parents who raised us, we give thanks for the patient souls who married us and the children who make us proud each day. We give thanks for our liberty and the universal desire for freedom that He has written in every human heart. We give thanks for the God who made us in His image and redeemed us in His love.

In prayer we grow in meekness and humility. By approaching our Maker on bended knee we acknowledge our complete dependence on Him. We recognize that we have nothing to offer God that He does not already have, except our love. So we offer Him that love and ask for the grace to discern His will. We ask Him to remain near to us at all times. We ask Him to help us lead lives that are pleasing to Him. We discover that by surrendering our lives to the Almighty we are strengthened, refreshed and ready for all that may come. In prayer we also grow in boldness and courage.

The more time we spend with God, the more we see that He is not a distant king but a loving Father. Inspired by this confidence we approach Him with bold requests, we ask Him to heal the sick and comfort the dying and sustain those who care for them. We ask

Him to bring solace to the victims of tragedy and help to those suffering from addiction and adversity. We ask Him to strengthen our families and to protect the innocent and vulnerable in our country. We ask Him to protect our nation from those who wish us harm and watch over all who step forward to defend us. We ask Him to bring about the day when His peace shall reign across the world and every tear shall be wiped away.

In prayer we grow in mercy and compassion. We are reminded in prayer that we are all fallen creatures in need of mercy. And in seeking God's mercy we grow in mercy ourselves. Experiencing the presence of God transforms our hearts and the more we seek His presence, the more we feel the tug at our souls to reach out to the poor and the hungry, the elderly and the infirmed.

When we answer God's call to love a neighbor as ourselves we enter into a deeper friendship with our fellow man and a deeper relationship with our Eternal Father.

I believe in the power of prayer because I felt it in my own life. Prayer has strengthened me in times of personal challenge. It has helped me meet the challenges of the presidency. I understand now clearly the story of the calm in the rough seas. And so at this final prayer breakfast as your President, I thank you for your prayers and I thank our people all across America for their prayers and I ask you not to stop in the year ahead. We have so much work to do for our country. And with the help of the Almighty we will build a freer world and a safer, a more hopeful, a more noble, America. God bless. (Applause)

Senator Enzi: Thank you, Mr. President for that prayer for our country. We thank you for your presence here. This is the 56th consecutive time that a President of the United States has been at the National Prayer Breakfast, a tremendous and important tradition. Ladies and gentlemen, we would ask that you please remain at your places as the President and First Lady take their leave of us. And we do thank you for your presence, Mr. President, and the faithful way that you strive to carry the burdens of our nation. I know all of us want to join in saying we will pray for you and for your spouse and for your family that the Lord will give you success in your efforts toward the common needs of all mankind, which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

God bless you, Mr. President and Mrs. Bush. (Applause)

Mr. Smith: (Sings) [''Amazing Grace''] (Applause)

Senator Enzi: Thank you, Michael for the gift of worship as you do it so well through song. We're very grateful for all at our head table, the participants and the loving, thoughtful spirit that they have shared with all of us. I know that when I leave today, I will take with me the prayers, the scriptures, the words of our two speakers and try to remember that the word ''one'' is the important part to the least and that we all have the opportunity to do our part. I hope that God doesn't get too nervous when He is working through us. This has been an outstanding morning. We have shared with you a little bit of what our Wednesday prayer breakfast is like, it is the way we get filled up during the week and I hope this has helped to fill you today.

Senator Salazar: We hope you have all been encouraged. We hope you have been challenged. We hope you take the faith and hope and optimism and challenges that Ward Brehm has presented to us here today that not only in Africa, but in Latin America and all across this world that we work for a more perfect world and I am sure that this prayer breakfast will help us move along the way. Thank you to the 4,000 people who are here, to the millions around the world who are praying for us, to the 155 nations who are represented here knowing at the end of the day we are one human race. Thank you for coming this morning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

PROGRESS IN IRAQ

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes to talk about the testimony given yesterday by General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker regarding our progress and challenges in Iraq. I think it is important for the American people to understand and for our colleagues to understand that the surge of troops in Iraq that began in the early part of last year was a corrective measure, and that from the fall of Baghdad until January 2007, it was clear to me, Senator MCCAIN, and others that our strategy during that period of time was not working; that we had too few troops; that the country got into a lawless state; that political progress and economic progress was virtually nonexistent. There was a paralysis when it came to the ability to govern in Baghdad: The economy was stalled; violence was spreading throughout the country to the point, in 2006, that the al-Qaida flag flew over parts of Anbar Province.

So there was a moment of reckoning. The President had a decision to make after the Republican losses in November of 2006. It was widely held that the reason Republicans lost in the midterm elections was because of Iraq policy. Secretary Rumsfeld resigned and the President had a choice. One of the choices would have been to adopt the strategy of withdrawing at a faster rate, the theory being to put pressure on the Iraqi military and government to perform better because they were not doing well because they were relying too much upon us. The other theory was that the security environment is so out of control and so tenuous that you will never have military, political, or economic progress until you get better control over security.

Well, the surge argument, advocated primarily by Senators MCCAIN, LIEBERMAN, and others, won the day with the President. So it was clear that we needed to change strategy at the end of 2006, and we did. There is an ongoing debate about whether that was the correct choice. To evaluate fairly the testimony of Ambassador Crocker and General Petraeus, I think one has to look at what happened from January of 2007 up to today and planned out to July 2008.

During that period of time, there was a surge of American combat forces into Iraq of 30,000 additional combat troops. The security argument prevailed over the withdrawal argument. The troops were deployed in a significantly different way. Not only were there more of the troops, which was a requirement, General Petraeus came up with a new strategy. He got the troops out into the communities, at security stations, where American soldiers served with Iraqi soldiers and policemen within the community. That built a sense of confidence we had not seen before. At the end of 2006, something very startling happened in Anbar Province. Sheik Sattar, one of the young sheiks in the Anbar Sunni region, after part of his family was murdered by al-Qaida, came to an American colonel and said: We have had it, we want to fight with you. We want these guys out of Anbar. We don't want to be dominated by al-Qaida in Iraq. The commander seized the moment and put a couple of tanks around the guy's house. From that action by the colonel and the addition of combat forces, Anbar Province is a completely different place.

If you ask me what is the most successful event of all within the surge period of time, I would argue it is the uprising in Anbar Province by Iraqi Sunni Arabs against the al-Qaida presence in Anbar. They have rejected the al-Qaida agenda and joined forces with the coalition forces, American forces, and we have literally delivered a punishing blow to al-Qaida in Anbar Province—to the point now that Ramadi and Fallujah are some of the safest places in all of Iraq.

So for the American public to grasp what is going on here, I think you have to understand this one fact. When Arab Muslim people say no to al-Qaida and we will fight bin Laden, his agents, and sympathizers, that is a good day for America. That is what the war is going to be about conventionally, in terms of how we win. If the people in the Mideast turn on al-Qaida and they say no and shoulder the burden of fighting and create a community in place of al-Qaida's agenda that is more tolerant, more open, that will allow the Shia and the Kurds to live in peace; that will not try to pass on the al-Qaida philosophy and agenda to everybody surrounding the region. So this is incredibly good news from the surge, with the increased combat capability and the overplaying of al-Qaida's hand in Anbar; they were incredibly vicious to the people.

I have been to Iraq 11 times, and the stories that come out of Anbar Province while al-Qaida dominated the region are heart-breaking and bone-chilling. Now we have, in April of 2008, a completely changed Anbar Province, where we have over 90,000 Iraqis, called the ''Sons of Iraq,'' patrolling their communities at night and during the day to make sure al-Qaida doesn't come back.

Iraq is a changed place in many ways. If you had to list the winners and losers of the surge, I argue that the biggest loser of all is the al-Qaida presence in Iraq. Any time al-Qaida is losing, we are winning. What has happened in that period of time? The economic progress in Iraq is real and is fundamentally different than it was before the surge. The reason I think we

have had economic progress in Iraq is because, with better security, you can engage in commerce. It is hard to run an economy when you are afraid to go to work. It is hard to build a society when your children cannot go to school. The GDP growth in Iraq is about 7 percent, and inflation before the surge was at 66 percent. Now it is close to 12 percent, and dropping. The oil production is up by 50 percent. Electricity demand is up by 25 percent.

We have economic progress in Iraq that is showing signs of a vibrant country moving toward normalcy. We had a budget path in Baghdad by the Iraqi Parliament, where Sunni, Shia, and Kurds took the $48 billion of revenue that the central government has under their authority and shared it with each province and each and every group within Iraq. What does that mean? I think most political leaders in America would tell you that money is political power. In our minority status as Republicans, the Democratic majority gives us an allocation to run our staffs and participate in committee activity. We share the resources of running the Senate. We sit down and say the Republicans get this and the Democrats get that. That is a recognition that we may disagree with, but we all have a vibrant role and we need the resources. The fact that the Shia, Sunni, and Kurds were able to come together and allocate resources owned by the country as a whole to each and every group is a major step forward. It would not have happened a year and a half ago. It is a buy-in by every group that Iraq is a separate country with a common identity. When you can get all three groups giving the resources of the country to each other, that is a buy-in to win Iraq.

There is more than that. An amnesty law was passed about 90 days ago. That means there are thousands of people in jail in Iraq—mostly Sunnis—who were captured in part of the surge and some before—that were taking up arms against the central government. These Sunnis in jail didn't want to participate in democracy. They ran the show under Saddam Hussein. Even though they were a minority in Iraq when Saddam was in power, they ran the show. They had an uprising, using violence to get their way, to topple the government. They landed in jail. One thing history will tell you and teach you, if you follow it closely, is that there will never be a reconciliation of a country that is divided ethnically or politically until there is a level of forgiveness. Reconciliation is a word, and it means nothing without action. The amnesty law was passed by the Shia, Kurds, and Sunnis, and it gave the people in jail who were captured as part of the Sunni insurgency a chance to be released and to start over again. There have been 24,000 applications to be released from jail under the amnesty law and 17,000, I have been told, have been granted.

That is a statement by the Shia and the Kurds who were on the receiving end of the violence to the people in jail, saying: Go back home. Let's start over as a new country. That, to me, is an act of forgiveness that is a precondition to reconciliation, and it would not have happened if there had not been a surge in the reduction of sectarian violence.

I see my good friend from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. I wonder if I might interrupt the Senator to ask a couple of questions.

Mr. GRAHAM. Please.

Mr. KYL. I think the Senator from South Carolina makes an exceedingly important point here, and that is that our theory, which was that the Muslim world itself had to reject this virulent, militant Islamist approach, which is manifested in the terrorism of al-Qaida; that until the Muslim world itself turned on those militants, those terrorists, it would be difficult for the West itself to actually defeat terrorism. It could pose a defensive posture, but it would not be defeated. What the Senator from South Carolina has said is what we are now seeing, as a result of the American support for the Iraqi people: A, a unification of the Iraqi people and, B, importantly, a rejection of this militant Islamist terrorism to the point that they are now joining in the fight and have something invested in that in terms of their country.

The question I want to ask has to do with how all of this relates to American security. Yesterday, Senator WARNER asked both General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker whether, as a result of the success of the surge—and a key point that the Senator from South Carolina made, that now the Iraqi Muslim population was itself fighting to excise this cancer from the region—whether this fact does translate into America being safer. I wonder if the Senator could comment on both General Petraeus's response to that and Ambassador Crocker's response, and the Senator's own extensive experience and what his comments on that would be.

Mr. GRAHAM. I asked General Petraeus that very question. He said that anytime Muslims would take up arms against al-Qaida, it is marching toward the solution America has been seeking. I think General Petraeus, myself, and Senators KYL and LIEBERMAN understand this war is not just about killing terrorists; this is about supporting moderation where you can find it, isolating the elements within the region.

If you had to put a list of extreme elements together, al-Qaida would be at the top. To those men and women who have participated in the surge and stood by the Anbar Iraqis who turned on al-Qaida, I think you have made our country safer. To the Iraqis who took up arms against al-Qaida, I think you have made Iraq safer and the world safer.

Mr. President, my question back to the Senator from Arizona, if I may, is, from his understanding of what was said yesterday, what can the Congress do, rather than criticize, what constructively can we do as a body to support those in harm's way and make sure we leave Iraq with a successful outcome?

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, that is an extremely important question because there is a lot of rhetoric about this war. The question is, What is the action line here, what can Congress do? Actually, it is a question of what Congress must do.

As I understand it, looking at General Petraeus's testimony, he was very adamant that Congress needed to pass the supplemental appropriations bill that will actually fund the troops in the field. This money was requested over a year ago. It represents a little over $100 billion.

According to his testimony, it is critical not only to the military needs but also he importantly talked about the Commander's Emergency Response Program, the State Department's Quick Response Fund, and the USAID programs.

The Senator from South Carolina was talking a moment ago about this two-part process, not only the political reconciliation but the economic reconstruction of the country.

General Petraeus himself, who clearly wants to get the troops funded, noted the interrelationship of the funding to help reconstruct the country, as well as to support the troops.

We are very soon going to be in a situation, according to Secretary Gates, where the Armed Forces are going to have to allow money to be borrowed from their regular operational accounts to fund the operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. He said the results of that would be a slowdown in training and equipping Iraqi forces, the halting of military operations and pay of defense personnel, and losing the ability to replace lost and damaged equipment by ongoing operations and, finally, that some operations simply would not be started because they will not know in advance that the funding will be there to complete the operation, something with which I am sure no operational commander in the field would want to live.

My understanding of his testimony is he very strongly urged the Congress to quickly pass the supplemental appropriations bill so the troops in the field can be funded and do the mission, after all, we have sent them to do.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I see our colleague, Senator LIEBERMAN, is on the floor. If I may, I wish to direct a question his way.

One of the themes of the testimony from General Petraeus is that after the surge has progressed to this stage, the biggest threat to Iraqi stability is no longer al-Qaida or sectarian violence but special groups trained by the Iranian Government sent back into Iraq to destabilize this effort of moderation.

Mr. President, can Senator LIEBERMAN tell us his take on Iran's involvement and where he thinks we need to go as a nation?

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I thank my friend from South Carolina and also my friend from Arizona.

This is a very important question, and I thought it was a very compelling part of the testimony offered both by General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker yesterday. If I may approach this by going back to the colloquy between my two friends earlier, they put their finger on a very important point. Let me go even a little further back.

After 9/11/01, after we were attacked, one of the insights we had was there is a violent civil war, both theological and political, going on within the Muslim world between a small group of fanatics, violent jihadists and the rest of the Muslim world who are pretty much like the rest of all of us. They want to live better, freer, more opportunity-filled lives for themselves and their children.

We went into Iraq to overthrow Saddam Hussein. We are there now to essentially help the Iraqis—and remember, Iraq is not just another country. It is one of the historic centers of the Arab world—to help this great country and its leaders and people to take hold of their own destiny and, in doing so, reject the extremists, the jihadists, the suicide bombers, and create for the Muslim world a different path to the future than the extremism and suicidal death and hatred and primitivism that al-Qaida, the current leadership of Iran, and others of that sort present to them.

Part of what the testimony yesterday, I think, from Ambassador Crocker and General Petraeus said is that thanks to the backing of the United States through the surge, the Iraqis are taking control of their destiny.

As my colleagues pointed out, the moderates are winning. They have al-Qaida on the run out of Al Anbar Province. The businesses are reopening. The children are going back to school. They have hopes of a better future.

One of our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee said to General Petraeus: What is going on here? I thought we were in Iraq to fight al-Qaida. Now you are telling me we pretty much have beaten al-Qaida, we have them on the run, and now you are telling us we are there to fight Iran.

That question missed the point, the point my colleagues have made in their colloquy. The point is, we are there for an affirmative reason. We are there to help the Iraqis establish a self-governing, self-defending moderate country, an antiterrorist country. We do have al-Qaida on the run, but as the two witnesses made clear yesterday, Iran is not on the run. In fact, Iran is an expansionist, fanatic power not only working through these special groups in Iraq but through Hezbollah in Lebanon and through Hamas in the Palestinian areas. They were tremendous statements yesterday, very strong.

Ambassador Crocker:

> Iran continues to undermine the efforts of the Iraqi Government to establish a stable, secure state.

This takes me—and then I will yield back to my colleagues—to what seemed to be the frustration of some of our colleagues on the committee yesterday. They were trying to get General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker to tell us again: We are going to get all our troops or most of our troops out by X date. Fortunately, General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker are not accountable to political calculus. They have been given the responsibility for this mission. They have American lives on the line. They have lost American lives.

The answer General Petraeus gave us is clearly the right one: I wish I could tell you how many brigades more I can pull out after July, but I can't until I see what conditions on the ground are. Maybe I can bring out some more, but maybe I can't. If I do it prematurely, we will run the risk of chaos and a loss of all we have gained in Iraq; frankly, a disrespect of the lives of Americans who have been lost there. Their families and loved ones always tell us: Don't let them to have died in vain. The No. 1 winner, if we pull out prematurely, would be Iran. They are all over Iraq. They have their hands in just about everything.

If we leave and chaos ensues, as Ambassador Crocker said yesterday:

> Iran has said publicly it will fill any vacuum in Iraq, and extremist Shi'a militias would reassert themselves.

We cannot let that happen. I thank my colleague.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I think our time expires in the next 5 minutes. I will quickly wrap up my thoughts and ask my colleagues to comment.

People want to know when we are going to come home. Trust me, if you have been to Iraq at all, if you spent any time with our men and women in uniform, you want them to be with their families and out of harm's way in the most desperate way.

The point I want people to remember is these are all volunteers. Some have been there two, three, four times. They make one simple request to me as a Senator: Take care of us, but support us so we can win. The reason they go back time and time again is they understand the consequences to our Nation if we lose.

So if you want to take stress off the military—and don't we all—the best stress we can take off our military is the stress of not knowing if they are going to be allowed to win.

I hope colleagues in this body will respect General Petraeus's reasoned opinion and give him some deference because I think he has produced results that will go down in history as one of the most successful military counter-insurgency operations anywhere on the planet and give a little deference and respect to Ambassador Crocker, who has put together political progress under the most difficult circumstances, where the Iraqis are seeing each other now not as enemies but as partners in an endeavor to create a better life for themselves, to live at peace with their neighbors, and to make the whole world safer against extremism.

When we come home is not the question for the ages. It may be for your next election and it may be about your political future; that may be the way you are looking at it or it may be about the Republican Party's political future. It is not that way for me, Senator MCCAIN, or I think anybody else, certainly not for Senator LIEBERMAN.

The question for me, the question for our Nation, and the world over time is, What did we leave behind? I am more confident than ever that we can leave behind, in the heart of the Mideast, in the center of the Arab world, a group of people called Iraqis, who will be our friends for a long time to come, will contain Iranian expansionism, and will continue to be al-Qaida's worst nightmare. That day is coming. The only way we can lose now is for Congress to undercut it.

To Senator KYL, how important is it for the Congress to pass a supplemental without strings attached?

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I say to my colleague there are going to be efforts apparently to hold this war funding hostage to other funding requests. For example, one of our colleagues said we are going to look at the supplemental not only for the $190 billion for the war—by the way, that figure is incorrect; it is $102 billion—but also what we can do on this bill for summer jobs programs.

I submit it is important to fund the troops because we have sent them on a mission. They volunteered, and they deserve our support. We should not threaten to withhold that support unless there is also funding for other programs that have a far lower priority than the security of our troops and the security of the United States.

I will also add one other point. In reading from what General Petraeus said yesterday and focusing right down on the American people, it is clearly in our national interest, he said, to help Iraq prevent the resurgence of al-Qaida in the heart of the Arab world. Both he and Ambassador Crocker said it is worth it to the United States that the success there is making us safer here at home. That is what it all gets back to, when folks say we need to have supplemental funding on other programs. This is making us safer at home.

I will conclude. I want my colleague from Connecticut to comment for a moment, and the Senator from Tennessee also wanted a couple minutes at the end of our time. I assured him we would have a of couple minutes. We may have to ask for an extra minute or so.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I thank my friend. Briefly, I recount a conversation with a friend of mine this morning. He said, watching the hearings yesterday, that he thought those

who have been critical of our effort in Iraq seemed quite restrained yesterday. I said they were, and I think it is because the record General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker were giving us was one of remarkable progress militarily, politically, and economically. It was hard to criticize, so the criticisms were kind of around the side: Why can't you tell us when we will get out exactly? Why didn't President Maliki consult more before he went south?

What I wish is that our colleagues had accepted the facts General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker gave us of the extraordinary progress in Iraq, which is very critical to our security because it creates a victory for the moderates, the good guys in the civil war within the Islamic world, and it protects our security in that sense because, remember, it is the fanatics who killed 3,000 of us on 9/11.

Let's hope for another day when there will be an agreement on the facts, and maybe we can get together to figure out how we can accelerate progress in Iraq so what all of us want can happen, which is we bring as many of our troops home as quickly as possible, with honor and after success. What can Congress do? I would say two things, after listening yesterday. One is to pass a supplemental. The second is to stay out of the way and not force our military and diplomatic leaders to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. Don't impose deadlines.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator ALEXANDER be recognized for 3 minutes to celebrate a big event for the State of Tennessee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE LADY VOLS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his courtesy, and the Senator from Arizona as well, and I note the presence on the floor of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Connecticut as well.

I am sure a great many of the men and women of our Armed Forces, over the last few days, have been watching basketball when they could, and yesterday I expressed my pride in the University of Memphis Tigers, how they got to the finals of the NCAA Men's Division in basketball only to be defeated by a very good Kansas team. Well, today I have even better news. Last night, the University of Tennessee Lady Vols won their eighth NCAA women's basketball championship. They defeated an extraordinarily good Stanford team.

The Tennessee team has very good players. The Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, and I talked earlier this morning about Candace Parker from Illinois, from his home State. She may very well be the best woman college basketball player already. She is likely to be the first in the draft today of the WNBA, and this is her last year. She has graduated and has played 3 years.

There were four seniors who played. But even though there were extraordinary players, this one has to be about the coach as well. Pat Summitt has won national championships so often, she has made it look easy. She won last year as well as this year. She has won back-to-back championships before. She has won 983 games. This has been remarkably difficult. In her 34 years, she has dominated women's basketball. She has defined it. But she has also helped it with her spaghetti suppers for visiting players, with her encouraging other coaches, with her patience with the news media. She has shown her willingness to change, visiting with Phil Jackson about what offense to put in; to react to disappointment, playing with her superstar, the young woman from Illinois, Candace Parker, who was playing her last two games with a dislocated shoulder.

What I like best about the Lady Vols is not their winning streak over the years, it is the example they set. When I was president of the University of Tennessee, which was 15 or so years ago, I would proudly tell everyone that Pat Summitt and her teams have not only won championships, but their players graduated. It was true then and I believe it is true today that every single young woman who has played basketball for Pat Summitt for 4 years has graduated from the University of Tennessee. Pat Summitt not only requires them to go to class, she says: You go to class and you sit in the front row. I want the professors to know you are there.

Just a glimpse of Coach Summitt and her young players on national television is the best possible advertisement for the University of Tennessee that I can imagine. If Pat Summitt were the conductor of a symphony, one would say she has mastered the crescendo because she always plays the toughest schedule, but somehow she has learned as a coach to get the most out of her team, to have them playing the best as they get to the NCAA tournament, as they get to the Final Four, and as they get to the championship game, as they have so often.

So congratulations to the players, Parker and Hornbuckle, Bobbitt and Anosike and Auguste—those are the young women who played their last game last night. But special congratulations to Pat Summitt, whose remarkable career reminds us of what a mirror of the best of our society can look like.

I thank the President.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Of course.

Mr. DURBIN. I wish to address a question through the Chair, although it is more a comment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The assistant majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. And I would like to join with the Senator from Tennessee. We did speak this morning about that great game last night, and great praise to Stanford for yielding a wonderful squad and great players, too, and making it all the way to the finals. But a special praise to Pat Summitt and the Lady Vols from Tennessee. We had a special interest in the team because of Candace Parker. She is an extraordinary young woman, and watching her play with that physical challenge of her dislocated shoulder was an indication not only of her skill but of her courage.

When one of the players on the Tennessee team was injured toward the end of the game, you could sense the team feeling. There were tears running down the cheeks of fellow players. There was the sense of such a close-knit unit. That says a lot about them and an awful lot about their coach.

When we get into debates here on the floor of the Senate about title IX and women's athletics, I hope we can invite someone like Pat Summitt, someone like Candace Parker, and others to come and tell us what a transformative experience it has been for them to participate at this level of sport and to really achieve so much, not only on the court but in their lives, and I salute the Lady Vols.

I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his friendship, and we both admire a great coach and a great team and a great performance, which we saw last night.

I thank the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The assistant majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding the majority now has 30 minutes in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

IRAQ

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the country is consumed with the appearance this week of General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker from Iraq. This is our annual report. Companies make annual reports. People like Warren Buffett call in to Omaha, NE, to shareholders of Berkshire Hathaway to talk about the state of his corporation and what the prospects are of the future. It has become an annual occurrence here on Capitol Hill that the two leaders from the diplomatic and military side come and make their report to Congress.

This is indeed the beginning of the sixth year of this war. This war in Iraq has lasted longer than World War II. By the end of this summer, it will have lasted longer than World War I and World War II combined. We have lost over 4,000 of our best and bravest, our

men and women in uniform who have given their lives in this conflict—30,000 injured. Many with permanent injuries have returned from this battlefield.

Our military has been stretched to the absolute limit. There is no doubt in my mind that the U.S. military is the best in the world. You only have to meet them, you only have to understand the challenges they have faced and the success they have shown to know that. But it troubles me that in the midst of this debate about how long we can stay in Iraq, we are actually saying: How long can our military stay in Iraq with the support of the American people?

An honest appraisal of the American military today, in the sixth year of this war, will tell you they have paid a heavy price beyond the deaths and injuries. There is a serious challenge facing our military. The leaders—General Cody, who testified just a few weeks ago, and General McCaffrey—have told us that Iraq has pushed the U.S. Army to the breaking point. That is a sobering appraisal by the military itself of what this war has done to our great military.

Just the other day, the Army reported increased stress, anxiety, and depression for 27 percent of soldiers returning to Iraq for a third and fourth tour. Those of us who have been there to meet with soldiers, as I have on three different occasions, will tell you that these extraordinarily long deployments of our soldiers are virtually unprecedented since World War II, and they have taken their toll.

Our soldiers today are usually married. In previous wars, they were not. So they go to battle remembering that they have left behind spouses and children. On a daily basis, they are in contact by e-mail. They know if the car doesn't start. They know when the baby has to go to the doctor. They know when there is a problem paying the bills. They know it in real time.

In addition to the stress of being in battle and in combat, they have the added stress of separation from their families and the knowledge that for many of them it will be 15 months in deployment before they can come home.

A lieutenant colonel from Georgia, a career man, said to me as I left: Senator, we have to do something about these deployments. They are just entirely too long. And the period between deployments isn't long enough. He talked about leaving Georgia with his daughter in the fifth grade and returning after his deployment to find her in the seventh grade. He missed a year of her life.

He also talked about the fact that bringing these troops home for a year or sometimes even less before they are sent away again doesn't give them time to rest, to reunite with their families, to be reequipped, retrained, and to bring in new recruits and integrate them into the unit. We turn them around so quickly because this administration, and those who support it, look beyond the obvious, take for granted that the military will be there time and time again, and pursue a foreign policy which, sadly, has been a misguided policy from the start.

I will recall that evening as long as I serve in this body, in October of 2002, when we cast that fateful vote to give President George W. Bush the authority to invade Iraq, an authority which he used. It was a historic night and a sad night for many of us. Twenty-three Senators, 1 Republican and 22 Democrats, voted against the authorization to invade Iraq. I recall that evening believing that this President was poised and prepared and ready to go into Iraq. He had misled through statements—inaccurate statements. The American people were misled about the circumstance involving that invasion.

Do you recall the fear we had? We were told about weapons of mass destruction—biological, chemical weapons, nuclear weapons. We were told Saddam Hussein was somehow linked to the terrible tragedy of 9/11. We were told his continued presence in the Middle East made it more dangerous for Israel, for many of our closest friends and allies. We were told he was developing predator aircraft that could be sent in remote ways to drop these weapons of mass destruction all around the Middle East, if not beyond.

Virtually every one of those statements made by this administration prior to the invasion of Iraq was wrong, inaccurate, and was proven to have been false. America was misled into this war.

That does not diminish in any way the bravery and courage and determination of our troops, but it says that the policymakers, many of whom are finally going to leave the scene in a few months, have to accept the verdict of history that they were wrong. They were wrong to lead us into this war, and the price we have paid has been a heavy price for that deception and that mistake.

They come now and tell us that even if we were wrong getting into this war, even if it lasted far longer than anyone anticipated, even if the cost of this war in human lives and actual dollars went dramatically beyond anyone's expectation, we have to ''stay the course.'' We have to stay the course. How many times have we been told by these military leaders and by the President that when the Iraqis are prepared to stand up with their own defense force, America's troops can stand down? I have heard that until I am weary of it.

Years ago, when I went to Iraq, I was greeted then by General Petraeus, who was not in charge but was part of the leadership there, and he took me off for a little exercise at the airfield to show me what the troops were doing—the Iraqi troops. I couldn't tell you whether it demonstrated skill or not. I am not an expert in military deployment by any means. But a handful of Iraqi soldiers, whose faces were hooded so they couldn't be identified by other Iraqis, went through the routine of a drill. I suppose it was undertaken to impress us. It didn't. I thought to myself: I will believe the Iraqi military has really reached the point of professionalism when they start replacing American soldiers and American soldiers start coming home.

Year after weary year, we have invested millions and millions of dollars in the training of their soldiers and their police. Yet 140,000 of our soldiers are still rising this morning and every morning risking their lives for the people of Iraq.

I sometimes wonder if the Iraqi people have really come to the basic conclusion as to whether they are a nation worth fighting for. I do not know the answer to that. When you hear what is going on in Iraq recently, where 1,000 Iraqi soldiers turned and deserted in battle, it is not encouraging. It tells me that despite all the time, all the money, and all the bloodshed, this war continues unabated.

I know now that many want to see this administration leave and hand over the quagmire of Iraq to the next President. That next President, whoever that person may be, will inherit two wars from this administration—in Iraq and Afghanistan—a recession, a situation where health care across America is in crisis, an energy challenge the likes of which we have never seen in this country, an environmental challenge of global warming that challenges not only our Nation but the entire world, entitlement programs such as Social Security and Medicare on the ropes, and, unfortunately, a country that needs real leadership. That is the legacy of the Bush administration.

For General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker to come before us and talk about staying the course for another 9 or 10 months, to me betrays the obvious. We have given the Iraqi people more than any nation can ask, in terms of human life and treasure. It is estimated that the total cost of this war will be somewhere in the range of $3 trillion. What could we have done with that money in America had it been spent for America's strength? Just imagine: We could have provided 5.7 million Americans with health coverage each year since the war began, hired 430,000 new teachers across America, built 1 million units of affordable housing, and provided 4-year scholarships at State universities for 4.7 million students. Instead, the money has been sunk in Iraq.

Just so the record is straight, the Iraqis are not paupers. They have bountiful sources of oil that they sell. While we labor with one of the largest deficits—in fact, the largest deficit in the history of the United States, a debt, a mortgage we are passing on to our children—while we labor with that and are asked by the President to send another $100 billion into Iraq with the next request coming in just a few days, the Iraqis today have a surplus in their

treasury of over $25 billion. We are sacrificing in America to send money to Iraq to rebuild their country while they are building a surplus in their treasury from their oil revenues. What is wrong with this picture? There is no earthly explanation for that, and it is a fact.

I think, too, of what this means in the long term for the next President. That next President is going to inherit a terrible situation, finding an honorable way out of Iraq. I notice when the Republicans refer to that they always talk about a precipitous withdrawal. No one is calling for that. But the Democratic candidates for President are talking about bringing our troops home. I do not believe there is any other way for the Iraqis to be convinced that this is their nation and their future and their responsibility. As long as they can dial 9–1–1 and order up the best and bravest soldiers in the world to come from America and defend them, they are not going to accept their responsibility and do what is necessary.

Meanwhile, our military is devastated by this war. West Point-educated officers are leaving the Army in record numbers. Between 2001 and 2004, there was a doubling of the Army's divorce rate and a dramatic increase in suicide among the members of the military, particularly from the National Guard. In addition to that, we know we are waiving requirements for recruits. One out of eight new Army recruits has a criminal record, some with serious charges. We are lowering the requirements for basic education to bring in recruits. We are offering thousands of dollars to 19-year-olds fresh out of high school if they will just sign up to be in the Army. That is not good for the future of our country. It is not good for the future of our military.

We know that an estimated 90,000 Iraqi civilians have been killed, and maybe more, innocent people caught in the crossfire of a war. We know there are literally millions of Iraqi refugees, and shamefully the United States has been unwilling to even accept Iraqi refugees who have risked their lives for our troops and our safety. It is just unconscionable that countries around the world are accepting these refugees and the United States, which has needed them and used them, refuses to accept them. It is a fact.

We have dangerously emboldened Iran, which is moving closer to the development of nuclear weapons with this morning's announcement. In fact, it was actually Iran that helped broker an end to the recent violence in Basra.

If this invasion of Iraq was determined to show the strength of the United States, it is hard to show while we are still there 6 years later with no end in sight. If this invasion of Iraq was designed to diminish the power of Iran in the Middle East, it is hard to believe anyone could make that assertion today, with proof to back it up. That is the reality of what we face.

When I hear Senator MCCAIN and Republican leaders talk about staying the course, I understand—and I hope Americans do—that we need to change the course. We need to change the direction of this war. We need to start to bring our brave soldiers home to the victor's welcome they deserve. We need to start to say to the Iraqis: Stand up and defend your own country. We need to start extricating ourselves from Iraq so this money we are now spending to build Iraq and make it stronger can give us strength right here at home. Instead of creating jobs in Iraq, we should be creating good-paying jobs right here in America, jobs that can't be outsourced, jobs that make a decent paycheck with benefits and health care and a promise of a good pension. We should be investing in this country's schools, in this country's hospitals, in this country's infrastructure, and the Iraqis should use their oil revenues to strengthen their own country and come together and make the hard political decisions which they have avoided.

I will close and turn it over to my colleague, Senator CARDIN from Maryland, by telling you that the debate will continue, and in a few weeks the President's supplemental request will be before us. It is another opportunity for us to engage this Chamber in a debate. I know and we all know that the majority of Republicans refuse to join us in talking about the change in direction in this war. We know as well that this President will veto anything that changes his policies. He is determined to leave office with Iraq in the same condition that we know it today, with no change in basic policy before us.

The time is coming and coming soon—in November—when the American people have the last word. Finally, after 4 years, they get a chance to speak. They get a chance to pick a leader, to change the direction of this country in the right way, to make certain we have economic policies that build America and make it stronger—our families and our businesses—and to make certain we have a new policy in Iraq which really focuses on capturing Osama bin Laden, beating back the al-Qaida wherever they are found—in Pakistan or Afghanistan—making America safe from terrorism, and stopping what has been a longstanding and negative impact of this President's policy in Iraq.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MCCASKILL). The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, first, let me compliment and thank the assistant majority leader, the Senator from Illinois, for his consistent comments with regard to the U.S. role in Iraq. He has made it clear that the U.S. interest has not been served by these last 5 years, that we have lost our focus on the war on terror. As he pointed out, we have real concerns, internationally, about terrorism, and we have been distracted, particularly in Afghanistan, because of the focus on Iraq.

He pointed out very clearly that the United States has invested so much—the lives of our soldiers, the cost to the taxpayers, those who have come back wounded. And what have we done this for? These soldiers deserve the right mission: that we concentrate on dealing with the war against terror, that we have the Iraqis take responsibility for their own country, particularly in the midst of civil war. A lot of this is just Iraqis fighting Iraqis—Shiites fighting Shiites for power—and the United States has sustained fighters on both sides, in some cases. This is so counterproductive to U.S. interests.

I congratulate the Senator and thank him for continuing to bring out these issues. We hope in the next 10 months there will be some changes. We also understand we have to transition to a different mission, considering the type of sacrifices that have been made by our troops and the taxpayers of this country. I thank him very much for his leadership.

Madam President, I was part of the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday when General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker testified before our committee. When I had the time, I started to thank, on behalf of the people of Maryland, General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker and all the soldiers and all the diplomats who have served in Iraq. They have served with great distinction. I am humbled by their skills and sacrifices. I acknowledge the tremendous sacrifices that have been made by their families. But I must tell you, they deserve the right mission, what is in the best interests of the United States. How should we judge that progress? It is an interesting point, as to whether we have made satisfactory progress in Iraq.

Let me go back to January 10, 2007, when the President brought forward his ''New Way Forward in Iraq.'' His own words were that:

> If we increase our support at this crucial moment, and help the Iraqis break the current cycle of violence, we can hasten the day our troops begin coming home.

One of the reasons for the surge was to reduce our troop levels. But if we look at the presurge troop levels, it was 132,000 Americans; at the height of the surge last July, 160,000; and today, we have more than 140,000. We learned yesterday that General Petraeus believes we will be at that 140,000 level for the indefinite future, that there cannot be a commitment made at this stage to reduce our troop levels below 140,000. So at the end of the day we have more troops in Iraq rather than less.

The President stated in that same speech:

> Over time, we can expect . . . growing trust and cooperation from Baghdad's residents. When this happens, daily life will improve, Iraqis will gain confidence in their leaders, and the government will have the breathing space it needs to make progress in other critical areas.

As a result of that, benchmarks were established—not by the Congress, benchmarks were established by President Bush and his administration with the Iraqi Government. When you look at the progress we have made—let me use General Petraeus's comments that he made:

No one [in the U.S. or the Iraqi government] feels that there has been sufficient progress by any means in the areas of national reconciliation or in the provision of basic public services.

Only 3 of the 18 benchmarks have been satisfactorily met. The circumstances on the ground in Iraq are unsatisfactory. Iraqis are not getting the basic services they need.

I questioned Ambassador Crocker, and following up questions that I posed to a panel we had last week before the Foreign Relations Committee, a panel of retired generals, experts in this area, and that was: Can you name a national leader in Iraq who is willing to step forward to provide the type of leadership, make the necessary concessions so that you can have a government in Iraq that has the confidence of its people? Because that is what we need to make the political progress. No one could mention a person's name. Ambassador Crocker said—and I used the examples of South Africa and Northern Ireland, where you had people willing to step forward—Ambassador Crocker said:

There is no Nelson Mandela in Iraq.

What an understatement that was. That was the understatement of our hearing.

We seem to be changing our goals as to what is success or what we are trying to achieve, what is in the best interests of America, what type of government we want in Iraq. Well, our expectations certainly have changed there. There is no expectation that we will have the type of strong national government that has the confidence of all the ethnic communities. We have changed the expectation as to what that Government in Iraq's relationship will be with Iran. We seem to acknowledge that it may, in fact, strengthen Iran. There is no agreement now that we need to reduce our troop levels—certainly by the administration's mission. They want to maintain the troop level at the current level with no commitment to reduce it. There is certainly no expectation to reduce the cost to U.S. taxpayers. We are going to get a supplemental appropriation asking for more money from the U.S. taxpayers.

We certainly have not focused on the major dangers against terrorism. If we did, we would be concentrating on Afghanistan, not spending so much effort in Iraq. The current situation yesterday was characterized by our experts as: fragile, uneven, reversible. We went through the current flare-ups in Basra and Baghdad where Shiite are fighting Shiite, a fight for power within Iraq with U.S. soldiers in the middle of that power struggle.

We went through the influence of Iran and that the U.S. soldiers' presence may, in fact, be generating more support for Iran within Iraq. So let's take a look at the facts: The United States is supporting warring parties within Iraq. The fact is, over 5 years, over 4,000 soldiers have died, American soldiers; 30,000 American soldiers have been wounded.

I have visited them. I know these are life-changing injuries they will have to live with for the rest of their lives. Six hundred billion dollars and still counting of U.S. taxpayer money has been spent. This is a difficult mission for us to maintain. Look at our military. Our military is stretched. Look at our National Guards. I know what is happening in Maryland and our National Guard. They are serving with great distinction, but they are exhausted, and we need them in Maryland.

Look at our economy. We are losing jobs here in America. One reason is we are so focused on spending money in Iraq, we are not investing in our own country. Look what is happening on our fight against terrorism. Prior to our invasion of Iraq, there was no al-Qaida presence in Iraq. Now we have hundreds of thousands of troops, American and Iraqis, and a couple thousand al-Qaida, according to General Petraeus.

We are not focused on the war against terror, we are focused on a power struggle within Iraq, which should not be our focus. We need to do a better job in Afghanistan, but yet we are stuck in Iraq. We have no plan to draw down American troops. I find that unacceptable. That is not in the best interests of this country.

Let me mention one more aspect of what has happened in Iraq. This is factual: the number of displaced people, nearly 5 million now, nearly 5 million displaced; 2 million in neighboring countries. General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker acknowledged that one of the reasons why violence in Baghdad is down is that the communities, the neighborhoods have been ethnically cleansed and people have left. They do not want to be in a violent neighborhood. They have left.

But they are displaced. What is going to happen to them? Nearly three million in Iraq alone. The United Nations High Commission on Refugees has said it is not safe for them to go back to their neighborhoods. What is going to happen? If we are talking about a solution for Iraq, we have got to take a look at the refugees. This is a humanitarian concern, it is a security concern, it is also a concern about stability in the region.

Let me give you one example. Jordan has now an extra 8 percent of its population as a result of refugees; an 8-percent increase. Now, if you used the same numbers in America, that would be 24 million, 24 million people coming to our country. Think about the stability of the region.

Well, my position has been clear. I have opposed the war since its inception. I opposed giving the President the right to use our military more than 5 years ago. I have opposed the manner in which this war has been conducted. But we are where we are. We cannot reverse history. Where do we go from here?

Well, we have 10 months left in this administration, 10 months to go, and the status quo is not what we need. We need to change course in Iraq, focus on the war on terror, rebuild and restrengthen our military. We have got to do that and stop spending $12 billion each month in Iraq at the expense of priorities right here at home. That is what we need to do starting immediately. We should not wait until the next election. We should start doing this today.

We need to change our mission. Our mission should be U.S. soldiers fighting terrorists, not refereeing community fights, neighborhood fights; American troops protecting our interests and helping transition the Iraqis to take responsibility for their own security.

We should draw down the U.S. troops, bring them home. The status quo is not acceptable, that is, 140,000 U.S. troops remaining in Iraq.

There was bipartisan recognition that the status quo is unacceptable. Several of our most distinguished Republican members of the Foreign Relations Committee made it clear that the status quo is not acceptable, yet this administration is trying to maintain the status quo for the next 10 months.

I hope we can change that. Public opinion is against the status quo. We know that. What we need is a surge in diplomacy. We need other countries that have a direct interest in what is happening in Iraq to step forward. We need to engage international organizations, the United Nations and the OSCE. We have to have the Iraqis step forward and take responsibility for the security of their own country. They have oil. We need the Iraqis to pay for the costs of their own defense. The American taxpayers should not be doing this.

One more thing I should talk about that we do not need: We do not need President Bush and the Iraqi Government negotiating a long-term security plan without Congressional approval. That would only restrict the options of the next administration or future Congresses. We should never allow that to happen.

The world has an interest in a safe and secure Iraq, but in working toward that end, we cannot ignore other competing needs around the world and at home. We need a more thoughtful approach that will bring our troops home, refocus our resources on al-Qaida, and Afghanistan and Pakistan, step up diplomatic efforts, and internalize the effort to bring stability to that country and to the Middle East.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NEW DIRECTION FOR ENERGY INDEPENDENCE, NATIONAL SECURITY, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT AND THE RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ENERGY CONSERVATION TAX ACT OF 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 3221, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3221) moving the United States toward greater energy independence and security, developing innovative new technologies, reducing carbon emissions, creating green jobs, protecting consumers, increasing clean renewable energy production, and modernizing our energy infrastructure, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the production of renewable energy and energy conservation.

Pending:

Dodd/Shelby amendment No. 4387, in the nature of a substitute.

Sanders modified amendment No. 4401 (to amendment No. 4387), to establish a maximum rate of interest for loans insured under title II of the National Housing Act.

Cardin/Ensign amendment No. 4421 (to amendment No. 4387), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of a principal residence by a first-time home buyer.

Ensign amendment No. 4419 (to amendment No. 4387), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the limited continuation of clean energy production incentives and incentives to improve energy efficiency in order to prevent a downturn in these sectors that would result from a lapse in the tax law.

Alexander amendment No. 4429 (to amendment No. 4419), to provide a longer extension of the renewable energy production tax credit and to encourage all emerging renewable sources of electricity.

Nelson (FL)/Coleman amendment No. 4423 (to amendment No. 4387), to provide for the penalty-free use of retirement funds to provide foreclosure recovery relief for individuals with mortgages on their principal residences.

Lincoln amendment No. 4382 (to amendment No. 4387), to provide an incentive to employers to offer group legal plans that provide a benefit for real estate and foreclosure review.

Lincoln (for Snowe) amendment No. 4433 (to amendment No. 4387), to modify the increase in volume cap for housing bonds in 2008.

Landrieu amendment No. 4404 (to amendment No. 4387), to amend the provisions relating to qualified mortgage bonds to include relief for persons in areas affected by Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma.

Sanders amendment No. 4384 (to amendment No. 4387), to provide an increase in specially adapted housing benefits for disabled veterans.

Murray amendment No. 4478 (to amendment No. 4387), to increase funding for housing counseling with an offset.

Mikulski amendment No. 4494 (to amendment No. 4478), to make additional funds available to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation to increase legal assistance available to homeowners at risk of foreclosure and assistance to community organizations working to preserve home ownership and prevent foreclosure, with an offset.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORKER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING TENNESSEE VOLUNTEERS AND THE UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I rise today, while business is slow in the Senate, to send my strong congratulations to the University of Tennessee Lady Vols who again excelled and set an example for our country in the way they conducted themselves.

Pat Summitt has a tremendous legacy in our State. She is someone who not only is an outstanding coach and has won eight national championships, but she also teaches players life examples and ways to be successful later in life. Our students who play on the Lady Vols team are steeped and focused on academics and being successful later in life. The way she has led the Vols and led our State by her actions and the way this team has excelled is something to be congratulated and certainly makes all of us in Tennessee and in our country proud.

I also extend my congratulations to the University of Memphis. Memphis has also done an outstanding job. Coach John Calapiari has been a great addition to our State. While they fell short earlier this week in reaching the national championship, they still raised our excitement level in Tennessee and our tremendous respect for the University of Memphis and what they have accomplished. I am sure at some point in the near future they will achieve the ultimate goal they have of winning the national championship. My hat is off to both of these outstanding coaches, to both of these teams and programs which focus on student excellence and making sure players are prepared for life. I join Tennesseans all across the State in congratulating them and telling them how proud we are of all of them.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, last Saturday, I held two town meetings in Vermont on the collapse of the middle class, and both of them were very well attended. Our guest speaker was Elizabeth Warren, who is a professor of law at Harvard Law School and one of the leading writers in this county on economic matters.

In preparation for that meeting, I sent out an e-mail on my Web site just asking people in Vermont to tell me their personal experiences regarding what is happening to the middle class. We have done that in the past and, frankly, I expected we would get a couple dozen responses. What happened was really astounding to me and speaks about what is going on in the economy in this country today. Over a period of a few days, we have now had some 500 responses, mostly from Vermont, but also I do a national radio show, and we made a similar request nationally, and we have had some from out of State. They are mostly from Vermont, some from out of State, but a total of some 500 responses.

What was absolutely astounding was the nature of these responses. They were so powerful, so overwhelming, that, in fact, they were sometimes difficult to read. Person after person wrote with amazing honesty and with an articulateness which comes from telling the truth. They were not giving a great speech, as we often do here in the Senate, talking about everything under the Sun. They were talking from their own hearts. They were talking about what it means to be trying to raise kids, trying to send your kids to college, trying to pay your fuel bills, fill up your gas tank when you get to work—amazing stories. We are going to post many of them on our Web site.

What I want to do this morning, because I think it is terribly important that the Senate hears from ordinary people to get a sense of what is really going on in America, the struggles people are having—maybe it is a good idea we hear from the people rather than just campaign contributors, rather than just lobbyists. The language I heard that came to my Web site was extraordinary. So what I want to do this morning—I have the feeling I will be doing it more than once—is just have you listen to what people have to say, reading exactly the words they have written to me.

Let me begin by reading an e-mail that came from a small town in northern Vermont. I am going to do my best to disguise the identities of the writers. But this is from a small town near the Canadian border. This is what this writer says.:

My family has been squeezed for years now. My husband and I have two children. My husband works full time and has a degree. He works 60 miles away from home, and has tried to find a new job closer but has been unable to do so. I tried for 2 years to find a job, when I could not find a job I went back to school. I am hoping that my degree will help our family.

The price of gas and oil now consumes 30% of our disposable income. We have cut back on groceries, and recently was only able to get groceries because my parents were nice enough to give us money. We are going to buy a woodstove because we are afraid we will not be able to afford oil next year. We do not qualify for LIHEAP. My husband got a raise last year that disappeared on Jan. 1st when the cost of our health insurance increased. We have to have reduced cost lunch for our children, we cannot afford to put our children on his health insurance plan, and luckily they are on Dr. Dynasaur—

Which is the SCHIP program in Vermont—

but now we have to pay a premium where we didn't last year.

We have stopped doing any fun things. We have not been able to go out to eat in a long time, or to bring the kids to see a movie. There are no treats. I am praying that after I graduate I will be able to find a job to help my family out. Of course when I go back to work both my husband and I will have to start paying our student loans, and this payment will amount to about $500 per month. But what other option do we have? I couldn't find work. He can't find a better job closer to home.

Both my husband and I have degrees, we did everything right, we are not doing better than our parents when they were our age.

If it wasn't for our parents we would be worse off. Our parents have helped us with oil. My parents gave us $600 last year to pay for our oil, my husband's parents helped us with car repairs so we wouldn't go into debt. My parents have given us grocery money and bought our kids school clothes. I don't know what we would do without our parents.

This is demoralizing, my husband keeps asking when will we be able to actually afford to support our own family? I'm not sure what the answer is.

Thank you for listening.

That is a letter from a woman in northern Vermont.

This is a letter from a woman in north central Vermont whose job, it turns out, was outsourced. This is what she writes:

My husband and I are in our mid-fifties. At this time of our lives we should be at our peak earning power, putting money away for our retirement. Two years ago, we were, but now we are making about $42,000 between us and struggling through this Vermont winter.

I was an international IT manager, making a nice salary then. I spent 14 years getting my AS, BS and then my Masters degree from Champlain College.

Which is a college in Burlington, VT.

We were comfortable, and able to go on a nice vacation every couple of years. Then the company I worked for for 18 years outsourced its entire IT operation to India. I received a layoff package, but at my age it took me a while to find a job for one third of my previous salary, and that job is not even in my field—I am an accounting technician now.

My husband was laid off from a job as an electrician's assistant and he is now working in a hardware store. He makes $3 less per hour now.

Both of our moms are near 80 and live with us. We also help to take care of our next-door neighbor, who is 83. We are struggling to keep up with our bills. Fortunately when we refinanced our home several years ago, we took a fixed rate mortgage. Even so, our heating, gas and even grocery costs are rising so quickly and our salaries are not.

When I was younger, I found it easier to regroup from a loss like this, but then everyone wanted to hire me when I was younger. I thought the government was ''of the people, by the people and for the people,'' but it seems to me that it's mostly ''of the people, by the lobbyists and for the rich.'' By the time we get to retirement, maybe when we're 70 at this rate, Social Security and Medicare will be gone and we'll be on our own. I feel as though our government has sold us out and even if we elect a new President who cares for the people, it will take too long to recover for us to reach a comfortable place again.

Thank you for listening Senator SANDERS.

This is a very brief e-mail that we received from a small town in central Vermont:

Between my retirement & SS [Social Security], I get a grand total of $804 a month. My last oil delivery was over $600 for the month of March.

That's my story—and I'm stuck with it.

Thank you, Senator, for trying to ''make it better.''

This is from the wife of a logger in northern Vermont. A lot of people in the State of Vermont earn their money in the woods. They go out and they cut trees.

This is the toughest time I have seen since I was a child. My husband is a self employed logger and has an excavation business. The way the economy is has really hit in both of his employment very hard. The price of logs have dropped drastically and no one is building.

He has extremely high blood pressure but some how we can't receive any help. We do have catamount blue health insurance that we pay $250.00 a month for but that does not cover some of his medicine nor does it cover all hospital bills. We have exhausted any savings we had but still have a small IRA but cannot touch that with out being penalized. We have had to refinance our home of 34 years and I have just started a job but it requires me to travel 35 miles one way to work and with the price of gas it is almost a hopeless case.

I'm sure there are other people in worse shape than us, but I have to wonder why the government is not helping the working person? The only thing I guess a working person has is pride.

Is it worth it?????? I'm really beginning to wonder!

This is from a 57-year-old working widow, again from the central Vermont area. This is what she says:

I have no—

Underline ''no''—

disposable income. Like many Vermonters I drive a long way to my job and consider myself lucky to have one and like most jobs in Vermont it does not pay as well as the same job in other areas of the country. My roundtrip mileage is 60 miles per day. I invested in an America made hybrid in 2004 which gets between 25 to 30 mpg [miles per gallon]. Also, the organization I work for does not reimburse me at the federal rate for the miles charged to them. I have to have more and more money each week to pay for that week's gas and then wait to be reimbursed. It really is a tough squeeze and some of my co-workers are in tighter spots.

I was fortunate to have locked in fuel oil last Spring at $2.46/gallon for 800 gallons. This is to supplement wood burning. However, I fell on the ice in December and hurt my shoulder which makes lifting wood difficult therefore I turned the thermostat back to 60 and live that way. Now the thermostat is back to 50 and the burner only comes on to heat hot water. I stopped using hot water to wash my clothes over a year ago and just use cold water. I don't notice a difference.

I have not had a vacation except a long weekend in years. At 57 and a widow and a woman, I can look forward to living in poverty. I am thankful for the things I have and pray that I can hold onto them. I have first hand experience that there are many, many Vermonters that have much less and are falling through the cracks. They do not have enough food to eat and are ''too rich'' for fuel programs.

I have a friend who is legally blind and lives on less than $800 per month. She lives in Senior housing so her rent is subsidized but she still has to pay for utilities and food. How does she buy food and clothing on this pathetic amount of money?

How can we be the richest nation in the world and allow this to happen?

I vote. I give to charities when I can albeit small amounts but how can I move mountains? I pray for peace and justice because I don't know what else to do and I am thankful for what I have and for what I am able to do.

I appreciate your keeping important issues before the public.

As I said, these are stories from Vermont. But we have received similar-type stories from all over America. Let me conclude with four stories from families in States other than Vermont.

This is from a young man in Tulsa, OK:

Thank you so much for allowing me to tell the story of how our family is being squeezed by the current economic conditions in our country. . . .

In December of 2000, I started work for my current company at the ''bottom rung of the ladder.'' I was changing careers yet again and the old saying ''you can't start at the top'' certainly applied. I have since worked my way up from a starting position, part time at $7.65 an hour, through 3 promotions and into a management position in the mid $30k a year salary range. That used to be an ok salary here in Oklahoma. Not anymore.

The rising cost of fuel, food, utilities and other necessities has turned my ''ok'' salary into a near poverty-level experience for my family. In addition to the above mentioned costs, I experienced a $102 per month increase in my portion of the premium for my ''employer provided'' family health coverage.

I don't get it. I work hard, every day. I show up on time every day, give it everything I have and never back off and somehow everything except my salary is going up at an alarming rate. My parents taught me that no matter what, if we worked hard enough and never gave up, we'd get somewhere. It seems these days, that doesn't hold true anymore.

Please encourage your colleagues in D.C. to do something, and hurry. I am doing all I can and it just isn't enough.

This one is from a young engineer in Gladstone, OR:

I am a 26-year-old college graduate with a master's degree in mechanical engineering. I have been working for two years as an engineer in the Portland, OR metropolitan area, and though I consider my compensation for my job to be appropriate for my level of education and expertise (about $60,000 a year), I am still struggling to make ends meet in this economy.

Despite the fact that my home mortgage payment has remained stable, I am finding that the average price of energy and commodities has increased such that I can no longer afford to contribute to my 401(k) retirement plan, and I am living month-to-

month with only about $200 in savings. I pay about $300 for gasoline, $200 for heat, $100 for electricity, and about $400 for food every month. This is fully twice as much as I was paying for the same expenses just 2 short years ago. Ouch!

My situation is ironic and a bit frustrating. Whereas I now make over four times what I made as a graduate student, I live with the same quality of life as I did in college. I cannot afford vacations or extravagant purchases, and I am burdened as so many people are these days with a persistent worry about getting sick or injured and stuck with a medical bill that I cannot afford.

I realize that I am nobody special in terms of how hard I work or how much I pay for food and gas or how ''sad'' my story is, and that is why I write to you. I am moved by the stories of how these middle-class families are surviving, and I can sympathize with them in terms of some of the financial worry they are experiencing. It is hard for me, it must be incredibly difficult for them.

Thank you for your time and thank you for your service as a U.S. Senator, and thank you for providing a forum like this.

This is from a 30-year-old man from the Pacific Northwest who feels the American dream has failed him. This is what he writes:

I was raised in extreme poverty. My mom had a 9th grade education and my father dropped out in 6th grade. My brother, 3 years my senior, dropped out of high school in 1996, the year I graduated. I never knew a house; we grew up in one and two bedroom apartments. I also never knew I was raised in poverty until adulthood—when I tried to transcend this state of economic marginalization.

I was the first of my family to graduate high school. Four years later I entered junior college; transferred to a private four-year institution and earned both an undergraduate and graduate degree. I also earned $70,000 in student loan debt. At that point, I had never earned more than $7,000 in my life.

Three years after college, I purchased my first home. You guessed it—my loan was predatory and was one of those ARMs. This was the first home ever purchased in the Ryan family. As you know, to truly gain a firm stance in the middle class, one must own property.

I earned $50,000 in 1997, more money than I've ever known. Yet I still have to charge my groceries or medications. My ARM matured and my mortgage raised $300 over night. The first home in my family is likely to go back to the bank and I'm falling short of the finish line in the race out of poverty.

I'm now in credit card debt just to buy the essentials and my student loan debt haunts me most days of my life. I feel disillusioned by the ''American dream and the American middle class.'' If you graduate, if you go to college, if you . . . then you will rise above the poverty line. Let me tell you, Mr. SANDERS, I feel more impoverished today than I ever have. Why? Because when I was poor, I didn't have nearly $100,000 of debt; essentially making me indentured to my country. That isn't freedom.

Finally, an e-mail from a woman in California in a city near San Francisco. This is the last letter:

Both my husband and I have faced significant pay cuts the last year. We feel grateful to still have jobs, however. Many of our friends our age have no jobs and have been out of work for many months with no prospects in sight.

We have 3 children and live in the high-cost San Francisco Bay Area, where we were born. A combined income of $100,000 to $150,000 doesn't go very far at all here when a modest townhouse costs almost $600,000 and everything else is proportionately more expensive. (The difference in the cost of living across the country is never taken into account by politicians planning tax breaks and should be . . .)

Our oldest daughter completed 2 years in Ameri-Corps after graduating from the University of Vermont where she got a Bachelor's degree in environmental science and conservation biology. Some of her student loans were forgiven by Ameri-Corps, but not many. Now she works for an environmental consulting firm in Boston but her wages are so low she can barely support herself and we are still paying $350 per month on her student loans that remain. We will owe $350 a month on those loans for the next 30 years—she has close to $70,000 left to pay off.

My husband is almost 61 and I am 52. We have nothing saved for retirement. One small IRA we have will be cashed out this year to pay for a new roof on our townhouse. We can barely meet our mortgage payments, property taxes and pay our bills. We live month to month.

Over the past year we have cut out many of the extras we used to consider necessities. My husband felt extremely guilty running up a charge card to buy much needed clothes for himself for work. He had not bought clothes for himself in about 5 years.

Our home is now worth less than the loans we have on it. There is no money to replace our old rug, (or even have it professionally shampooed), no money to fix our broken clothes dryer, no money to repair our bathroom sink, no money to take even a modest vacation for a few days. The list goes on and on.

We no longer have what we once considered a middle-class standard of living. Now we are nearing retirement years realizing we will have to work (if we have jobs) until we die. How could we ever exist on Social Security alone in this area? It would be impossible since we will not have our home even close to paid off.

I have never felt so despondent about the state of our life and our family's prospects for the future. We have slid down the economic ladder one rung at a time. I used to believe if we worked hard enough we would be rewarded for our work—but no longer believe that. We are working harder than ever and now make far less money. I see no improvement in our financial well-being in the future whatsoever.

I am beyond anger. I have no more tears. I only have two questions that no one seems to be able to answer.

Mr. President, I think it is appropriate to end on this note, and this is what she says:

I have only two questions that no one seems to be able to answer. Is everyone in Washington so far removed from the plight of our country's middle class that they cannot see what we are going through? Or do they see and simply not care?

I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and bring up the DeMint amendment No. 4474.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DODD. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, if I may, I will mention a few things about the amendment. I am, obviously, disappointed that a germane amendment cannot even be brought up in this debate. A part of this housing package is a $4 billion title III section that we are referring to as community development block grants. Many people here support those.

I wish to make clear to my colleagues this is not a normal block grant. What it is—in the name of helping homeowners who have lost their homes, this $4 billion goes to selected areas of the country where there has been the highest concentration of foreclosures. What it actually does is use taxpayer dollars to buy homes from banks. The banks have taken these homes from former homeowners. This money doesn't help the people who have lost their homes. It takes taxpayer money from all over the country and bales out the banks that now hold this. What we are going to end up with is this money that goes through States down to local communities, through the block grant process, to local communities themselves or through an intermediary who is actually buying private property now owned by the banks, and we are spending money to fix those homes up and then to sell them, the local communities—we are helping to make them property owners.

The bill, as written, does not prevent them from keeping the property as rental property. This will not only spend $4 billion, it will not necessarily do it in an equitable way around the country. It doesn't help homeowners who have lost their homes. In fact, it may hurt the homeowners who don't get the benefit of Government money to fix up their homes. They don't get bailed out if they cannot make their payments. What we are faced with is the Government fixing up a home. We are giving someone a tax credit to buy that home but not the one for sale next to it.

We know this process of how block grants work, and these have been deemed one of the least-effective programs by the General Accounting Office and other Government agencies that looked at this. We are going to funnel money from here to the States, to the local communities, to the banks, and the transactional costs to move these homes and to fix them up is going to probably be more than any value from it. We put responsible homeowners at a disadvantage in this package.

I encourage my colleagues to look at this whole bill. First of all, look at the process. If we cannot have a germane amendment postcloture—which was promised when this bill was brought

up—and we cannot strike a large provision such as this, which is clearly not in the interest of those who are hurting; it is obviously bailing out banks who have made bad loans, what this will ultimately do is encourage banks to foreclose on homes they might not have because they know they are going to get the Government to buy that home if they take it from the homeowner.

The perverse incentives built into this plan need to be thought through. There is no way this will work to help those who have been hurt. It is throwing the money into the wrong places and making homeowners out of local communities in an inequitable way in this country.

It is unfortunate we are not allowed to up bring this amendment and vote on it in a fair and open process. Nevertheless, I appreciate the opportunity to speak, and I appreciate the chairman's indulgence today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, let me say to my colleague from South Carolina, I appreciate his generous comments. We have reached a point where, obviously, we are trying to complete this product. We have been at this for over a week. There are a lot of good ideas, while I disagree with his conclusion on his own amendment. What we are trying to do, at the behest of the leadership, is accomplish as much as we can, where we can, and move forward. I have said this so many times, but if I were writing this on my own, it would look different. We live and work in an institution where we have to deal with 99 colleagues, and 435 in the other body, and an administration down the road. We are trying to package these ideas in a way that would win a majority of support here and will be accommodated in the other body and to receive the ultimate approval of the White House. It is an arduous journey and complicated and an emotionally charged set of issues. It is no easy path. While I, for one, have a number of ideas that have been offered by people I support—in fact, my own idea was rejected. As a principal negotiator, I wasn't able to convince my colleagues on the other side to take an idea that I might point out the Wall Street Journal this morning said the administration is moving closer and closer to. It is a very valid point that the Senator raised, and I agree a lot of what we are talking about is dealing with the effects of foreclosure. Whether you like the idea, we are dealing with after the fact. I would prefer to deal with an effort—and there are some provisions that deal with this—to keep people out of foreclosure.

But with a major thrust we ought to be talking about—and the administration, through the FHA Secure program, which they are opening, will do a large part of that—we are heading in the right direction.

On the CDBG, there are legitimate criticisms about that money. This program is very differently designed. We keep it far more targeted, with more accountability required. One of the values is the following. We are oversupplied in housing. The marketplace is not doing as well in resolving this issue because supply and demand is not working as it normally does because of the abundance of housing out there and the unavailability of capital to move a lot of it.

Our concern was, of course, not only to clean up the properties but to clean up the properties and move them because you get a declining value in neighborhoods with foreclosed properties. So that hard working neighbor my friend talked about who is sitting there going, wait a minute, I have done everything right here and I read all the documents and I made a responsible loan and here you are taking care of the property next door and someone is getting a break with the Government's help and I am not getting much out of it. Why are my tax dollars being used for that purpose?

My answer to his constituents, and to mine, is I understand what you are saying, but I am concerned because if the value of your property, which you have maintained and done everything right with, is declining by 1 percent immediately when the next-door neighbor's property or one down the block is foreclosed on, to allow that to deteriorate affects you directly. We know crime rates go up 2 percent and values, by as much as $2,000 to $5,000, go down that day on that property, and it will continue to decline as that neighborhood further deteriorates. So there is a direct correlation between trying to help the property get back on its feet, to make it marketable and able to be sold because the neighborhood will be adversely affected if we don't do that.

The community block grant program of $4 billion in this bill is targeted. It is right that it is after the fact. We ought to, ideally, figure out a way to keep a person out of foreclosure in the first place. In this bill, we don't do a lot about that. We do it with mortgage revenue bond proposals and with the counseling in the bill that does help.

Clearly, as the Presiding Officer and I heard at a hearing in his State in Philadelphia—we heard from people directly how counseling can make a difference. So there are some provisions which do minimize foreclosure.

In the absence of doing more, we need to ask ourselves: Can we do something when these properties do fall into that situation? That is why this Community Development Block Grant Program has value beyond putting tax money into a community, but making a difference possibly for those other homeowners who otherwise have watched everything they saved and worked for—their single source of wealth creation is in that house, and that equity they built up by being responsible over the years to protect themselves in retirement or to assist their child get a college education, to take care of that unforeseen problem that can happen with a health care crisis, that equity can make all the difference in the world—and through no fault of their own, they watched almost instantaneously that hard-earned equity decline rapidly because of what happened here.

Part of the goal here—and I cannot admit it is going to work in every case—is to make sure that homeowner is getting some protection. They ought to get something back for their tax dollars, and this is an indirect way to help them get back on their feet.

My colleague raised a legitimate point. If it is a great idea, why can't we vote on it? We have reached a point where we want to move on and complete the legislation. There are a lot of ideas we want to bring up. The general thought was to see if we couldn't complete this work and move on to a conclusion. I appreciate my colleague's comments. I thank him for his indulgence and consideration as well.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4400

Mr. COBURN. I ask unanimous consent the pending amendment be set aside and call up amendment No. 4400.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DODD. I object.

Mr. COBURN. I thank the chairman. I understand they desire no further votes on this amendment.

I ask to speak on the subject matter of my amendment, knowing that it will not get a vote—which is disturbing on such an issue as the one we have in front of us.

We are talking about housing. For years we have spent a tremendous amount of money on homelessness in this country. What this amendment would do, frankly, is help us know what to do on homelessness. It would cause us to take an in-depth look at our current state of homelessness in hopes of providing constructive solutions to that problem.

We have spent billions of dollars every year for Federal housing programs, but homelessness rates have remained constant for decades. In other words, it doesn't matter how much money we have spent, we have not seen a decline in homelessness. We ought to be about asking the question: What is wrong? We continue to spend more money. Yet we make no impact on the rate of homelessness.

A number of reviews have found Federal housing programs are ineffective and misspend too much money on nonhousing assistance, are not sufficiently

allocated or distributed, and are subject to tens of millions of dollars of waste and fraud. The waste and fraud actually has been documented. HUD's ability to effectively carry out its mission is so impaired that these shortcomings should be addressed if we ever hope to eliminate homelessness in our country.

In the past year alone the inspector general of the department found nearly $1 billion—let me restate that—one thousand million dollars in waste in HUD alone. That is their own inspector general. There is nothing in this bill that addresses this issue.

This amendment was designed for us to look at that. HUD also reported $1.5 billion, of which over 80 percent were overpayments in terms of improper payments.

The charge on the Congress is to manage the programs effectively. We have a bill before us, and we have an amendment that will help us do that. To me, it is disconcerting in the fact that we are not going to even take up and look at $2.25 billion worth of waste every year.

I have sympathies with the chairman and his ranking member in that they do not want other amendment votes. But this is an amendment we are going to see again. We are going to see it on an appropriations bill the next time we have one with anything to do with housing.

Here are the following criminal activities found at the Department of Housing and Urban Development: 2,684 arrests with the fraud, 1,338 indictments, and 1,055 convictions.

We are going to pass a housing bill, and we are not going to address these issues? We are not even going to vote on them, even though we have 1,055 convictions and 1,338 indictments on fraud and overpayment and corruption within the Department of Housing and Urban Development?

In efforts to remedy the housing problems, Congress has allocated $4 billion to HUD's community development block grants. One of the vehicles HUD uses to combat homelessness is this CDBG program. An OMB analysis determined that the CDBG grants were ineffective in accomplishing what they intended to accomplish.

The conclusion stated that major problems, including the lack of a clear purpose and an annual and long-term outcome measure—in other words, there is no metric to see if the money we are spending is doing any good. There is no requirement on us, either through this bill or any other bill, that there be a measurement to say we will spend money to help homelessness but look to see if that is effective. None of that is available. It is not available. Also, it was noted they did not target funds to the areas of greatest need. They went to the areas of greatest political influence, not the areas of greatest homelessness. And the inability to produce transparent information.

The whole idea behind this amendment would help HUD and Congress address those very issues. It also will help us know what to do about it, if we actually find them.

The average age of the world's democracies is 200 years. That is the average. They are not conquered. They die from within. They die over lose fiscal policy. Those are not my words. That is a paraphrase of the Scottish historian as he looked at the Athenian Empire and wrote about it about the time our country was being founded. I daresay I have great concerns for us as a free country when we will allow $2.25 billion a year to be defrauded out of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and then we will not allow an amendment that doesn't change it. It just says let's look at it and find out where it is and what we can do about it. We are not going to allow it on a housing bill.

It is interesting where we have come. We say we want to help the people who are in the midst of a housing emergency, in the midst of problems with their mortgages, in the midst of those who were either being gamed into a mortgage or stupidly going into a mortgage they couldn't afford, but at the same time we will not do the real work we are asked to do, which is to make sure the programs we do have, that are already authorized, already funded, are run efficiently. It is no wonder confidence in us is lacking.

Here is $2.25 billion that we could address in this bill toward a solution—toward finding out how we at least eliminate 70 or 80 percent of that, and we will not even allow an amendment to address that.

That is not a reflection on the chairman. I understand what he and the ranking member are trying to do to get this bill through. But this is not an amendment to which anybody should have any opposition. This is an amendment that should be accepted; to say, yes, we need to study this. We need to find it. Yet when we have asked for that it has been denied.

My only thought is, either we do not want to look at the fraud and we do not want to look at the overpayments or we think it is just fine.

That is what I am left with and that is what the American people are left with. Mr. President, $2.25 billion would do a lot to help a lot of people having trouble with their mortgages today. That $2.25 billion could come back in and, if directed in the proper way, could significantly increase the effort of holding onto the homes of 100,000 people. Yet we are not going to look at it.

There is no question we need to do more. Unfortunately, I am not going to be able to vote for this bill because we are going to give tax credit to builders who don't need to have a tax credit. We are going to give $4.5 billion more in CDBG block grant money that HUD already said hasn't been spent wisely to begin with. We already have $1 billion worth of fraud in it. I will not support the bill.

I do support the right of the chairman in managing the bill in the way he is managing it at the present time, but I also will say this amendment will be back—as it should—not just for us, and not, as it should, just for the taxpayers but the real taxpayers who are going to pay back this $2.25 billion, which is our kids.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MENENDEZ). The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Vermont wants to be heard, but let me just say a few things to my friend from Oklahoma.

First of all, I appreciate his comments about the importance of monitoring and overseeing the programs, the homeless programs in the McKinney-Vento legislation that goes back some time.

He may not be aware of this, but I will raise it with him anyway.

Senator ALLARD of Colorado and Senator REED of Rhode Island have offered a piece of legislation to modernize and streamline the McKinney-Vento legislation. It passed out of the Banking Committee some months ago unanimously. I commend Senator ALLARD and Senator REED for working together in a bipartisan fashion to come forward with the proposals dealing with homelessness.

The bill—and it can be corrected—we brought up here to bring it up on the consent calendar with anyone who wanted to offer some amendments to it. It sounds as if my colleague from Oklahoma has an amendment that would be right on the subject matter of the Reed-Allard proposal. There has been a hold on the legislation to come forward with that bill, offered by our two colleagues from Colorado and Rhode Island, that specifically addresses the issues, although I am not suggesting exactly the amendment my colleague from Oklahoma has, but it would seem to me that would be an appropriate place to deal with homeless programs.

We may have exact numbers—I tried to inquire here whether it is 1.8 or 2.1. It is a lot of money, obviously, and I do not question that at all. But we do have a bill that is enjoying pretty board-based support here. Rarely, I might add, do we see that—it comes out of a committee of jurisdiction that authored and wrote this legislation, unanimously adopted by every Banking Committee member who had an opportunity to go through the hearings and watch all of it.

I am more than prepared—I do not want to speak for Senators ALLARD and REED—that bill could be done this evening, and possibly the amendment suggested by my friend from Oklahoma could be a part of that to go forward. He understands the situation Senator SHELBY and I are in, in trying to get this particular bill done. If that hold could come off the legislation and someone sit down and try to work on

this provision, we might very well accommodate the very issue that goes to the heart of the homeless programs.

So I raise that with him. It is S. 1518. It did come out I think several months ago.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, first of all, I am the individual who has a hold on that bill because I think we need to have real property reform, and there is a bill that is coming out of the Homeland Security Committee that is a bipartisan bill authored by Senator CARPER, with the cosponsorship of both Senator COLLINS and Senator LIEBERMAN, that has real property reform.

As the Senator knows, McKinney-Vento places a limitation on all Federal properties before they can ever be disposed of. So the real property reform needs to go through at the same time the McKinney-Vento bill goes through so that we reform both of those, so that we still protect the rights of the homeless in this country but at the same time enable the agencies of the Federal Government to dispose of them. We now have 22,000 pieces of property the Federal Government does not want but we can't get rid of. So the reason that is being held up is we are trying to get those to move together and in tandem so that we can fix both problems at the same time.

I would say this in response to the Senator. I understand how you have locked arms to move this bill, but what the American people are not going to understand is, if there is $2 billion worth of waste—and there is; the IG of HUD said it, there is no question about it, a billion dollars worth of fraud, a thousand convictions, another $1.2 billion in overpayments to supposed landlords. There is no reason not to fix that right now. It can be fixed with this bill. This bill is going to get passed, it is going to get signed. Move it and fix it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD. Reclaiming my right on the floor, there is a vehicle moving including, possibly, the legislation that is coming from Senator CARPER here. It seems to me that making a case for exactly why probably allowing that bill to come up, the very bill that Senator ALLARD and Senator REED have drafted on homelessness that was unanimously adopted by the committee after significant work would be the right place—if people have ideas and suggestions on how to deal with Federal property or deal with allegations of fraud and the like, that is the vehicle.

As my colleague from Oklahoma points out, he is the only member with a hold on that bill, so we are not going to be able to get to it, and the suggestion somehow that we are denying him an opportunity is really not the case. I am more than willing to entertain ideas and thoughts, and I do not want to speak for Senator ALLARD and Senator REED—they are the authors of the legislation—but I am confident they would be more than willing to sit down and listen to the arguments and possibly include ideas in the legislation.

Ninety-nine Members of this body have decided that this bill is a pretty good bill, and one Member has not. I respect that. You have the right to do that here. But I think the right to do that should also suggest that when you stand up and suggest we are not welcoming enough of an idea here in this bill, we might properly put our attention at the focus where it deserves to be, and that is on bipartisan legislation specifically dealing with the issue of homelessness, which includes various other ideas, and we can get that done.

So I apologize to my colleague from Vermont, but I wanted to address that situation and the work of the committee, on which the Presiding Officer is a member, dealing with these issues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wanted to say a few words in support of the Clean Energy Tax Stimulus Act, an amendment to the housing bill offered by Senators CANTWELL and ENSIGN. Before I begin, let me thank Senator CANTWELL for her determined efforts to ensure that we don't stand by while our renewable energy industry and energy efficiency industry lose jobs due to expiring tax policy.

In these times of economic uncertainty, while we work to create new jobs in the green economy of the future, we must also make sure we do not lose existing jobs in the small green economy we already have, and Senator CANTWELL, along with many of my colleagues, has made that a priority. I thank her for that.

The clean energy tax stimulus amendment which the Senate is expected to vote on later today and which is based on a stand-alone bill introduced last week, which I am strongly cosponsoring, extends financial incentives for renewable energy and energy efficiency that would otherwise expire this year, and that is something we must make absolutely sure does not happen.

More specifically, the amendment would extend for 1 year the current production tax credit—commonly called the PTC—which supports the generation of electricity from renewable energy such as wind, biomass, and geothermal. Additionally, the amendment would extend for 8 years the business investment tax credit which provides financial help for larger scale fuel cell and solar investments and the residential investment tax credit that helps homeowners by giving them the tax credit for up to 30 percent of the cost of a solar PV unit and up to $2,000 for the installation of solar hot water heaters.

Finally, in terms of energy efficiency, the amendment we will vote on today would extend for 1 year the current credits for energy efficiency improvements for heating and cooling systems, windows, and other qualified residential property, and it also extends the tax credit for building homes that are energy efficient. In addition, the amendment extends tax credits for the purchase of energy-efficient appliances.

As you know, wind energy is the fastest growing source of energy throughout to entire world. Unfortunately, in our country today, the wind industry is seeing a dropoff in investment which will quickly lead to the loss of thousands of jobs. This is totally absurd. The American people want to move to sustainable energy. They want to move to wind energy.

There are businesses out there prepared to build and install wind turbines. Yet we are not providing them the help they need to help us deal with global warming and also to create many good-paying jobs. Every month that passes without a production tax credit extension diminishes the industry's capacity to create jobs, spur economic growth, and produce electricity that helps us reduce global warming. In fact, the American Wind Energy Association projects that the rate of growth in American wind power will decrease by more than 70 percent between this year and next in the absence of an extension of the production tax credit. This is totally absurd. All over the world, countries are growing good jobs in terms of wind, and we are on the verge of losing jobs despite the fact that the American people want to move us toward sustainable energy. What we are doing contrasts sharply with the current trend of dramatic wind power growth that could otherwise be expected to continue. People want sustainable energy, people want wind power, and here we are sitting back, not providing the help the people in the wind industry desperately need.

If we do not extend the PTC, we will waste a tremendous opportunity to preserve existing jobs, create many thousands of new good-paying jobs this year alone, and build, in addition, another 5,000 megawatts of new wind energy, which will spur another $10 billion in economic activity.

Let me say a few words about the solar tax credit. The investment tax credit is responsible for an estimated 6,000 high-quality jobs that were created in the solar sector in 2007 alone, and another 9,000 to 12,000 are expected in 2008 if Congress sends the signal that this tax credit is here to stay. That is, of course, exactly what we must be doing.

Without an extension of the ITC, some have estimated that we would lose over $8 billion in investments that would have been made, leading to a net loss of almost 40,000 jobs in the solar photovoltaic sector alone in 2009.

The ITC has real implications also for utility-scale solar projects. I have talked to people in the solar thermal plant business, talked to some of the major utility companies. We have a potential in this country to produce an enormous amount of clean, relatively inexpensive electricity through solar thermal plants which are now beginning to move in the Mojave Desert, in

Nevada, in New Mexico, and Arizona. It turns out that based on the geography of the Southeast, there is enormous potential for dozens of solar thermal units that could produce a significant amount of electricity that our country needs. That electricity could be produced at a reasonable cost, in an effective way, emitting virtually no greenhouse gas emissions. It is sitting there waiting to happen, and our job has to be to help those people in the utilities that want to move forward. Without an extension of the ITC, these types of projects will be in jeopardy or, in fact, face a significant delay.

Additionally, we are seeing a new solar powerplant located 70 miles southwest of Phoenix, AZ, and scheduled to go into operation by 2011 which would not go on line without the benefits of the ITC. The 280-megawatt facility is expected to generate revenue of over $4 billion, bringing over $1 billion in economic benefits to the State of Arizona and enough electricity to power 70,000 homes. The solar thermal unit being planned by Pacific Gas and Electric would provide electricity of 553 megawatts for over 400,000 homes.

All of this is sitting there waiting to happen, and all over the world people are wondering, What is the U.S. Congress doing to stimulate this type of activity? Today is our day.

Let's take a quick look at the importance of extending the PTC and the ITC, but let's not forget that extending these credits has a ripple effect on other sectors of the economy. For example, the American Council on Renewable Energy estimates that for every job created in renewable manufacturing, there are an additional three high-quality jobs created to design, install, operate, and maintain the renewable energy infrastructure.

So I think it is pretty clear that we must act today to, at the very least, extend some of the current renewable energy and energy-efficiency tax credits. I myself hope we are going to go a lot further than this, but what we have to do is an absolute necessity.

Let me conclude once again by thanking Senator CANTWELL for her leadership on this issue. This is enormously important. The rest of the world is moving in order to deal with global warming, in order to create good-paying jobs. We have to pass this legislation today, and we have to go beyond that in the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise today to encourage our colleagues to support the passage, hopefully later today, of the Foreclosure Prevention Act of 2008, the legislation that has been on the Senate floor for the better part of a week now.

I like to think of this legislation not in isolation but as the third piece, if you will, of a series of steps that have been taken to try to stabilize our economy, to restore confidence in our economy, and to infuse liquidity into our financial system.

The first was really a series of steps taken by the Federal Reserve. The Federal Reserve has acted in an extraordinary way, not just in monetary policy and trying to lower the Fed funds rate but also in encouraging Federal banks to act and now investment banks to take advantage of the discount money, to borrow money when they need it, for the Federal Reserve to be willing to take and swap, if you will, highly liquid Treasury securities for very illiquid mortgage-backed securities that a lot of our banks are holding in their portfolios, allowing those swaps to take place to infuse liquidity into the banking system to encourage banks to begin lending money again.

The Federal Reserve is involved, as we all know, with JPMorgan Chase to engineer their takeover of Bear Stearns to prevent it from going into bankruptcy and probably creating a domino effect that would have brought down other financial entities and maybe made a bad situation even worse.

Those are some of the things the Federal Reserve has done. The Presiding Officer is different, he is not as old as me, but I have never seen the Federal Reserve take these kinds of steps as we enter into a period with this kind of uncertainty. But that is the first series of things that has been done, needed to be done, and is being done by the Federal Reserve. I applaud their action.

The second piece is the stimulus package we voted on and debated here a month or two ago and passed. Sometimes when stimulus packages are agreed to by Congress and the President, it takes so long to debate the package that by the time the effect actually takes place, we are coming out of the recession and it can have the overstimulative effect providing inflationary pressures. In this case, I think what has happened is the Congress and the President agreed in a timely way on our stimulus package, and it will have a modest effect on our economy, probably in the second half of this year. Some have said it will raise gross domestic product by as much as 1.5 percent by the second half of the year. I think the most important thing that came out of the adoption of the stimulus package was to send a clear signal to people, taxpayers and others, businesses, that around here, when the chips are down, Democrats and Republicans, Congress and the President can still agree on a series of actions to help boost the economy, to give the economy a little bit of a jump start.

The third piece in this process is the legislation before us this week and last. I call it a housing recovery package. There are a number of elements to it that are meritorious. I wouldn't oversell this package. This by itself is not going to save the day and prevent all foreclosures and bring the housing market back overnight or within a couple of weeks or months. But it is a third of a series of steps that will be helpful. It is going to be followed within the next maybe 2 months with a handful of other steps that I will talk about in a few minutes. Let me talk about some of the elements I think are most beneficial in this housing recovery package that is before us today. The centerpiece is FHA modernization.

The Federal Housing Administration was created about 75 years ago. It was born during the Great Depression. Out of the FHA came the possibility for home ownership for a lot of people who otherwise would never have become home buyers. People wonder, where did we get the 30-year fixed rate mortgages. They were a creation of FHA, a legacy of FHA. As recently as 6, 7, 8 years ago, probably 15 to 20 percent of mortgages were guaranteed or insured by the FHA, 15 to 20 percent. Last year the number was about 5 percent. We dropped, in roughly half a dozen years, from 15 to 20 percent of home mortgages insured by FHA to last year about 5 percent.

Where did those mortgages go? Where did people go for financial help to buy a home? A lot of them went to places they should not have gone. A lot of them ended up being induced or seduced and convinced to use a different kind of a financing. They used exotic adjustable rate mortgages, some of them with no money down, no principal payments for an extended period of time. Some of these exotic adjustable rate mortgages called for very low interest, seductive teaser rates which may have been 2, 3, 4 percent at the beginning and would later go up by reset within a couple of years to be 7, 8, or 9 percent. A lot of folks ended up signing on to this deal and didn't realize there is a penalty for trying to refinance out of an adjustable rate mortgage, making it very difficult. I suppose the borrower and maybe the mortgage broker or the lending institution that was involved, everybody expected housing prices to continue to go up; they had for years. As long as housing prices continue to rise, everybody comes out of the hole. If somebody is unable to make payments, they sell the house, do it for profit and pay off their mortgage. Not many people thought about what happens if prices, instead of going up, all of a sudden come down. They have come down, and in some places they have come down a lot.

Part of our legislation is designed to encourage people to take a second look at FHA. For folks, especially first-time home buyers or people who have less than perfect credit, the FHA in the past has been their avenue to become homeowners. We wanted to make sure it is an option that is there for the 21st century.

Without getting into a whole lot of detail, let me say, of all the pieces that are part of this bill, the most important one is FHA modernization. I will mention a couple of those elements that I think are helpful. One of those takes the FHA loan limit starting at

the end of this year to $550,000. Instead of being $420,000, it takes it up to $550,000. In Delaware, you can get a perfectly good house for $420,000. In some places in New Jersey one can get a perfectly good house for $420,000. In some places in New Jersey you probably can't. A lot of places in California, Florida, Connecticut, home values are such that for $420,000, which is the FHA loan limit that will be in effect next January 1, you can buy a cottage, but if you want to think about buying a three-bedroom house with a garage and a bathroom, you can forget about buying anything close to that for $420,000. What we want to do is address the needs in high-cost housing areas so that FHA will still be relevant in those States, as well as in States that have more modest housing costs.

The second element of this bill that is good is that the bill seeks to streamline the bureaucracy of FHA. We hear a good deal about that from banks and from realtors, that the bureaucracy is inappropriate for the 21st century. We have streamlined it. We do that in the context of this legislation.

Another element that I believe is helpful is, we are going to make more available counseling assistance to people who need it as they are looking for a place to buy and to consider their options. There is a new pilot credit scoring program that will be created. It is designed to increase access to credit for borrowers who may have a history of making required payments on time but haven't established a sufficient credit rating to enable them to be considered as serious home buyers.

Those are some of the pieces of the FHA modernization portion of this bill. It is maybe the most important thing we are going to do.

A second important element of this bill deals with community development block grants. We appropriated this year around the country, I want to say, roughly $4 billion to communities, State and local governments, moneys they can use to help develop their communities. We want to make sure that some additional moneys—in this case, another roughly $4 billion—might be made available to State and local governments to help communities that have been hit hard by foreclosures and delinquencies. The money could be put to use in many communities around the country.

A third element of this bill that I believe has merit deals with housing authorities. Housing authorities currently are able to issue tax-exempt revenue bonds. The proceeds of those tax-exempt revenue bonds are used in probably every State in the country to allow people to become first-time home buyers and to realize a low interest rate. They do this with moneys raised by tax-exempt revenue bonds. The proceeds of these same bonds can be used by housing authorities to build multifamily, affordable housing as well. The proceeds of these bonds cannot be used, though, to assist in refinancing of subprime loans. With this legislation, we say you can do that, too. State and local housing authorities can use the proceeds of these tax-exempt revenue bonds. In fact, we allow them to issue another $10 billion worth and a permissible use is to help folks to refinance out of these subprime loans that they have gotten themselves into.

Another element of this bill is actually one offered by our colleague Senator ISAKSON from Georgia. He has been good enough to let me advise some changes in his earlier proposal. Let's use the situation here. We have 100 desks here, and we will assume for this example that these are not desks but homes in a community. Maybe there are two or three of these homes where the families have run into trouble and cannot keep up with the mortgage payments. The homes have gone into foreclosure and they are decaying, the grass is growing, the shrubbery is not cut, trash not removed. Those homes are destroyed and beginning to decay, and they bring down the value of the other homes in the community. Senator ISAKSON suggested that we allow a tax credit to be used for someone who will come in and buy a home in foreclosure and live there. He proposed that that person be provided by the U.S. Treasury a $5,000 tax credit. To buy a foreclosed home and to agree to live there, $5,000 for year 1, $5,000 for year 2, $5,000 for year 3, is a pretty expensive proposition. That would certainly get people's attention and encourage them to buy homes in foreclosure, but it is a serious hit on the Treasury.

I urged him—I am sure others did as well—to make the proposal a little more modest. What he has done, I think prudently, is to say, in the same situation, a home in foreclosure, to encourage people to come in and buy homes in foreclosure so they don't bring down the values of other properties, that they will get a tax credit but year 1 is $3,500 and year 2 is another $3,500; $7,000 in all as a tax credit from the Treasury to the person making that purchase. It is more modest. There is an impact on the Treasury, but it is not nearly as great as would otherwise have been the case. It is a good proposal.

Another idea in this legislation that makes a lot of sense deals with people who are in some distress—maybe they have lost their job, they have sickness in the family, they are finding it difficult to pay their bills, they are getting behind on their mortgage payments. They are not sure what to do, and sometimes they end up turning to people who take advantage of them, shysters who take advantage of them. And rather than helping them with their problems, to work their way through it, they take advantage of the distressed homeowner.

There are nonprofit entities. They work under a broad umbrella of something called the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation. The shorthand title is NeighborWorks. And the idea there is to have these nonprofits provide counseling assistance. They are not trying to take advantage of home homeowners in distress. They want to help them find the best option for themselves and their family. We provided, I think through HUD's budget, about $200 million initially. That money has been used. Under this legislation we provide about another $100 million, maybe more. I think an amendment by Senator MURRAY would take that up a bit higher. The idea is to make sure that when people are in trouble and they turn to someone for help, they will turn to someone who is really going to help them. This is a good proposal as well.

Senator REED of Rhode Island has offered an amendment that has been made part of the package that seeks to address complex paper disclosure. When you buy a house, you have all these papers. You sit down with a realtor. It is pretty confusing stuff, even for people who are pretty smart. Senator REED has come up with some suggestions that would protect a person who is going through the forms, trying to understand what they are signing on to. Without going into a lot of detail, his ideas have a great deal of merit and are part of the package and ought to be.

As to another element of the package—I say this as a veteran who served in the Navy during the Vietnam war and came back; they had to protect us—to protect others who have served in our Armed Forces since, we have something called the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act.

The idea is to try to make sure our soldiers and sailors—particularly when they are deployed overseas—and their families are not taken advantage of. We have given them, if you will, a break in making sure they are not taken advantage of by those who are, for example, lenders who loaned money to them.

Right now, the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act—say I am deployed to Iraq or Afghanistan. I come back from my year or 15-month deployment. My home cannot have been foreclosed on. My family and I live in the home, and we had a hard time making our mortgage payment. Maybe I gave up my regular civilian job and took a much lower paying job, was called up for Active Duty in the military, and I have been unable to keep up with my mortgage payments.

Under the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act, my home could not be foreclosed on for at least 3 months while I am away and for 3 months from when I come back from that deployment. This legislation would extend that by an additional 6 months. I would be protected for 9 months, my family would be protected for 9 months, after my return to, hopefully, get back on our feet to be able to meet our financial obligations.

Also, this provision provides returning soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines with 1 year of relief from increases in mortgage interest rates. Where these adjustable rate mortgages are resetting, the military personnel get an extra year.

The final part of this provision is that the Department of Defense is required to establish a counseling program to ensure veterans and active servicemembers can access assistance if they have seen financial difficulties. Again, the idea is for folks who are in distress—in this case, military personnel—who are homeowners, that they could actually get access to advice from people who have the best interests of the veterans at heart.

Those are some of the provisions, not all of the provisions. There are other provisions dealing with standard property deductions and to allow folks who do not itemize to take a standard deduction—$500 for single filers, $1,000 for joint filers. It is in this legislation.

There is an extension of net operating loss carry-back that will help some of the homebuilders who are in trouble. There were concerns raised. I think Senator GREGG raised the concern yesterday—and there are other concerns about it as well—that the cost to the Treasury is considerable. The cost over 10 years, I am told, is about $6 billion, so it is not inconsequential. But we also know among the companies that are undergoing real distress right now are those that build homes. This is designed to try to extend some relief to them.

Senator MIKE CRAPO of Idaho and I have offered an amendment which has been accepted by both Senator DODD and Senator SHELBY on behalf of the majority and minority sides that tries to help homeowners who are in distress in another way. A lot of people do not know in this country we have something called the Federal Home Loan Banks. There are 12 of them across the country. Together they make up the Federal Home Loan Bank system. A primary job they have is to raise money they then turn around and lend to smaller financial institutions, principally for home ownership, to make home ownership more affordable.

Delaware is in the Pittsburgh Federal Home Loan Bank region. A lot of financial institutions—banks, savings and loans—work with the Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh. They get loans, if you will, below market-rate loans, from the Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh.

But one of the requirements under Federal law is these Federal Home Loan Banks have to contribute 10 percent of their net income into an affordable housing fund. The affordable housing fund is used by local entities, local financial banks, local financial entities, banks, thrifts, in order to provide home ownership opportunities for, in a lot of cases, first-time home buyers or low-income home buyers. It is a good program. We use it a lot in my State. It is used to leverage money from State and local governments. It is used to leverage money from nonprofits, from for-profits, from banks. It is a real good thing.

The problem with this affordable housing program fund is none of the moneys in this program can be used to help subsidize or refinance—somebody who is in one of these adjustable rate mortgages that is resetting. They need to refinance and get out of it and maybe get into a 30-year fixed rate mortgage. This is affordable housing money. It is compiled. It is built up. It is about a third of a billion dollars this year. It cannot be used to help folks refinance out of a mortgage they have no business being in. This amendment that has been accepted will allow that to take place.

My friend, Senator MCCASKILL of Missouri, along with Senator KOHL and myself, has offered an amendment. I understand it has been accepted, and we are grateful for that. That amendment seeks to protect folks who have taken advantage of reverse mortgages.

One of the nice things about being a homeowner with equity in your home, in a lot of cases when you reach an older age and maybe your home is paid off, you ought to be able to live off the equity of your home for the rest of your life. In some cases, people who are in that situation do not get very good advice, and they are duped into making investments with the equity of their home in ways that really do not help the homeowner trying to live off the equity of their home for the rest of their life. It helps them less than maybe someone who is a scoundrel trying to take advantage of them.

So Senator MCCASKILL's amendment, that Senator KOHL and I have joined in sponsoring, allows HUD to use a portion of the mortgage insurance premiums collected under this program to adequately fund counseling and disclosure activities. So the idea there is to make sure people have good advice. If you think about it, that is a theme of almost every element I have talked about in this bill. Many of the elements of this bill are designed to make sure that consumers, homeowners, purchasers have access to good advice, someone who is going to be there for them and not take advantage of them.

I said this housing recovery package is the third step so far of three steps we need to take. The first step is action by the Federal Reserve; the second step, our stimulus package; the third step is our housing recovery package; a fourth step, that I hope will follow in the next month or two—certainly before we get to the Memorial Day recess—is when the Senate Banking Committee takes up another measure that will consider a Hope proposal, one that Senator DODD and Congressman FRANK have been working on that has a lot of merit to help people, families whose mortgage is underwater; that is, they owe more than the value of their property, find a way to get out of that situation.

The lenders, the investors, the homeowners themselves will probably take a little bit of a financial haircut, but by doing that they would be able to stay in their homes and maybe end up with a little bit of equity in their homes in the end.

A number of us—Senator MARTINEZ and I and Senator SCHUMER and Senator JACK REED—have been very much interested, along with some of our colleagues, in trying to make sure we have a strong independent regulator for Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and the Federal Home Loan Banks. That ought to be part of our next package. We need to license mortgage brokers to make sure they have the kind of training and the kind of regulatory structure under which to operate, to make sure the appraisals that are written on a lot of homes are actually worth the paper on which they are written.

So there is a lot that can be done and should be done, and my hope is we will have the opportunity to take those up, have hearings as appropriate in the Banking Committee, and mark them up before the Memorial Day recess and literally have them on the Senate floor to debate by the Fourth of July. That would be good for our country, and that would be the fourth step, if you will, to help stabilize our economy, to begin to restore some confidence in our economy, especially in the housing sector of our economy, and to make sure we put some liquidity back into our financial system and our banking system where it is needed.

But the last thing, and maybe the most helpful, it would do is to clearly demonstrate to folks around this country that this place still works, that Democrats and Republicans can find common ground, work with the administration, and do what is in the best interests of our country, our citizens, and our families.

None of what is done in the legislation that is before us today is designed to reward bad behavior. For people who have been borrowers and bought homes as a speculator, where they were interested in buying it to watch the price go up, to simply flip it, flip the house, and take advantage of these exotic adjustable rate mortgages to do that, to work the system, and to look for some short-term profit, we are not interested in helping.

With all due respect, we are not interested in borrowers who have misbehaved or mortgage brokers or investors who have misbehaved. That is not what this is about. This initiative is to restore confidence in the system, liquidity in the system, and to say to people: The system—our legislative system, our political system—still works, and it works for the interests of people who need our help.

That said, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise to speak about an amendment I have

offered with Senator WICKER from Mississippi. Our amendment is pending. It is germane. We hope to have a vote sometime soon on this amendment, if we can move past this present standstill.

I want to just put up some numbers to try to explain our situation in Louisiana. I have used this chart before. This chart is the underlying reason for the bill that we are on because these are the top 10 districts in the country, according to the official data, where these foreclosures are taking place.

As you can see, there are about 40,000 distressed properties in and around Detroit; about 10,000 in Stockton, CA; 30,000 in Las Vegas; about 51,000 in San Bernardino, CA; about 23,000 in Sacramento; about 27,000 around the Cleveland area—and it goes on. These are the top 10.

Now, this data is readily available. I am sorry I do not have more than just the top 10. But I used this chart to make my point about our situation still in Louisiana and on the gulf coast.

You can see, the percentage of households in Detroit is about 5 percent; the same with Stockton, CA, and Las Vegas is 4 percent. That is a real crisis in those areas. It seems like a small percentage, but if you are in a neighborhood where there is a concentration of these kinds of homes, the problem is—and what we are trying to solve, those of us who are supporting this bill; and I am supporting this bill—to try to provide some additional community development block grant funding because not only are we trying to perhaps come up with State-based local solutions that might help these particular families, but the real tragedy, in my mind, is those families around these homes who did absolutely nothing wrong. They took out a 30-year mortgage. They have paid their mortgage every month. They did not enter into any flimflam kind of agreement.

But the problem is, as homes collapse around them and become vacant and are foreclosed on, these homeowners who did nothing wrong, who have most of their net worth tied up in the value of their home, are seeing, through no fault of their own, their property values plummeting.

Now, if you are a young person, and you are a homeowner in this situation, you might have time to ride it out. But if you are a senior getting ready to retire, or if you are getting ready, in middle age, to send your two children to college and were hoping to refinance your home to do that and had planned for 20 years—this was your plan to send your kids to college. You did not get to go to college, but you have saved and scrimped and worked hard, and you were going to refinance your house to send your children to college. Guess what. Your kids do not go to college because your neighbor took out a subprime loan, and it is causing your property value to plummet.

Now, I know the President does not understand why community development block grant moneys are important. He does not understand a lot of things. But some of us do understand why we need to help people in these neighborhoods.

So I am just explaining that while the numbers are very high, and these percentages are startling, I want to show you what our numbers look like in Louisiana because if these look bad, ours are terrible.

It is not because we had foreclosure problems. It is not because we have subprime—in fact, our State does not really have the same problem that California and Nevada are facing. But we had our own sets of catastrophes, and that, of course, was in the storms of a few years ago, Katrina and Rita, that hit the gulf coast—both just historic in their devastation.

We are still having a housing crisis throughout the gulf coast, really from Alabama to the southern part of Texas, as people struggle with the impact of those storms. In New Orleans and Saint Bernard and in the southeastern portion of Louisiana, our situation was even further complicated when the Federal levees that should have held did not. They failed, and people who had never had an inch of water in their home had 14 feet and lost everything they had worked for their entire lives.

So in St. Bernard Parish we see not 5 percent, not 4 percent but 54 percent of the homes are empty or devastated. In Cameron, LA, not 4 percent or 5 percent but 46 percent of the homes; in Plaquemines Parish, 44 percent; in Orleans Parish, 78,000, almost 80,000, out of only 122,000. That is an extremely high percentage almost 42 percent of households that are still damaged or destroyed.

Now, what has been done to help these homeowners? Some have been able to collect their insurance, but very few people have collected all of what they thought they were due. Some have collected a modest grant we gave from this Congress of an average of $60,000. Some have received—that is about the average for homeowners. But I would contend that a $60,000 to $75,000 to $85,000 grant and some insurance proceeds they were able to receive does not, by any means, get these homeowners back to where they need to be.

So we have tried to pass additional legislation that might help and have been unable to move anything substantial through the Housing Committee. However, we now see an opportunity on this floor on a housing bill that is attempting to reach communities that are in distress—ours is in distress for a different reason, not, as I said, because of failure to pay or because of delinquency or foreclosure. We see an opportunity, by making a very modest change in the underlying bill, to help these homeowners. This would make it clear, with the amendment I offer with Senator WICKER—our amendment would simply say that in the community development block grant portion of this bill, that it be allowed to be used not just for homes that were foreclosed but for homes that were conveyed to local land banks.

To deal with this situation, we have created in Louisiana—or are in the process of actually creating—parishwide authorities that are done at the local level; they are called land banks. They have other names for them, such as redevelopment authorities. They exist throughout the country. It is not anything new. But we are finding we may need to be supporting these kinds of land banks as properties are conveyed back to the Government—not in every case, but some people are making choices. They don't want to rebuild in that place; they would rather take their grant money and build somewhere else. That piece of property is then conveyed back to our State land bank, and our land bank is trying to move these properties back to local parish-based land banks so these neighborhoods can be redeveloped with some sort of rhyme and reason to them; so it is not hit or miss but that there is some sort of local planning. We are being required to build better and stronger and smarter. We are trying to actually live up to that challenge by being smart about the way we redevelop.

I see the ranking member of the committee on the floor, the Senator from Alabama, who is familiar, of course, with some of the devastation that occurred because some of it, unfortunately, happened in Mobile—not to the extent it happened in the southern part of Mississippi and Louisiana. But what I am saying to the Senator from Alabama is that with one modest change that actually is germane, according to the Chair, and does not cost anything, we would simply allow our portion of whatever comes to Louisiana and Mississippi—not a dime more than what is already in the bill—to be used for land banks associated with the redevelopment of these kinds of properties. I am afraid, if we don't make this change, it might put Mississippi and Louisiana and, frankly, Alabama and parts of Texas in the position of not being able to use their community development block grants for the problem they have.

So in this whole country, some States have problem A. In other States, we have problem B. I am trying to make sure our problem is met with this amendment. It is not adding anything; it is an allowable use of our community development block grant, and it will go a long way to help.

Now, we estimate—I don't know if the Senator from Alabama has these numbers—that for our State, based on the formula that is in the bill, Louisiana may get somewhere between $90 million and $100 million, but we don't know until that formula is promulgated by the Secretary of HUD, but we estimate that based on the formulas in the bill. So we want to make sure the $90 million or $100 million can actually

be used to help these homeowners because they are technically not in foreclosure. They are in various stages of legal status, but they are not necessarily in foreclosure.

So that is the purpose of our community development block grant amendment. I would most certainly appreciate it if the leadership would take a look at it. Again, it is amendment No. 4447. It doesn't cost anything. It is scored at zero. I have a great partner in offering this amendment, the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. WICKER. So that is the community development block grant amendment.

I wish to take a moment to also talk about the mortgage revenue bonds, which is part of the financing part of this bill. As my colleagues know, this bill is basically made up of two different sections. One is a housing section and then one is a tax section. In the tax section of this bill, one of the ways the Finance Committee wants to try to alleviate some of the problems around the country is to allow the issuance of some additional mortgage revenue bonds. We have done this for years and years and years. Before I was a Senator, I was the State treasurer. I used to issue these bonds in my State. They are a very good tool to promote home ownership, which we believe in at home in Louisiana, and I am sure everyone else does as well. It gives opportunities to build affordable, low-income housing where there is a real need throughout the country, particularly now in the gulf coast.

One of the things I am very concerned about—I don't know if the Senator from Alabama or the Senator from Utah, who is on the floor, experienced this in their States, but we have a real shortage of affordable housing for seniors, as more people want to live independently, but they don't necessarily want to live in a 2,000- or 3,000-square-foot home by themselves. They would like to move somewhere closer to maybe where their family is, and they would like an affordable rental unit. Some people would like to buy a condo, but to people of a certain age bracket, a condo is not something they grew up with, so an affordable rental is a more comfortable situation for them. We can't find a lot of senior housing down in the gulf coast right now. Most everything we had was literally washed away or flooded or destroyed.

So the great thing about this particular provision coming out of Finance is these revenue bonds could be used for this kind of building. Again, the other amendment I have, No. 4404, does not have a score. Actually, it has a minor score of $3 million. It is very minor compared to the other costs of this bill. It is de minimis, a $3 million cost. What it will do is it will allow us to be able to again use our bonding authority—not anything more, not anything additional, but to use our bonding authority to address the problem we have with these properties.

I wish to show some pictures. This is a neighborhood—I am sorry I can't identify where this is, and it was some time ago. Most of this debris has been picked up throughout the gulf coast, but in many places, while the debris is gone, these structures remain as they are here: abandoned and destroyed until property owners figure out what they are going to do.

Here is another picture we have used. I am not sure, again, where this is, but houses such as this are still throughout the gulf coast area; a lot of it has been cleaned up. Maybe this home has been gutted, but it is basically down to its 2 by 4s, and it is basically sitting there in neighborhood after neighborhood. This is actually a home in St. Bernard Parish in a community called Chalmette.

I wish I had better pictures to show the blocks and blocks of devastation that still exist. When I say devastation—it is cleaned up, on many of the lots the grass is cut, but there are no homes there, there is no neighborhood there. The library is not yet back, the Post Office is not yet back, and people are still struggling to rebuild their neighborhoods.

So I am imploring the leadership handling this bill to please take a look at amendment No. 4404. Please take a look at amendment No. 4447. The cost in one case is nothing. The cost in the other is a de minimis $3 million, but it will help tremendously to make this bill, we hope will pass, applicable to the situations in Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, whose people are still struggling 2½ years after this devastation.

Basically, that is the gist of my remarks. We have another amendment pending relative to the tax credit, but I will hold my remarks on that. But these two amendments we are hoping we can get included in any kind of modified package. Again, I have bipartisan support. It does not increase the cost of the bill, and it would go a great way to make sure this bill, if it does get passed—I know there is opposition in the House and I know the President is opposed to this bill, so this bill may never see the light of day. I am very clear about that. But if it does, at least let the people of Louisiana and Mississippi use the money that is being allocated to us anyway for the problem we have—not the problem everybody else has—because we simply have a different problem. I hope my colleagues would recognize our situation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, this afternoon in the Senate, I wish to take a minute to commend the Senator from Louisiana for her work on these amendments and her concern for her people. Senator DODD and I have talked to the Senator from Louisiana and others about our package. The Presiding Officer is a member of the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee who knows we have done the best we can to craft a bill which is focused on bringing relief to those areas affected most by the growing rate of foreclosures. We realize this will not be a panacea, but it is a good first start. Because we were stalled, as the Presiding Officer knows, on the floor, and what we are trying to do is make a breakthrough. The success of this effort we have been working on for a second week now, I believe, will depend a great deal on whether the funds made available in this bill make it to their intended designation. We can help to ensure a degree of success by keeping it focused on the foreclosure market.

The Presiding Officer talked about that, as did the Senator from Louisiana. Chairman DODD and I worked closely with Senator REID and Senator MCCONNELL, our respected leaders, to draft a targeted bill designed to address the problems caused by the recent turmoil in the national housing markets. Our goal was to provide resources to deal with the recent foreclosures and try to prevent additional foreclosures. In other words, this bill was put together in the context of the current conditions of the national housing market.

I recognize, as I said a minute ago, Senator LANDRIEU's concern and others' concern regarding the housing issues, particularly hers in Louisiana. I believe we need to address those, some of them, outside this particular legislation. I know the Presiding Officer right now is very involved in the Banking and Housing Committee, and we are going to continue to address this problem. I think we have to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

TESTIMONY OF GENERAL PETRAEUS AND AMBASSADOR CROCKER

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a little over a year ago, I stood before the Senate and recited the words of Thomas Paine—who in his essay titled ''Chaos''—spoke about commitment and sacrifice to a noble cause when it appeared that all hope was lost. His words still resonate today:

> These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country; but he that stands it now deserves the love and thanks of man and woman.

Paine wrote those words when it seemed the American Revolution was lost. However, their effect was to rally what remained of the Continental Army and ensure the success of Washington's raids on Trenton and Princeton.

When I recited Paine's words, our Nation faced a dilemma. Despite the great heroism and noble sacrifice of our servicemembers, large portions of Iraq were under the control of al-Qaida. The mainstream media had concluded that, at best, our forces were locked in a stalemate. Many advocated that the only recourse was to bring the troops home and allow Iraq to fall in the abyss of an implosion.

For some, including the senior Senator from Arizona and me, that was never an option. The knowledge, experience and, hopefully, wisdom that I have accumulated over the years in this august body allowed me to make only one conclusion: If we are not successful in this war the result will be catastrophic for our Nation, the Western world, and the Middle East. This enemy—and despite what some in the media would lead us to believe, our main adversary in Iraq is al-Qaida—will pursue us home. Imagine the horrors that will follow if al-Qaida, with reinvigorated resources provided by Iraq's oil wealth, were to defeat us in Iraq.

However, one of the great historical truths of our Nation is that in our most dire hours, our military has continually provided us with leaders of great resolve and strategic brilliance. General David Petraeus amply fits that mold.

The new strategy that General Petraeus proposed—in which he has so ably been assisted by Ambassador Crocker—is based on the classical counterinsurgency tenet of providing security to the population of a nation under attack.

Why is this critical? By providing security to the Iraqi people, that Nation's citizens will develop a vested interest in the creation of institutions that will ensure their security for the future. Simply put, only in a secure environment can the majority of Iraqis earn a living, put food on the table, and provide a better life for their families.

What once was theory is now becoming reality. The Iraqi people are seeing considerable results from General Petraeus's strategy and their actions and plans for the future increasingly reflect this new reality.

How do we know this? Since the beginning of 2007, well over 100,000 individuals have joined the Iraqi Army and security forces. This means that a total of 540,000 Iraqis now serve in that Nation's security forces. This includes the 91,641 individuals, who in little over a year, have joined the Sons of Iraq, the coalition of citizens that are tasked with providing security to their local communities. One should remember that 80 percent of the Sons of Iraq are Sunni Muslims. In addition, it should be noted that al-Qaida receives most of its support from the Sunni. Frankly, this alone is a major triumph.

The Iraqi people are also providing us intelligence. One of the methods by which we find weapons and explosive caches is through tips from the local population. In 2006, Coalition forces found and cleared 2,660 such weapons caches. In 2007, after the Petraeus strategy was implemented, that number increased to 6,963. What is even more impressive is that though we have just entered the fourth month of this year, Coalition forces have already seized more weapons caches than in all of 2006. Clearly, this increase in seizures would not be possible without greater support from the Iraqi population.

In the area of ethno-sectarian violence, we have seen a dramatic reduction in deaths. When our new strategy was first implemented, there were more than 2,000 ethno-sectarian deaths a month in Iraq and over 1,500 in Baghdad alone. Today, there are fewer than 250 ethno-sectarian deaths a month in all of Iraq.

All of these events have occurred during the period of enhanced security brought about by General Petraeus's strategy. For example, shortly after the implementation of this strategy, there were greater then 1,400 weekly security incidents in Iraq. Today that number has dropped to less than half.

In addition, the number of high profile attacks, which include car bombs, suicide car bombs and suicide vests—the preferred means of murder by al-Qaida—has also decreased by more than half from March 2007 to the present day.

Enhanced security has strengthened the foundations of political institutions and economic ventures. This is evidenced by a poll conducted by the Center for International Private Enterprise which was summarized by Ambassador Crocker in his testimony. That poll, which was conducted last month, concluded that 78 percent of Iraq's business owners ''expect the Iraqi economy to grow significantly in the next 2 years.''

Equally as impressive is the International Monetary Fund estimate that Iraq's gross domestic product will grow by 7 percent in real terms this year—7 percent. That rate of growth will only be matched by some Asian tiger economies and it is a level that I wish that the United States could enjoy.

This economic growth and strengthening of political institutions is also evidenced by the fact that the United States will no longer fund major infrastructure projects. Ambassador Crocker reports the reason for this fundamental shift is that Iraq's economy is now earning sufficient funds for the Iraqi Government to independently build their own infrastructure.

This does not mean that we should view this conflict through rose-colored glasses. As evidenced by the events in Basra last week, there remain many challenges ahead. The fact is that the Iraqi operations in Basra were not properly planned. However, as General Petraeus said: ''. . . in the wake of recent operations, there were units and leaders found wanting in some cases . . . Nonetheless, the performance of many [Iraqi] units was solid, especially once they got their footing and gained a degree of confidence, and certain Iraqi elements proved quite capable . . .''

In addition, it should be noted that in previous years no one would have dreamed that the Iraqi Government would have launched such an operation. Remember, the Prime Minister gave an order to the security forces. Those orders were executed. In Basra, the results were mixed. Some units did well; some did not. However, the fact that the Government thought they could execute this major operation independently is a positive development. As General Petraeus testified ''operations in Basra highlight improvements in the ability of the Iraqi Security Forces to deploy substantial number of units, supplies and replacements on very short notice; they certainty could not have deployed a division's worth of Army and Police units a year ago.''

Further progress is also being made by Iraq's political institutions. When our new strategy was first being implemented, there seemed to be an inextricable stalemate in Iraq's parliament. During my trip to Iraq in May 2007, Senator SMITH and I spoke to senior members of the Iraqi Parliament and strongly urged them to pass legislation vital to the reconstruction and the establishment of effective political institutions. As with any democratic political process, it has been slow going. However, the Iraqi Parliament has recently passed important laws. These include a new pension law, de-Ba'athification reform, and a new Provincial Powers Law, that sets elections for this fall and defines the structure of power between the Iraqi Federal Government and its provinces. These are great strides forward, and all Americans should recognize our accomplishments in Iraq.

I believe that Ambassador Crocker summed up the situation best when he said yesterday:

> Al-Qaida is in retreat in Iraq, but it is not yet defeated. Al-Qaida's leaders are looking for every opportunity they can to hang on. Osama bin Ladin has called Iraq ''the perfect base,'' and it reminds us that a fundamental aim of al-Qaida is to establish itself in the Arab world. It almost succeeded in Iraq; we cannot allow it a second chance . . .
>
> . . . the world ultimately will judge us far more on the basis of what will happen than what has happened. In the end, how we leave and what we leave behind will be more important than how we came. Our current course is hard, but it is working. Progress is real, although still fragile. We need to stay with it.

Mr. President, the road has been long and hard. However, as I said 1 year ago, the words of Thomas Paine remind us that great causes require sacrifice, that in any conflict there will be dark days, but if our cause is just and our will is strong, there is nothing that we cannot accomplish as a people. I suggest very strongly that our cause is just and our will is stronger than some in this body believe it to be.

Mr. President, our forces have accomplished much. It is now our responsibility to sustain them until they achieve the victory which they deserve, and for which they are fighting.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BINGAMAN. 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.

The Senator is recognized.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few minutes in support of the Ensign-Cantwell amendment that I understand is to be offered to the pending legislation.

I have long maintained that targeted tax incentives are an essential component of a new energy policy for our country. Accordingly, I look forward to voting for this amendment. Because of my longstanding commitment to fiscal responsibility, I want to also point out my disappointment that the amendment is not going to be paid for in this legislation.

There is no denying that these incentives play a vital role in promoting clean, renewable energy and energy efficiency and, in turn, reducing our dependence on conventional fuels, promoting a more secure energy supply, and combating global warming.

Secondarily, though also critically, these tax incentives create high-wage jobs and reduce consumer and business energy costs.

In the 110th Congress, we have already tried three times, unsuccessfully, to extend these tax provisions. We cannot afford to wait any longer. Business decisions are not made overnight, and companies that invest in these technologies need to plan with certainty. But because of congressional inaction, companies are already putting on hold or canceling plans to create and expand investments that currently benefit from these tax incentives.

It is because of this urgency that I plan to vote for the Cantwell-Ensign amendment. But because the extensions are not paid for, I will cast my vote with less than full enthusiasm. This amendment will add to our unsustainable budget deficits. Already we send 9 cents out of every dollar we collect to pay interest on our national debt. There is no justification, other than politics, not to offset the amendment.

My colleagues in the House have shown greater fiscal restraint than we have in the Senate. Because they are less willing to break from the pay-go rules that have been adopted in both Chambers, I doubt that the House will accept these extensions without some corresponding offsets. This leaves the administration with a key role to play in developing a compromise that will be acceptable to both Chambers and that will be signed by the President.

President Bush has previously committed to support these tax incentives which were enacted by the Energy Policy Act of 2005. I can recall when he visited my home State of New Mexico to sign that legislation. The President praised the bill for recognizing ''that America is the world's leader in technology and that we've got to use technology to be the world's leader in energy conservation.''

But while Congress has been working to ensure that America maintains this leadership role, the administration has been absent. They have rebuffed our requests to identify any acceptable offsets. Most recently, we were told by the Department of Treasury that the administration will not support the use of sufficient revenue raisers listed in its so-called blue book. Why? Because Treasury has reserved those offsets to pay for other priorities.

I call upon the President and this administration to work with Congress in good faith to find a way to pay for these incentives. The time is far overdue to send the President a package to extend these tax provisions—a package that can pass the Congress and can be signed into law.

I yield the floor, and 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.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. I ask I be allowed to speak in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is recognized.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments today to talk about an important topic affecting individuals and families from all across the country, and that is the rising cost of health care. It is an issue that affects every individual, every family's pocketbook. It is an issue that is affecting our small businesses across the country as they try to keep up with the rising cost of health care.

I thank my colleague from Louisiana, Senator VITTER, who last week spearheaded a discussion along with seven of my Senate colleagues on the conservative principles of health care reform. This is a discussion we plan to highlight over the next several weeks and which we will continue to focus on in the future.

I had the privilege of visiting a number of hospitals around South Dakota over the March work period, to hear from providers on issues of concern to them and to discuss health care reform. I was primarily focused on small hospitals, critical access hospitals, providers that deliver health care services in very rural and remote areas of this country.

My State of South Dakota has lots of land and not a big population base. Yet people's expectation out there is they will have access to high-quality health care. As I visited these hospitals and health care providers as I visited my State over the March work period, I heard lots of different messages, and one of them was we have to figure out a way to keep up with these rising costs. Fortunately, for many of the smaller hospitals in the rural areas that are critical access hospitals, they are able to get cost-based reimbursement, and that is something I think has led to the survival of lots of health care providers that otherwise would have had to close their doors.

It is important the American people hear the message of choice and affordability championed by many Republicans in the health care debate. Unfortunately, we are up against an opposing message, which is one of a quick fix or universal plan that Washington will decide for everyone. This message too often sticks in the minds of the media, with health care trade associations, and with many of our constituents.

The goal of universal coverage, or allowing every person in America the opportunity to afford health care insurance, is an important goal. How we work toward this goal is where the debate lies. That is where a Clinton or Obama health care plan differs strikingly from that offered by our colleague from Arizona, Senator JOHN MCCAIN.

I would like to focus today on one of the most basic principles which should guide all our health care reform proposals we debate in the coming years and that is to reject this movement toward more Government-run health insurance. Instead, we ought to make long-lasting reforms to both our tax system and the insurance market to increase access to privately owned health care coverage. That is private insurance you, the individual, can choose and you can keep from job to job.

What we have today is already a mixture of Government-run insurance, including Medicare, which provides coverage to over 40 million seniors, and Medicaid, a program available to the poor and the disabled, and private insurance, usually offered through medium or large employers.

Only about 7 percent of the population in this country actually purchase their insurance on their own directly from an insurance company. In lots of ways, the way people access health insurance today is very limiting when you consider the Government or your employer does not choose other important services in your life, such as the food you eat or the car or the home you buy.

Rising health care costs are also a huge problem, not only for those who have private insurance but also for our Government programs. The Medicare trustees now report that into the future, the trust funds have over $36 trillion in long-term unfunded obligations. By that I mean benefits that are promised but not paid for, which amounts—if you can belief this—to 2½ times the size of the entire U.S. economy. Let me repeat that, $36 trillion in long-term unfunded liabilities or 2½ times the entire U.S. economy.

This is money somebody has to pay, and it is an added burden on future

generations and on our economy. Left unchecked, the Federal Government will be forced to cut benefits or substantially increase taxes. If there is one thing that should be obvious to all of us, it is that a system such as traditional Medicare or Medicaid is not sustainable financially. There are no natural incentives under these programs to control costs. It is not just the cost of these programs that presents a problem. While over 40 million seniors have Medicare coverage, most beneficiaries also have some form of supplemental coverage, or other insurance, that wraps around because traditional Medicare is not enough.

In 2004, only 9.3 percent of Medicare beneficiaries relied solely on the traditional fee-for-service program, and over 60 percent had some form of private supplemental coverage.

Also, for many providers in my State of South Dakota, Medicare's prices and regulations do not account for the challenges patients and providers face in rural areas. Once again, one size fits all, Government-run health insurance is neither financially sustainable nor is it even sufficient for those it is meant to help. For the next several weeks, the Senator from Louisiana, myself, and Senators DEMINT, BURR, COBURN, MARTINEZ, ISAKSON, and CORKER will be talking about the alternatives that are out there to our current rules and regulations and how we can achieve affordable coverage for all Americans through expanding access to private insurance.

While some of my colleagues in this body would like to expand Medicare to cover everyone to achieve the goal of universal coverage, or to expand Medicaid and SCHIP to cover many more Americans, I strongly oppose the expansion of Government insurance at the expense of choice, quality, and affordability.

Frankly, I want much more for my constituents back home in South Dakota and others across the country. I don't want the next President to push through a health care plan that will put more families on Government insurance, simply so we can say we have provided coverage.

As we were having the SCHIP debate last year, this point came up. Expanding SCHIP, which is essentially Medicaid in my State and in most other States, to families making as much as $80,000 per year, would have made it harder to attract good physicians to South Dakota, something we struggle with constantly in rural States. At a time when as many as 50 percent of physicians nationwide are limiting or dropping Medicaid patients because it simply does not cover their costs, why would we want to expand this program even further?

There is a better way. In my State, most of the uninsured are employees of small businesses. These are individuals capable of owning their own insurance, but it is simply not affordable or is not offered through their place of employment. What Senator MCCAIN has proposed—and even one Senator from the other party, Senator WYDEN from Oregon—is to reform the tax incentives in place now that only benefit large employers, CEOs and their employees, in purchasing health insurance, and level the playing field for everyone else. This can be accomplished by eliminating the tax benefit employers receive when offering insurance to their employees, which equals more than $200 billion over 1 year, and instead taking that money and offering it in the form of a tax credit or standard tax deduction to every American toward the purchase of health insurance.

With a tax credit proposal, we would be able to give every American a credit—$2,000 for an individual or $4,500 or $5,000 for a family—which is advanceable and refundable toward the purchase of insurance.

You could still choose to get your insurance through your employer or keep it, if that is the best option for you. But for anyone else, they would also have a substantial tax benefit to be able to choose their own plan that fits their needs and which is not tied to their employer. This would allow individuals and families to keep their insurance when moving from job to job.

By giving all Americans the option of a tax credit, we would empower millions of families who normally could not afford to buy insurance on their own to do so on the individual market, putting millions of consumers in the driver's seat, demanding more personalized, convenient, and affordable insurance plans. Right now, it is simply not possible for families or individuals in most States to afford their own insurance plan. But by redirecting this tax incentive and creating a more vibrant market, quality insurance plans will become more affordable and more accessible. This will drive down the cost of insurance for everyone.

Finally, by giving individuals a tax credit toward the purchase of insurance, we allow people to choose their own health insurance and the type of plan they desire. They could choose the plan that fits their needs, rather than having their employer do it for them. In many cases, their employer is only going to offer a very limited number of options—perhaps doesn't know the health care needs from one person in the plan to the next. More people will know what they are purchasing and will know what their premiums are going toward each and every single month, making us all better consumers of health care services.

Now, more than ever, words and phases such as Washington bureaucracy, Government-run health care, wage garnishment, and mandates describe the direction many in this Congress wish to take. I believe that is the wrong direction, and I will continue to support health care reforms which expand choices and which give people more freedom to access the health care that is right for them.

This is a debate that needs to be joined in the days and weeks and months ahead. My hope is it will get underway this year. My expectation is anything done this year will probably be very incremental because I think the big, bold decisions that need to be made regarding America's health care system will probably, regrettably, get punted into next year, after the Presidential election. But the debate needs to begin.

What I and my colleagues I mentioned have decided is, we need to start that dialog now. We need to get the American people engaged in this debate in a way that allows them to see what the options are, what the alternatives are, what their choices are. I believe a majority of constituents in my State of South Dakota, and I would daresay across this country, will chose a system that is based in the market, that gives them more choices, more alternatives, that creates competition—a competitive model, and, yes, that covers more Americans who, today, do not have access to health insurance.

I believe that is a goal that is achievable. I believe the debate needs to start now. I also believe that whoever the next President of the United States is, needs to work together with this Congress, we need to work together as Democrats and Republicans on a health care plan that is based on these very simple principles.

It is the principles that have served this country and this American economy so well for so many years—freedom, choice, competition, quality—that ought to be the model for the health care of the future. I look forward to continuing this discussion throughout the coming months.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from South Dakota, Senator THUNE, for his leadership this week and his remarks on this vital topic. As he said, a number of us have joined to forge and promote and advance this discussion; specifically, of course, Senator THUNE, Senator BURR of North Carolina, Senator DEMINT of South Carolina, Senator COBURN of Oklahoma, Senator ISAKSON of Georgia, Senator MARTINEZ of Florida, and myself.

As Senator THUNE said, what we want to do is advance this debate and lay out the conservative model for dramatic, bold health care reform so we advance this debate and move toward that sort of needed reform.

Senator THUNE is right. There is huge consensus in America that our health care delivery system is broken. It needs dramatic action, emergency care, if you will. But for so long here in Washington, that was only heard one way, that somehow we needed to react with a bigger government program and a big government response.

I think now the American people are more aware that we have a critical

choice, and Senator THUNE has helped lay out that choice today. Is it big Government and a government program or is it more of a system dominated by private insurance, individual choice, empowering the patient, doctor-patient relationship, and that mantra Senator THUNE mentioned?

Of course, I agree with him and thank him for advancing this debate. We are going to continue this debate over the next several weeks. I know in the very near future Senator ISAKSON will be taking the floor and going to other venues to begin talking about a closely related subject, which is the choice between forced enrollment in certain programs versus maximum individual choice.

I thank Senator THUNE for his remarks and leadership and look forward to those further remarks of Senator ISAKSON and others as we advance this critical debate toward dramatic, bold health care reform.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, it looks as if we are getting to the end of this debate on housing, and it has been a good one.

I come to the floor before we move to the final stages of this debate to thank my colleagues for their extraordinary help in putting into this bill, which is a major piece of legislation—attempting to help communities throughout the country deal with the added rate of foreclosures, the spiraling downward of so many neighborhoods due to a variety of different circumstances—and I think it is important that the Senate act today.

I particularly thank the chairman of this committee, Senator DODD, for his patience and his tenacity in getting us to this point and for putting in many good provisions into this bill that will be a help to homeowners, to communities, in some instances to lenders, who got themselves into difficulty because, again, our goal is to try to reinvigorate the housing markets, to stop the slide. Particularly, in the case of Louisiana, we still have a significant housing crisis that did not start with the foreclosure crisis but started when 250,000 homes were destroyed by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

This Congress has been generous at times in helping us to try to come up with ways to deal with this unprecedented situation. I am very grateful for the amendment that was adopted overwhelmingly last week by a vote of over 70 Members of this body to say that our Road Home grants, which is what they are called in Louisiana—they are called Homeowner Assistance Grants in Mississippi—but those grants that have been provided by this Congress to help people rebuild homes that were destroyed when insurance proceeds were either not available or not enough. This is from small towns such as Waveland, MS, to very large cities such as New Orleans, LA; places such as Lake Charles, LA, to small little communities such Creole, LA, on the southwest side.

So it is affecting urban and rural places in my State. That amendment we adopted last week will be a significant help to homeowners trying to use those grants to get back into their homes. Until that amendment passed, this grant, if you will, was taxable. With the amendment we placed on the floor of the Senate, those grants will be treated as nontaxable, basically.

I wish we could get this bill to the President's desk before April 15. We are going to move it off the floor today. It has, of course, to go to the House for negotiations and eventually get to the President.

I am very hopeful this bill—generally in its current form, with, hopefully, some improvements, as it continues to move through the process—can get to the President's desk quickly because our people on the gulf coast—particularly in Louisiana, but on the gulf coast—who received help 2 years ago through community development block grants are feeling a real pinch right now because they are now paying $5,000, $10,000 or $20,000 in taxes on those grants at a time when they can least afford it.

I cannot tell you how many people stop me when I go home and say: Senator, if you could do one thing for us, please tell them we cannot pay tax on these grants we have received—which have been minimal, helpful but minimal, in their efforts to rebuild hundreds of thousands of homes.

Let me say for the record—and I am very proud of Habitat for Humanity. I am the cochair of the Habitat for Humanity caucus here. I have been on many builds throughout the country. Habitat for Humanity, which has not stopped working since the rain stopped—and I see the Senator from Connecticut on the Senate floor—and which has had thousands of volunteers every day coming to their sites in Louisiana, has only completed 162 houses—162 houses—and they are the largest homebuilder in New Orleans. We lost about 250,000 dwelling places throughout the state of Louisiana. So I am here in an uphill battle.

I appreciate my colleagues bearing with this speech over and over again, but I can only say, if your cities or your communities were as devastated as the ones I am representing, you would be here, too, trying every way you could to bring every little bit of help and big help to them.

So I am grateful that finally we got a housing bill to the floor after 2½ years. Finally, we got a very significant addition to some tax relief. I will say that in further reading of this bill, I am encouraged—the Senator from Connecticut is here—that the $140 million to $150 million in extra mortgage revenue bonds that will come to our State will be a help. I think in further reading of the bill, the underlying bill actually will work for us. So I am very pleased.

I think we will continue to work on the $95 million to $100 million that will come to our State in the underlying bill to help land banks. We are establishing and have established NORA in New Orleans and other land banks, perhaps in St. Bernard, Cameron, Lake Charles, perhaps in Plaquemines, perhaps in St. Tammany and Jefferson Parishes, which are the hardest hit parishes. I think this bill allows for support of those land banks. So that is another $95 million to $100 million that may come for that purpose, and we have been looking for some help in that regard.

So, overall, this bill will address many issues in Louisiana with the additional help we have received through these amendments. I am very pleased that we have made progress.

Again, I wish to thank the Senator. He has been more than generous with his time. I know this has been difficult because there are 50 of us who are asking him for special help and attention. But he has been down to our State. I am hoping he will come back and walk through some of these neighborhoods.

Finally, I will say that this is quite an interesting and wonderful—if you can say that—experiment going on in the United States of America, because the question is, when a community of 60,000 people is wholly destroyed, which happened in St. Bernard Parish, the parish south of New Orleans, is it possible for the Government to rebuild it? If so, how and how quickly and how well? There are nonprofits and there are universities, from Harvard University to Stanford to LSU to some of the top social scientists in the country right there on the gulf coast, because in their minds, in this century, there has not been a devastation like this in modern times.

So there are some interesting questions: How does a neighborhood come back? Do you build the churches first or the schools or the libraries? How important is water and electricity relative to the scheme of things in terms of rebuilding neighborhoods? How do you do it with community planning in a democracy where every neighbor's voice has to be treated the same? So these are some exciting times. We are just making the best of a very desperate situation and trying to do the best we can to rebuild our communities.

I want to end with thanking all of the volunteers, all of the nonprofits, all of the businesses that have stepped up. I thank the Senate for acting on at least a very significant portion of this

tax relief for homeowners who are still putting the pieces of their lives and their fortunes back together—regardless of how modest some of those fortunes may be—neighborhood to neighborhood. But people are really trying to put their homes and their lives back together. So I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

I understand we are going to move now to the managers' package. Again, we have some significant portions taken care of in this bill. I am looking forward to being able to let the State know that another $140 million, $150 million worth of mortgage revenue bonds that I personally hope will go to affordable, low-income housing, workforce housing, and particularly for seniors who have been so devastated by the loss of their homes, and again, the support that may come out of this bill for our land banks as we think of new and innovative ways to get this property back on the private rolls, redeveloped in a way that creates excitement and vibrancy in neighborhoods from New Orleans East to Lakeview to the Lower Ninth Ward, all the way to lower Packwood Parish, which is about as far south as you can go in Louisiana.

I thank the Senator from Connecticut, and I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAQ HEARINGS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we had a hearing yesterday in the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, in which General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker made their reports back to the Congress, as they promised. They also testified yesterday afternoon before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and today they are before the House committee. I think they had about a 30-minute break or less between the testimony here and their testimony in the Foreign Relations Committee. I thought General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker did a marvelous job and were asked a lot of tough questions, which is the Congress's responsibility, I don't dispute.

What I wish to share with my colleagues today relates to the testimony of General Jack Keane, who testified this morning before the Armed Services Committee.

General Keane was former Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army. He is a paratrooper, a combat veteran, a student of the military for 37 years, a four star general who has made four trips to Iraq in the last year, and he has made a number of suggestions and continues to be, in my opinion, one of the most respected observers of the Iraqi military situation we have in our country today.

In fact, I happened to be on ''The Charlie Rose Show'' with him and Senator JACK REED last night. Reference was made that he was an adviser to Presidential candidate and Senate Member HILLARY CLINTON. He said that, in fact, he had provided advice to her, but he had provided advice to all three of the leading candidates still in the race and three of those who dropped out. His advice is widely sought. His criticism was real over a year ago when he felt the policies we were executing in Iraq were not good policies and not effective. He believed a change in policy was called for. To a significant degree, the surge, and even more importantly, the tactical changes that took place with the surge were suggestions that he had made. Of course, General Petraeus also executed them, and it represented General Petraeus's view, but General Keane did make a valuable contribution in the new policy we have undertaken.

Now, the American people are concerned about Iraq. They are rightly worried that we have a long-term commitment, and they wonder whether there is a good and decent government at the end of that commitment, whether it will be worth the effort we are putting forth, and whether we have a realistic chance of success in Iraq.

I have asked General Petraeus each and every time he has testified before me: Do you believe we have a realistic chance of success? He said that when he first went over there, when things were going badly and he knew he had to make some changes, he said: Yes, Senator. If I didn't believe I could be successful, I wouldn't go, I wouldn't take the job. Since then, he has twice reported based on his time there that he thinks we have a realistic chance of success.

What did General Keane say to us today? This very fine, highly respected professional military officer said this:

The character of my visits to Iraq is to spend considerable time with the Iraqi people, their Sheik and Tribal leaders, as well as time with our U.S. military, Iraqi military, and civilian leaders, and our troops.

That is a direct quote. I will continue to quote General Keane:

First and foremost, we have the most talented and capable leadership team in Iraq represented by General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker. Nothing in my 40 plus years in national security compares to this extraordinary team who provide the very best of leadership to their marvelous teammates and troops.

He talks about the dramatic turnaround:

The security turnaround in Iraq from the hell of 2006 and 3 years of failed strategy is one of the most stunning achievements in the annals of counterinsurgency practice. It was achieved in a matter of months versus the years it normally takes to turn around one of the most formidable insurgencies the West has ever faced. Fundamental to that success was the use of proven counterinsurgency practice to protect the people with sufficient amounts of Iraq and U.S. troops. This was a catalyst—

He says—

for the widespread Sunni awakening movement, which is truly underappreciated here in the U.S. What really happened is the Sheiks and Tribal leaders decided they could not achieve their political objectives with al-Qaida Iraq in fighting the United States and the government of Iraq. As such, the overwhelming majority of Sunni leaders made four strategic decisions to (1) stop the violence; (2) leverage the United States leaders to influence the government of Iraq; (3) reconcile with the government of Iraq; and (4) provide their ''sons'' to work with us and the Iraqis to help defeat the AQI—

al-Qaida Iraq—

and protect their own people.

Now, that is a remarkable development. It occurred in a matter of months, and I agree with him. I don't think even those of us in the Congress have fully understood the significance of what has happened. I don't say everything is perfect and is going to be perfect and there are not dangers and problems ahead, but we need to listen to the report from this objective, respected general very carefully.

He goes on to say:

These results are the very best one could expect in fighting an insurgency; your opponent not only surrenders, but comes to your side, to assist. The entire Arab Muslim world are aware of the Sunni rejection of AQI, the first major occurrence, ever, where the people have rejected the AQI and their barbaric hold on them. Additionally, in a recent poll over 90 percent of the Sunnis are expected to participate in the political process in the 2008 provisional elections and in the general election in 2009. What does that tell us about reconciliation? Clearly, the Sunnis are politically reconciling with the government of Iraq and the government of Iraq is assisting.

That is a good report.

People all over the Arab world know that al-Qaida has a Sunni heritage, and that al-Qaida fed on the Sunni unhappiness over being displaced from power as part of the Saddam Hussein regime. Many of the displaced Sunnis were military people with military training and capable in military conflicts and attacks. Now many Sunnis have partnered with the United States and the Government of Iraq and turned against al-Qaida and have basically driven them out of large portions of the country.

General Keane goes on to say this:

The implication of this is that the central region of Iraq is relatively secure and now the U.S. and Iraqi forces are focusing their efforts on the remaining presence of AQI in the north.

Now, I hope my colleagues will listen to this next sentence:

In my view, the AQI are already operationally defeated and the final campaign against AQI is underway as we speak. We will complete the defeat of AQI in the months ahead in 2008.

I say to my colleagues, without the slightest doubt, this is his professional

military opinion. It is not a political document, and it is consistent with what we have been reading. If you read through what the media saying that the people in Al Anbar, the Sunni region that had been the haven of al-Qaida, have turned against al-Qaida, they have joined with the U.S. military and the government of Iraq and have made Fallujah and Ramadi now cities of relative safety. Just a few months ago they were exceedingly dangerous and violent cities. It is not perfect, but huge progress was made.

General Keane went on to say this:

Make no mistake, this is genuine progress and has led to a significant conclusion. We cannot lose militarily in Iraq, as we were on the verge of doing in 2006. The AQI and remaining hardliner Sunni insurgents cannot mount an offensive that they could sustain, which would threaten the regime. Are we finished? No, but we and the Iraqis have the momentum, we are on the offense, and we can finally see that winning in Iraq is now a likely outcome.

He talks about the problem with the Iranians. He doesn't minimize that in any way. He goes on to talk about Prime Minister Maliki. We have had people continually criticize Prime Minister Maliki, but it appears to me, based on the testimony I have heard, that he is growing in personal confidence and stature and is beginning to show some of the leadership we would like for him to show in the sovereign nation of Iraq.

He talked about Maliki's decision to quickly send troops to the south, to Basra, where a militia group and special groups associated with the Shia community were causing trouble to the central government. Maliki is a Shia, his government is dominated by Shia, and the majority of the country is Shia. A lot of the people who criticize the war at every possible turn have said that the Shia government in Iraq is doing nothing to crack down on the Shia militia. Then when Maliki does it, they promptly rise up and start saying he didn't do it wisely; he should have done it differently.

Let's see what General Jack Keane said:

As impulsive as he was, and while the planning and coordination [of this action to Basra] was inadequate, this is the right course of action. We should not be quick to judge the success of a campaign by the first few days of action when we know this is the beginning of a campaign which will last for months.

He is talking about a campaign against extremist Shia militia, particularly in the south.

My view is, the campaign in the south will not be as difficult as the fight against AQI and the Sunni insurgents. Indeed, Maliki's political position has been considerably enhanced because all the major political parties are supporting Maliki against the Sadirists, who are now isolated. In fact, this weekend Maliki announced that you cannot participate in the upcoming elections if your political party has a militia. This had thrown the Sadirists into disarray.

So I think it is a noteworthy event that Maliki took the central army of Iraq, supported as best we could, and sent them off to the south—almost a division—to confront these Shia militia and, as General Keane noted, they can be successful in the long run. It has thrown the Sadirists into disarray and it has been very popular with the Iraqi people, who would like to see him standing up to these groups, many of whom are associated with Iran. There is a nationalistic mood in the country of Iraq. They do not want to be dominated by Iran.

So General Keane goes on to say this:

All that said, it is critical to succeed. It is in the U.S. national interests to defeat Iran in Iraq. To do so, we need a U.S. national and regional strategy. . . .

Many of our colleagues and commentators continue to say, well, yes, we have had some military progress, thank you, General Petraeus and people like you. We congratulate you on your work, but still the Government of Iraq has shown no political progress. Without political progress, ultimately, we cannot have peace and a progressive Iraq, so it is all doomed to failure. You have heard those arguments on television all the time, and they are on the floor of the Senate, and they were raised in committee. This is what General Keane said:

The surge or counter-offensive was always intended to buy time so that the Iraqis could make political and economic progress. This is happening and while there is much to be done, the progress is definable. How can anyone conclude there is no political progress when (1) the Sunnis are reconciling with a Shia dominated government, stopped the violence, and are providing 91,000 of their sons [Sons of Iraq] to assist us? This, after all, was the intent of the much-discussed national legislative benchmarks. (2) As to the benchmarks, we, the United States Government [he was somewhat critical of our Government] ''brow-beated'' the government of Iraq into submitting to a legislative agenda. After we achieved some basic security, the government of Iraq has made impressive political progress—passing 12 of 18 benchmarks and making progress on 5 others. Significantly, 4 out of 6 legislative benchmarks, including deBaathification, amnesty, semi-autonomous regions and provincial powers are passed. Why is it so difficult to acknowledge that both these points, Sunni reconciliation and major national legislation, represent significant political progress?

I ask my colleagues, why are we in this body not willing to acknowledge this is progress? Is it because we are so invested in predicting a defeat of our own military that we refuse to acknowledge that progress of unexpected depth and breadth has occurred? It is not over yet, I submit. This is a difficult, dangerous situation still. The violence is still about in Iraq; I don't deny that. But it is a 60-percent, or more, reduction in less than a year. And huge sections of the country have begun to reconcile, as we hoped and prayed would occur.

We had this talk through the last election. It was a good way to articulate it politically. Opponents of the war argued that the only thing they understand in the Iraqi Government and the only way they will reconcile and work out their political differences is for us to tell them to do so, and if they don't do so, we threaten to pull out our troops, regardless of the consequences on the ground, and this will make them more likely to reconcile and be nice to one another. We basically rejected that and we signed on to a new strategy, a counterinsurgency strategy, which we called a surge. What did General Keane say about that?

It is a myth to suggest by withdrawing rapidly, somehow, that will force the Iraqis to make progress they would not make by our presence. Anyone who truly knows the situation in Iraq, and the Iraqi leaders, realizes that it is the American presence that has aided the Iraqis to make the progress they have made and will continue to make. Our encouragement, tough-mindedness, and genuine assistance are major factors in that success. To leave and abandon them forces them into isolation, not reconciliation. It brings out their worst fears, driven by their paranoia about the past, that the Shias are on their own and their enemies are all around. What is needed is our continued, but not open-ended, presence to further our mutual objectives.

He talked about our force, our military. This is important. This man has given his life to the service of his country. He said this:

One final point, about our ground forces; not only are they magnificent but are performing to a standard not seen in any previous conflict. They are not a broken force, or near broken. Their discipline, morale, competence, behavior, and courage is extraordinary, and it is so with the knowledge that many of the American people do not support the war, but do support them. Are they stressed, and their loved ones as well, by the repeated deployments? Of course they are. But this is a proud, resilient force that has no quit in it; they have a dogged determination to succeed. We are fighting two wars that are in our national interest [Iraq and Afghanistan] and I have known since 9/11, our force, which I was a part of it, was committed to protect the American people by staying on the offense against our enemies. They want to win, and they will; they do not want to be a party to choosing defeat, or to be part of an Army or Marine Corps that suffers a humiliating defeat. That stark reality will break the force. Fighting protracted wars in our history has always stressed our forces. Doing what we can to reduce the impact is critical, but choosing victory is, hands-down, the best answer.

It was a remarkable bit of testimony, I think, and it came from a man whose credentials are undisputed—a general who was prepared to criticize our tactics when he believes they were in error. He invested time by going there four times to visit this country. He has gone throughout the entire country, and he is in a position to evaluate and analyze whether our new tactics—the surge and counterinsurgency tactics General Petraeus has applied—were successful. He said it is one of the most dramatic turnarounds in the history of warfare, certainly in fighting against an insurgency.

We can all disagree about the war and whether we should have gone there, and how we should draw down our troops. But let's not deny that with

the courage and fidelity of our military men and women in uniform, they have made dramatic progress in recent months. That progress places us in a much better position to secure a very successful outcome in this effort.

As to those who have opinions about what we should do in Iraq, and they think perhaps the President's ideas or others are not worthy of respect, let me just say it this way: January, a year ago, General Petraeus went over to Iraq. Last summer, we funded by an overwhelming vote the surge giving General Petraeus additional troops and additional authorities to lead in Iraq. We basically gave General Petraeus a chance because things had not been going well and people were very worried, and I was one of them.

General Petraeus was No. 1 in his class at Command and General Staff College, received a Ph.D. from Princeton University, commanded the 101st Airborne Division in Mosul when the war began, and spent a year there. I visited with him there. He came home for a period of time, I think less than a year. He was asked to go back and train the Iraqi military. I visited him in Baghdad when he was doing that. Following that tour, he came home and he wrote the Defense Department manual on how to confront and defeat an insurgency, and before the ink was dry on that manual we asked him to go back and lead that effort.

I would say we have never had a better prepared general for the complex military and political situation such as we face in Iraq. There has been a dramatic improvement under his leadership. That is indisputable.

General Petraeus testified yesterday, and this is basically what he said: I have drawn down the surge numbers. We will have those numbers completely drawn down by this summer. So our troop levels will be back to where they were before the surge occurred. I think, it is my best military judgment—my best military judgment—that we ought to pause for a while, and not immediately continue to draw down—and not for a year, just for a matter of months—and make sure we don't go so fast in our withdrawal that we destabilize the progress we have made because much of the progress is fragile. It could fall back if we don't conduct ourselves properly. That is what he asked us to do.

We have political generals, we have commentators on television who like to talk, and on the radio, but I will tell you who has earned my respect. General Petraeus. If he says, after all this effort and all the commitment of this Nation, that he needs a few months of pause before we begin to draw down again, then I think we ought to give it to him. Who is prepared to dispute that? If we don't support that, what we are saying is we think we know better than General Petraeus. General Keane says it is the finest military team he has ever seen assembled in his 40 years in the military.

I made the mistake of saying that General Petraeus—because I visited him over there, I knew this was his third tour in Iraq—that he had served 3 years in the war on terror. A little later it came up again. He said: Since 2001, I have been deployed 4½ years.

I remember when he went this time. He was asked to go. He believed he could make a difference. He believed he owed it to his country to give it his best shot. I am sure he felt a burden—people said he was the best person we had to lead our troops—to try to fulfill the request of his country. He left his family again to place his life at risk and to serve our country in Iraq.

I think his advice has been proven correct repeatedly, and I believe we ought to give him this chance to succeed. I agree with General Keane that nothing would be more corrosive of a fabulous military than to have all their sacrifice, all their efforts, the loss of life, the injuries sustained among the brotherhood of the military, to have all that thrown away by a precipitous political pullback. What will the military think the next time we ask them to go somewhere?

I have to tell you, Mr. President, I think we were far too optimistic about creating a government in a country that has never had a legitimate government, that has no experience, and no history with it. We thought it was far easier than it turned out to be. We thought and did not fully comprehend, as General Keane indicated, the depth of the opposition that rose up after the initial successful invasion. Our military was smaller than we needed. Now we know, and perhaps we should have known earlier.

We have made some mistakes. It has not been a perfect operation, that is for sure. I respect people who disagree with what I have said. Good people can disagree. I am not questioning their patriotism. However, logic, common sense, and a commitment to the men and women who have gone out and served us so well, to me, makes it pretty easy to say we should support General Petraeus's reasonable request that the continued drawdown pause for a while before resuming, and we should support it.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4429

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak against amendment No. 4429, which has been offered by my good friend, Senator ALEXANDER from Tennessee. Senator ALEXANDER's amendment would slash the wind tax credit in half and would curtail the wind energy development for the State of Colorado and for the Nation.

All across America, what we see today is great enthusiasm for the possibility of renewable energy. It is driven, in my view, in a very different way, with a robust look at renewable energy as a way forward. In the 1970s, Richard Nixon coined the term ''energy independence'' after OPEC was formed. Then Jimmy Carter talked to the Nation about the importance of energy independence that we needed to embrace with the moral imperative of a war. Yet through the eighties, through the nineties, through the beginning of this century, we did not, frankly, live up to their vision or to that promise of energy independence. In fact, we went the other way. And in going the other way, what has happened is we have compromised our national security with our addiction to oil that we import from other countries to where in March of 2007 we imported 67 percent of our oil from foreign countries.

We compromise our environmental security as we see what is happening around our planet with the danger of global warming and the consequences it will bring to this planet and to this generation and to generations to come. And we have lost our way forward in terms of creating economic opportunities in America because what has happened is the technology we developed in America, such as the technology from the National Renewable Lab in Golden, CO, has, in fact, been taken by other countries—Spain, Germany, and other countries—and they have developed a very strong energy renewable economy.

When we talk about renewable energy, I agree very much with my colleagues on both the Democratic and Republican sides who have said we need to embrace the renewable energy future of America with an ethic that is a sustainable ethic, with the sense that we are here to do everything we possibly can, and we cannot do this by fits and starts. When we look at wind energy, it seems to me we need to come together to support the future of wind energy in America.

In my State of Colorado, we are seeing a virtual revolution occurring in terms of what is happening with wind energy. In 2004, there was hardly any wind generation taking place in my State of Colorado. I remember going across the eastern plains during my campaign for the Senate and then following that time, my visit to all 64 counties in the State and talking about how renewable energy would open a whole new chapter in rural America, would help us in so many ways to address the fundamental issues of our time.

Since 2004, my State of Colorado has moved to the point where we are about to produce 1,000 megawatts of electrical power a year in the State of Colorado—1,000 megawatts of electrical power—by harnessing the power of the wind. It would take much longer than 3

years to permit a coal-fired powerplant, and 1,000 megawatts represent the energy that would be generated from three coal-fired powerplants.

I don't have anything against coal, as my friend from Pennsylvania knows. We need to have coal some way as part of our portfolio of energies as we move forward, but we need to embrace the renewable energies we know are now on the market and make these initiatives of renewable energy sustainable over a long period of time.

Many projects are depending on our extension of the production tax credit and the investment tax credit. These tax credits are very important. I will be supporting Senator CANTWELL's and Senator ENSIGN's amendment later on in the vote we will be having.

A recent study by Navigant Consulting indicates that failing to extend the investment tax credit could result in the withdrawal of nearly $19 billion in capital investment in solar and wind. That would result in a loss of 116,000 jobs in 2009, including 10,600 jobs in the State of Colorado.

Over the last several weeks, the last 2 months on the floor of the Senate, we have talked about the economic situation in which we find ourselves. We said what we have to do is stimulate the economy and do some things that make sure the economy doesn't go further in the ditch. There are some who say we are already in the ditch. Alan Greenspan said yesterday he thought we were already in a recession. We need to do what we can to make sure that ditch is not too deep so we cannot find our way out.

One of those ways is making sure we are stimulating the economy in ways that work. When we talk about production tax credits and investment tax credits, that essentially will make sure we have these 116,000 jobs created in America. It is something we should very much support.

Congress has looked at the PTC and the ITC in fits and starts. It was first created to expire at the end of 1999, again in 2001, and again in 2003. We need to stop those fits and starts, and we need to be more persistent than consistent with respect to these investments.

Currently, the wind production tax credit has a value of 2 cents per kilowatt hour. The credit is scheduled to expire in 2008. Senator ALEXANDER's amendment would cut the credit for wind to just 1 cent per kilowatt hour. That, in my view, is headed in the wrong direction. Senator ALEXANDER argues that the wind energy receives special treatment and argues fossil energy has received some credit but that we should back down on the credits we are giving to wind energy.

What this chart will show is that what we are doing in terms of tax incentives, as well as in research and development expenditures out of the Federal Government, is not at all skewed toward renewable energies. In fact, it is skewed to fossil fuels. You will see that in tax expenditures, in the year 2007 in billions of dollars, fossil fuel received $13.7 billion of the expenditures that we were making through the incentives we are creating for oil, gas, coal, and other fossil fuels. But we were putting $13.7 billion into fossil fuels to help us with our energy independence, where we were only putting $2.8 billion into renewables. That is a stark contrast as to where we should be going if we are to get to energy independence for national security and environmental reasons.

When you look at research and development, these are the figures from the Department of Energy out of a General Accounting study which was requested by Senator ALEXANDER in 2007. We see that, in billions of dollars, the Department of Energy spent only $1.4 billion on renewables, but at the same time the Department of Energy spent $3.1 billion, three times as much, on fossil fuels, and $6.2 billion on nuclear.

So when we talk about harnessing the power of the wind, the power of the Sun, the power of biofuels as we grow our way to energy independence, in my view, we need to have some more balance. We need to put more into the renewable energy future of our country.

We have, as a Nation, starting over a century ago, made major investments in helping the fossil fuels industry. What this chart will show is, beginning in 1916, we created this laundry list of tax incentives for exploration of oil and gas and for the production of oil and gas and coal. Also, beginning in 1957, we made major incentives for nuclear. Yet we see the very few incentives we have instituted with respect to wind, which did not start until 1992. So this chart reflects there is a lot of catching up to do if we are to do everything we can as a Nation to harness the energy of the wind.

I am hopeful, therefore, my colleagues will vote no on the Alexander amendment because the wind energy future of our Nation is very dependent on our continuing to sustain a policy over a longer period of time so we get the wind energy industry up and running in America. It is also, in my view, important we support the amendment of Senators CANTWELL and ENSIGN, with respect to energy tax credits, because we need to make sure those do not expire, and right now they are on the verge of expiring.

I would hope, as we move forward in dealing with tax incentives and other issues in the Congress, we will be able to find a way to extend them beyond the end of 2008.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Alexander amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the Cantwell-Ensign amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and to call up amendment No. 4501.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SALAZAR. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GREGG. Well, I am shocked, shocked to hear an objection from the Senator on this very reasonable request to call up an amendment so this bill, which is a fairly significant bill, could be voted on by the Senate in parts, because there are some parts of this bill which aren't that good, and this amendment addresses one of those parts. Specifically, this amendment says the net operating loss carry-forward provisions, which cost $17 billion over the first 3 years of this bill, would be eliminated. There are already in law net operating loss provisions. What this bill does, however, regrettably, is expand those provisions dramatically and benefits one small segment of our commercial society, to the disadvantage of other segments of our commercial society and to the distinct disadvantage of our children and our children's children who have to pay for all the money that is going to be spent in the area of a tax credit or deduction.

This $17 billion will go to benefit the same industry, or part of the industry, which created the problem which this stimulus package is trying to address. It is a lot like that story of the fellow who shot both his parents and then threw himself on the court and asked for mercy because he was an orphan. What we have is the housing industry requesting a $17 billion tax break specifically for them because they created an economic meltdown by speculatively building thousands of houses—thousands more than we needed—and then selling those houses to people through the subprime mortgage process, which turned out to be a very poor idea for many people who bought houses with a subprime mortgage.

At the time these housing construction industry companies did this, they made a lot of money—a lot of money. Now they are losing money. And they are saying, with a straight face, in this bill: We need a $17 billion tax break, which allows us to go back and eliminate the taxes we paid on the profit we made during the good days of the housing bubble and get a tax rebate to reflect the fact that we are losing money today, which recovers the taxes we paid 3 and 4 years ago. How outrageous is that?

In addition, of course, housing contractors who were responsible—and who during this period of the bubble did not overbill or did not overly utilize subprime mortgages but, rather, built in a reasonable manner and are still doing well and are still making money—are going to find that their competitor down the street—who was potentially excessive, building a lot of inventory that was not necessary, selling it through subprime mortgages and then finding they are stuck with it today and thus losing money today—is going to get a tax benefit representing

$17 billion. So the contractor who actually has been responsible and has run their business in probably a conservative and constructive way is going to have to compete with the profligate contractor, potentially, who is losing money but is suddenly going to get a huge windfall as a result of this bill in the way of a tax rebate. Where is the fairness in that?

In addition, of course, it undermines the whole concept of the free marketplace. I mean, the marketplace says: If you take a risk and you make an investment and you make a lot of money—which is what happened here—and then that risk turns out to turn on you and you start to lose money, the Government shouldn't come in and say: Oh, that is okay, we are going to insure your losses with a tax break—which is essentially what is happening. We are going to insure them to the extent of $17 billion over the next 2 years.

That is not a capitalist system. That is a French system. That is sort of modified socialism. It essentially says: You can't lose. You can go out and make money, and if you start to lose money, we will give you a tax credit. So the American taxpayers get to pay so you don't lose money.

Then who pays for all this? Who pays for this $17 billion? Well, these folks sitting right down here—the pages—will pay for this. We are not going to pay for it this year. We are not offsetting this cost. This goes on the national debt. Interest will accrue on it. When these young pages graduate from high school and then move on to college—and I know they are all going to go to college—and then they move out of college and start to get a job, you know what they will have to do? They will have to pay taxes, and part of the taxes they are going to be paying 8, 9, 10 years from now is going to go to pay for this tax deduction which we are passing today to benefit an industry which created the bubble, which created a recession. We are giving them this type of insurance through this type of tax break. That is not fair.

It is not fair to the next generation to pass this bill on to them. It is not fair to competitors who were conservative and managed their businesses well, that we are going to give this tax break to people who were not so successful or were successful but today aren't doing well. It doesn't make any sense. It is almost a bill of attainder. It should be unconstitutional—the idea we are going to pass a tax that benefits this one segment of the industry.

By the way, it is not going to stimulate the economy because most of this benefit is going to probably come to fruition after the recession is pretty much over. Probably not before the third or fourth quarter of this year and into next year will these dollars start to reflow into these industries. So as a practical matter, most economists are saying that to the extent we have a recession—and I happen to believe we have one—it is going to be shallow and short, which means it will probably be over. With all the Fed is doing, I think it will definitely be over by the end of this year, at the latest. So this makes no sense.

At the minimum, the Senate should at least have the right to vote on this policy. I mean, why not at least have a vote on this policy? It is a huge piece of policy, by the way. It seems to me we should have the right to have a vote on this policy. So all I have asked for is not that we accept the ideas I have put on the table, which is that this tax benefit makes no sense economically, that it makes no sense from the standpoint of a capitalist system, it makes no sense from the standpoint of the debt to pass on to our children, and it makes no sense from the standpoint that the people who are benefitting from this tax benefit were the biggest beneficiaries from the runup of the speculative market. I am not saying people have to accept those arguments, although I find them logical, reasonable, and I hope most people would accept them. I am saying let's vote on them. Let us have a vote on whether those arguments make more sense or the idea of putting this tax benefit in this bill makes more sense.

So that is why I have asked, on a number of occasions, for a vote on this item. I regret that there has been an objection, on occasion, to my request for this amendment to be brought up. I am tempted to renew that request at this time, but I sense somebody else might object—this time probably from the audience, as the last objection came from staff. But in any event, I can appreciate the fact that there would be an objection, so I will not raise it again. I will simply reflect the fact that I have made this point, and hopefully at some point there will be a relenting on the other side of the aisle to having a vote on this item.

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. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PRYOR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

2008 OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to express my concern about the Chinese Government's continued human rights violations and to urge President Bush not to attend the opening ceremonies at the Olympic Games in Beijing this summer.

The Chinese Government's unwillingness to acknowledge or address their record of human rights violations is in direct conflict to the spirit of the Olympic Games, and the United States should not accede to the Chinese Government with our attendance.

The recent developments in Tibet, in which Buddhist monks and other ethnic Tibetans were violently punished, and in some cases killed, for participating in protests, are disturbing and should be unacceptable to anyone who believes in basic human freedoms. Furthermore, these developments also seem to confirm that the Chinese Government, which has long disrespected the rights of its citizens, under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, has failed to sufficiently improve its conduct when confronted with citizens who happen to voice a difference in opinion.

We believe—I think many of us believe—that the President's attendance at the opening ceremonies, rightly or not, would send the implicit message to the world that the United States condones the intolerance that has been demonstrated by these actions of the Chinese Government.

The Chinese Government was awarded the Olympic Games on the understanding that it would work to significantly improve its human rights record. Clearly—clearly—it has not. In fact, its actions are completely contradictory to the Olympic spirit.

Let me highlight two specific points in the Olympic Charter's Fundamental Principles of Olympism. It says:

> The goal of Olympism is to place sport at the service of the harmonious development of man, with a view to promoting a peaceful society concerned with the preservation of human dignity.

The other principle that is on point here:

> Any form of discrimination with regard to a country or a person on grounds of race, religion, politics, gender or otherwise is incompatible with belonging to the Olympic Movement.

''Incompatible with belonging to the Olympic Movement.''

The Chinese Government blatantly violates both of these points.

Some have made the argument that the President's attendance at the opening ceremonies is more about support for the Games themselves than for the host country. I believe it is all to the contrary. It would show tremendous support and respect for the Games and the spirit they embody, and these principles that are part of the Olympic Charter, to take a stand against a host nation that flagrantly disrespects that spirit.

We remind the President that the recent developments in Tibet are only the latest chapter in a long history of Chinese human rights concerns. Even in the midst of the latest atrocities against Tibetans, we should not forget the Chinese Government's continued unwillingness to use all of its unique leverage—unique leverage—with the Sudanese regime to assist the international effort to bring an end to the genocide in Darfur. This issue remains

of serious concern to us and many others who have not seen the improvements in Darfur that we had hoped would have happened long ago.

If we were languishing in the camps in Darfur, as the world watches genocide, if we see human rights violations in China against the Tibetans, if we see prison camp labor, child labor, forced abortions, the exiling of the Dalai Lama, and so, so much more, who among us, if we were in their position, would be content with the counsels of patience and delay? Who among us would be content with the silence that exists in this respect? And who among us would not want to see a world leader, a leader of the free world, make a very powerful statement to ensure that we move in a different direction?

If the Chinese Government is ever to treat its people with basic human rights, it must be sent a bold and clear message that its record of violence and suppression is completely unacceptable.

Few actions can speak louder than if the President of the United States were to condemn the Chinese human rights record with the entire world watching. It is at the moment of the opening ceremonies where the world's attention is riveted on the Olympic Games—it is at the opening ceremonies where the world's attention is riveted on the Olympic Games—and not attending, refusing to attend, the opening ceremonies would accomplish exactly that: a clear condemnation of China's human rights record.

We hope the President will agree with us, that the Chinese Government's actions are unacceptable, and that we must send a bold message now while the world—while the world—is focused on China.

China wanted the Olympic Games. It got it with the understanding that, in fact, it would dramatically improve its human rights record. It has not. The world has seen its repressive nature. If we go on as if nothing had happened, we will send a message that impunity is, in fact, something that is tolerated by the rest of the world.

I do not believe Americans want to see that happen. I believe the principle of the Olympic Charter that clearly says, ''Any form of discrimination with regard to a country or a person on grounds of [their] race, religion, politics, gender . . . is incompatible with belonging to the Olympic Movement'' is something worthy of sustaining, and this is an opportunity in time and history to make that principle ring loudly and clearly.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4419

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few minutes on an amendment I have offered with Senator CANTWELL regarding renewable energy. It is amendment No. 4419. I don't know whether it is going to be voted on tonight or tomorrow. Either way, I wish to spend a few minutes on this particular amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some letters of support from various industries.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 3, 2008.

DEAR SENATOR: As a coalition of businesses, environmental organizations, investors, labor, nongovernmental organizations, public health organizations, religious organizations, states, trade associations and utilities, we urge you to pass bipartisan legislation as soon as possible that extends federal tax incentives for energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies and consumer purchases of energy efficient products. These critically important incentives have expired or will expire at the end of this year and must be extended immediately to avoid significant harm to the developing clean energy industries in the United States.

We urge extension of the renewable energy production tax credit, clean renewable energy bonds, efficient commercial buildings tax deduction, investment tax credit for solar electric and fuel cell systems, tax credit for energy efficiency upgrades to existing homes, tax credits for the production of efficient home appliances, and tax credit for construction of efficient new homes. These incentives play a vital role in reducing global warming pollution, creating new high-wage American jobs, spurring economic growth, promoting consumer purchases of energy efficient products, and saving consumers and businesses money on their energy bills.

It is essential for the development of clean technology industries that extensions of the efficiency and renewable energy tax incentives remain effective for multiple years. Congress has historically extended the clean energy incentives in one or two-year increments, which creates a boom-bust cycle for the technologies covered by the incentives. This cycle undermines the efficient development of the clean energy technology industries into mature industries.

It is critical for the sustained development of the clean energy technology industries that efficiency and renewable energy tax incentives be promptly extended. The delay in extending these provisions is already discouraging investment decisions today for clean energy projects that will be completed in 2009 or later. According to a recent study by Navigant Consulting, failure to promptly extend renewable energy tax incentives places at risk 116,000 jobs in the wind and solar industries and more than $19 billion in clean energy investment. Similarly, more than 800 megawatts of renewable biomass electrical generation in development has been placed on hold because the renewable production tax credit has not been extended according to biomass industry estimates.

America is on the cusp of a new, clean energy economy. Extending efficiency and renewable energy tax incentives is critical to promoting the transition to this economy. They will help get us started on solving the global warming problem, reduce energy prices for consumers, and create new high-wage jobs. We urge you to do everything you can to ensure prompt passage of legislation with significant bipartisan support that adopts long-term extensions of the efficiency and renewable energy tax incentives and can be enacted into law this spring.

Sincerely,

American Council on Renewable Energy (ACORE).
AES Wind Generation.
Airevolution Wind Energy Systems, LLC.
Akeena Solar.
Alaska Wind Power, LLC.
Alliance to Save Energy.
Alliant Energy Corporation.
Alternative Fuels Renewable Energies Council.
Ameren Corporation.
The American Agriculture Movement, Inc.
American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy (ACEEE).
The American Institute of Architects (AIA).
American Solar Energy Society.
American Wind Energy Association (AWEA).
Applied Materials.
Apricus Inc.
Arizona Public Service.
Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers (AHAM).
Audubon.
Ausra, Inc.
AWS Truewind, LLC.
Babcock & Brown.
Ballard Power Systems.
Best Buy Co., Inc.
Bio-A.I.R.E., LLC.
BioEconomy Development Corporation.
BioEnergy Development, LLC.
Bloom Energy.
BOSCH.
BrightSource Energy, Inc.
Broadwind Energy, Inc.
Business Council for Sustainable Energy.
California Energy Commission.
Cardinal Fastener & Specialty.
CCIM Institute.
Center for Energy and Environmental Sustainability at James Madison University.
Central Vermont Public Service.
CH Energy.
Chirag Bator.
Clipper Windpower, Inc.
Clyde Industrial, LLC.
Coalition on the Environment and Jewish Life (COEJL).
Competitive Power Ventures, Inc.
Conergy.
Constellation Energy.
Converteam Inc.
Dakota Resource Council.
Dakota Rural Action.
D.H. Blattner.
Dominion.
The Dow Chemical Company.
Dow Corning Corporation.
Duke Energy.
The Dyson Corporation.
Earthjustice.
Edison Electric Institute (EEI).
Edison International.
Empire District Electric Company.
Energize Now Initiative.
Energy Innovations, Inc.
Energy Systems Group.
Energy Unlimited, Inc.
Enertech.
Environmental and Energy Study Institute (EESI).
Environment America.
Environmental Defense Fund (EDF).
enXco.
Eurus Energy America Corporation.
Evergreen Solar, Inc.
Exelon Corporation.
Fagen, Inc. Construction.
Federal Performance Contracting Coalition.

FPL Group.
Friends Committee on National Legislation.
Gamesa Technology Corporation.
GE Energy.
Geothermal Energy Association (GEA).
Global Energy Concepts.
Global Resource Options, Inc.
GPCO USA.
Green Mountain Power Corporation.
Greenpeace.
Green Volts.
Great Plains Energy.
Hansen Transmissions Inc.
Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc.
Heartland Power and Light LLC.
Hexcel Corporation.
HICO America.
The Home Depot, Inc.
Honeywell.
Horizon Wind Energy.
Hydrogenics.
Iberdola Energias Renovables.
Idaho Rural Council.
IdaTech.
Infinia Corporation.
Intermountain Wind, LLC.
International Council of Shopping Centers.
Interstate Power and Light.
Institute of Real Estate Management (IREM).
Invenergy LLP.
John Deere Renewables, LLC.
Johnson Matthey.
JP Morgan Chase.
JW Great Lakes Wind LLC.
JW Prairie Wind Power LLC.
Knight & Craver.
Kyocera.
Lake Superior Warehousing Co., Inc.
League of Conservation Voters.
LM Glasfiber, Inc.
LOGANEnergy.
Lowe's Companies, Inc.
Macy's.
Mendel Biotechnology, Inc.
Mesa Power, Inc.
Michigan Alliance of Cooperatives.
Millennium Cell, Inc.
Missionary Oblates of Mary.
Immaculate, Justice Peace/Integrity of Creation Office.
MJH Power Consulting LLC.
Mortenson Construction.
MMA Renewable Ventures, LLC.
Mortenson Construction.
MOU Citrus Partnership, LLC.
National Association of Home Builders (NAHB).
National Association of Industrial and Office Properties (NAIOP).
National Association of State Energy Officials (NASEO).
National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA).
National Farmers Union (NFU).
National Grid.
National Multi Housing Council.
National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA).
National Small Business Association.
National Tribal Environmental Council.
National Venture Capital Association (NVCA).
National Wildlife Federation.
National Wind LLC.
Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC).
Noble Environmental Power.
Northeast Public Power Association (NEPPA).
North American Equipment Dealers Association.
North American Insulation.
Manufacturers Association (NAIMA).
Nuerva.
Oerlikon Solar.
Ohio Environmental Council.
OptiSolar.
Oregon Rural Action.
Owens Corning.
Peloton Energy, LLC.
PG&E Corporation.
Pacific Winds LLC.
Physicians for Social Responsibility.
Pinnacle West.
Plug Power Inc.
PNM Resources.
Polyisocyanurate Insulation.
Manufacturers Association (PIMA).
Portland General Electric.
Powder River Basin Resource Council.
Power Works LLC.
PPM Energy.
Progress Energy.
Public Citizen.
Public Service Enterprise Group, Inc.
Public Works LLC.
The Real Estate Roundtable.
Rebirth Capital, LLC.
REC Silicon.
Redefining Progress.
Regeneration Project/Interfaith Power and Light.
Reinforcing Services.
Renewable Energy Systems Americas.
Retail Industry Leaders Association.
Rocket Wind Energy LLC.
Rosendin Electric, Inc.
Rural Minnesota Energy Board.
Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD).
SANYO Energy Corporation.
SCHOTT Solar, Inc.
Sempra Energy.
SGR Site Associates LLC.
Shell Wind Energy.
Siemens Windpower A/S.
Sierra Club.
Signal Wind Energy, LLC.
SkyFuel, Inc.
Smart Growth Advocates.
Solar Energy, Inc.
Solar Energy Industries Association.
Solar Integrated Technologies, Inc.
Solar Power Partners.
SolarReserve.
SolarWorld California Inc.
Southern Alliance for Clean Energy (SACE).
Southern California Public Power Authority (SCPPA).
SPI Industries.
Spire Solar, Inc.
Sriya Innovations, Inc.
SunEdison.
SunPower Corporation.
Susitna Energy Systems.
Suntech America, Inc.
Target Corporation.
Third Planet Power LLC.
TPI Composites.
Trade Wind Energy.
Trane.
TRI Composites, Inc.
TRICO TCWIND, Inc.
Trinity Industries, Inc.
TSS Consultants.
25x'25 Steering Committee.
United Biofuels Development.
Union of Concerned Scientists.
The Union for Reform Judaism.
The United Steelworkers.
3M.
United Technologies Corporation.
UPC Wind Management, LLC.
U.S. Fuel Cell Council.
USA Biomass.
US Wind Force, LLC.
Ventera Energy Corp.
Vestas Americas.
Vote Solar.
Waste to Energy, LLC.
Westar Trade Resources.
Western Colorado Congress.
Western Organization of Resource Councils (WORC).
Western Renewables Group.
Westwood Professional Services.
Whirlpool.
The Wilderness Society.
Wind Capital Group.
WindLogics Inc.
Windsmith, LLC.
Wind Turbine Industries Inc.
Wisconsin Power and Light.
Xcel Energy Company.

KEEP OUR ECONOMIC ENGINES TURNING ON A CLEAN ENERGY FUTURE

America is on the cusp of a new, clean energy economy. Extending the efficiency and renewable energy tax incentives is critical to promoting the transition to this clean energy future. But these important incentives have expired or will expire at the end of this year and must be extended immediately to avoid significant harm to the developing clean energy industries in the United States. These incentives play a vital role in reducing global warming pollution, creating new high-wage American jobs, spurring economic growth, promoting consumer purchases of energy efficient products, and saving consumers and businesses money on their energy bills.

We, the undersigned, representing a broad coalition of organizations and businesses, urge you to pass with significant bi-partisan support the Clean Energy Tax Stimulus Act introduced by Senators Cantwell and Ensign.

PLEASE SUPPORT S. 2821, THE CLEAN ENERGY STIMULUS ACT OF 2008

MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, DC, April 4, 2008.

DEAR SENATOR: We are writing to urge you to cosponsor and support passage of S. 2821, the Clean Energy Stimulus Act of 2008. This legislation extends vitally important federal tax incentives for wind, geothermal, biomass, solar power, qualified hydropower, and other renewable energy technologies that expire this year. An immediate extension of renewable energy tax incentives is critical for sustaining one of the most rapidly expanding areas of the American economy.

The delay in extending renewable tax incentives is already discouraging investment decisions today for clean energy projects that will be completed in 2009 or later. According to a recent study by Navigant Consulting, failure to promptly extend renewable energy tax incentives places at risk 116,000 jobs in the wind and solar industries and more than $19 billion in clean energy investment.

Prompt action to extend renewable tax incentives is critical to continuing the economic growth and high-wage jobs associated with the rapid growth of wind and solar power, and to helping reduce global warming pollution even as we meet increasing electricity demand.

Please do all you can to support S. 2821.

Sincerely,

Alliant Energy.
American Wind Energy Association.
Alyra Renewable Energy Finance, LLC.
Babcock & Brown.
Bluewater Wind.
Broadwind.
CAB Inc.
Catamount Energy Corporation.
Clipper Windpower Development Company, Inc.
Columbia Energy Partners LLC.
Competitive Power Ventures, Inc.
D.H. Blattner & Sons.
DH Blattner.
Distributed Generation Systems, Inc.
DMI Industries, Inc.
Emerging Energies Of Wisconsin, LLC.
Energy Unlimited, Inc.

Enertech.
Eurus Energy America Corporation.
Global Energy Concepts.
Green Wing Pacific Energy.
HICO America.
Hilliard Energy.
Honeywell.
Horizon Wind Energy.
Iberdrola Renewable Energies U.S.A.
Interstate Power and Light.
Interwest Energy Alliance.
John Wade Wind Consultant, LLC.
JP Morgan.
JPW RIGGERS, INC.
JW Prairie Wind Power, LLC.
Knight & Carver Wind Group.
Lecco Steel.
LM Glasfiber.
Mackinaw Power, LLC.
Mecal Applied Mechanics.
Mesa Power LP.
Midwest Wind Energy, LLC.
Molded Fiberglass.
Motion Industries.
NextEnergy.
Noble Environmental Power.
Oregon Trail Wind Farm.
Owens Corning Company.
Pacific Winds, LLC.
Pike and Scott County Farm Bureaus.
POWER Engineers, Inc.
PPM Energy.
Renewable Energy Systems Americas.
Second Wind Inc.
Sharp Executive Associates, Inc.
Shell Wind Energy.
Siemens.
SIPCO Mechanical Linkage Solutions.
Skyward Energy.
Solar Energy Industries Association.
Southwest Windpower.
Suzlon Wind Energy Corporation's Torch Renewable Energy.
Torch Renewable Energy.
Tower Foundations.
TPI Composites.
Trinity Industries, Inc.
Two Rivers Farm Bureau Foundation.
UPC Wind.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, April 8, 2008.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing more than three million businesses and organizations of every size, sector, and region, supports an amendment based on S. 2821, the ''Clean Energy Tax Stimulus Act of 2008,'' which is expected to be offered by Sen. Ensign to H.R. 3221, the ''Foreclosure Prevention Act of 2008.''

The Chamber believes it is in the national interest to promote the responsible use of all energy sources. To reach this goal, government and business should support investment in new technologies that expand alternative energy and enable traditional sources of energy to be used more cleanly and efficiently. Extension of the incentives in S. 2821 will go a long way toward the development of the renewable and alternative energy technologies essential to our nation's energy future.

Congress must be mindful, however, not to merely stop at renewables. Many of the incentives extended by S. 2821 were included in the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPAct), a comprehensive energy policy bill largely overlooked scarcely more than two years after its enactment. EPAct contains nearly 70 provisions that require federal agencies to undertake research, development and demonstration of new technologies, to engage in public/private partnerships, or to make available financial incentives to the private sector for the development of these new technologies. Presently, a significant number of the nearly 70 new energy technology and efficiency directives are unfunded, under-funded, or simply not implemented at all.

The Chamber supports Sen. Ensign's amendment, and urges Congress not only to extend the incentives specified in that bill, but to fully fund and implement all of the energy technology and efficiency directives enacted by EPAct.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN,
Executive Vice President, Government Affairs.

RETAIL INDUSTRY LEADERS ASSOCIATION,
Arlington, VA, April 3, 2008.

Hon. MARIA CANTWELL,
Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN ENSIGN,
Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS CANTWELL AND ENSIGN: I write to thank you for introducing the Clean Energy Tax Stimulus Act of 2008. This bipartisan legislation seeks to extend federal tax incentives for energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies and consumer purchases of energy efficient products. These critically important incentives have expired or will expire at the end of this year and must be extended immediately to maximize energy savings for consumers and businesses to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions in communities across the United States.

The Retail Industry Leaders Association, RILA, promotes consumer choice and economic freedom through public policy and industry operational excellence. Its members include the largest and fastest growing companies in the retail industry—retailers, product manufacturers, and service suppliers—which together account for more than $1.5 trillion in annual sales. RILA members provide millions of jobs and operate more than 100,000 stores, manufacturing facilities and distribution centers domestically and abroad.

RILA and our member companies are committed to environmental sustainability. We applaud the bill's particular provisions that extend tax incentives for investments in solar technology; construction of ''green'' commercial buildings; and consumer purchases of energy efficient products to improve their homes.

We look forward to working with you to pass this legislation on a strong bipartisan basis toward the path of extending the efficiency and renewable energy tax incentives for enactment into law this spring.

Sincerely,

FAITH A. CRISTOL,
Vice President, Workforce & Tax.

THE REAL ESTATE ROUNDTABLE,
Washington, DC, April 8, 2008.

TO ALL UNITED STATES SENATORS: The Real Estate Roundtable urges your support for S. 2821, The Clean Tax Stimulus Act of 2008. Sponsored by Senators Cantwell and Ensign and cosponsored by 31 other Senators, this narrowly tailored bill extends essential energy tax provisions facing expiration.

This bill is being offered as Amendment #4419 to the housing stimulus bill H.R. 3221. Passing this amendment will encourage a dialogue between the Senate and the House regarding the timely disposition of these important policies. We urge you to cosponsor the bill and support the amendment.

The Roundtable particularly supports two provisions in the bill: (1) a one year extension of the Section 179 deduction for energy efficient commercial buildings and the modification to increase the entire building deduction to $2.25 per square foot and to $.75 per square foot for the partial building deduction; and (2) an eight extension of the 30 percent business tax credit for solar energy and fuel cells.

Ideally, a much longer extension of the Section 179 energy efficient building deduction should be enacted given the long lead time involved with the design, development and construction of commercial buildings.

Increased investment in energy efficient technologies—including building technologies—has special significance to our industry. Roundtable members have been leaders in advancing the state of the art as it relates to the development and operation of energy efficient ''high performance'' buildings. The energy efficient building deduction and the solar and fuel cell credit are important tools in allowing our members to continue this leadership role.

Failure to enact these extensions would mean losing the economic benefit provided by the alternative energy and energy efficiency industries. Further, it would hinder the development and deployment of energy efficient technologies and alternative energy production. The economic and environmental benefits spurred by these tax incentives would provide a meaningful offset to the bill's revenue cost.

If you or your staff has any questions, please contact Roundtable Senior Vice President and Counsel Steve Renna (srenna@rer.org).

Sincerely,

JEFFREY D. DEBOER,
President and Chief Executive Officer.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, over the last several weeks Senator CANTWELL and I worked together in a bipartisan fashion to craft a renewable energy package that would break the gridlock that has happened here in the Senate. There have been several good faith attempts to pass a renewable energy bill, but frankly, several of us, including myself, have objected to some of what are called offsets, the ''pay-fors'' in the bill.

I believe very strongly in renewable energy but also know that this country will be dependent on fossil fuels for the next 20 to 30 years. We need more domestic supplies of fossil fuels and less reliance on foreign sources of fossil fuels.

In the package that was put before us, tax incentives were going to be taken away from people who explore for domestic sources of fossil fuels. That was the reason I opposed the original renewable energy package.

Senator CANTWELL and I, along with our staffs, got together over the last several weeks and came up with a compromising provision that has no offsets. We encourage the continued development of solar, wind, geothermal, and biomass energies. There are several renewable energies out there and all kinds of new technologies that are coming on line. The more private investment and innovation that we have, the more alternatives and renewable energies we will see come into the U.S. markets. This will insure that we are responsible to the environment and to our economy by creating innovative new jobs and less dependent on foreign sources of energy. This is the reason

Senator CANTWELL and I have come together in a bipartisan fashion to say, ''Let's break this logjam in the Senate. Let's make sure we get this bill passed so it can be signed into law.''

What we have today in front of us is a housing bill which will help stimulate the economy. Everyone knows the economy is being dragged down by the subprime mortgage market crisis we are facing in America. My State leads the Nation in foreclosure rates. It is dragging the rest of the Nevada economy down in what appeared to be a recession-proof economy. We need this housing bill. We need to do things that will help bring our economy out of the doldrums it is in.

This energy package we have put together is also stimulative. It will preserve the jobs that have already been created, as well as create more jobs and help the economy.

I believe strongly, for many different reasons, that this amendment will help the economy, it will help our environment, and it will help make us become less dependent on foreign sources of energy. For those reasons, I would encourage my colleagues to support our amendment.

Senator ALEXANDER is offering a second-degree amendment that I believe will gut our amendment and will break apart this bipartisan coalition we have put together. It is his right to offer a second-degree amendment and he will speak in defense of it. But, I am going to encourage our colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, if you want a renewable energy bill, to oppose the Alexander amendment and to support the Ensign-Cantwell amendment on renewable energy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for his comments, and I thank him for his effort. He and the Senator from Washington, Ms. CANTWELL, are making a constructive effort to give Federal support for emerging renewable energy. Clean renewable energy is very important for our country. I have a chart here which lists the sources of renewable electricity qualified to receive the production tax credit. This production tax credit is the subject, in part, of the Ensign-Cantwell amendment No. 4419. But what Senator KYL and I have is a second-degree amendment No. 4429 that we will offer when the Ensign-Cantwell amendment comes up, which is a way to improve that amendment.

Basically, what we have been hearing from entrepreneurs and those who are inventing new technologies, which would help reduce our dependence on fossil fuels, is: We need some certainty in whatever support you give us from the Federal Government. The Ensign-Cantwell amendment would—the first part of it—would allocate about $3 billion to the production tax credit for 1 more year. It would extend the ability of renewable electricity to qualify for the production tax credit. What we would say is, let's do that for 2 more years. I will explain that in just a minute.

One might say: Well, how are you going to pay for that? The way we would propose paying for it is to put wind in the same category as emerging renewable energies, make it also available for a 1-cent subsidy per kilowatt hour, and that amount of money alone would make it possible for us to have a 2-year extension of the production tax credit at the same cost that Senator ENSIGN and Senator CANTWELL propose in their amendment.

Now, let me explain what I mean by that. But first, our goal with the Alexander-Kyl amendment would be to extend the production tax credit for 2 years, to focus it on emerging renewable electricity technologies, to focus it on those that have a capacity for supplying baseload electricity; in other words, electricity production that we can rely on all day and all night. If you want to turn your light on in the middle of the night or operate your computer at 4 p.m., whether the sun is shining or the wind is blowing, you need reliable sources of baseload electricity, and we would like to treat all of these energies fairly.

Here is what the law now does and has done since 1992. It pays the producer of this kind of electricity, renewable electricity, 2 cents per kilowatt hour for the electricity it produces. Right now, the 2 cents is going to closed-loop biomass and to geothermal; that is heat coming out of the ground and is being converted into clean electricity. It used to go to solar, but that was removed in 2005, and it goes to wind today. So those three—closed-loop biomass, geothermal, and wind—all get 2 cents per kilowatt hour. These other emerging technologies on this side of the chart just get 1 cent per kilowatt hour.

What we propose to do is move wind from the two-cent category to the one-cent category. Wind would still get 1 cent per kilowatt hour. It would end up getting more of the money than any of these others, but it would focus more of the dollars in the Cantwell-Ensign bill on emerging baseload energy by providing more time for these to be developed.

Now, that is not as complicated as it sounds. Let me try to say why it is necessary to do this. Most of the speeches we hear around here about the production tax credit say: Oh, we need to have renewable energy. We need to have everything. We need to have biomass. We need to have small irrigation power. We need to have landfill gas. We need to have trash combustion, qualified hydropower, and now wave and tidal. That is new. That is when you put a turbine in the East River in New York City and the water turns the turbines instead of the wind. It turns out there is more power in the water. In fact, it destroyed the turbines, so they are going to have to start over again. But these are emerging experimental technologies. So we say on the Senate floor that we are going to have all of these renewable generating sources, but the fact is we don't do that.

We are now committed to $11.5 billion in tax expenditures, according to the Joint Tax Committee, on wind power alone over the next 10 years—$11.5 billion on wind power alone. By adopting the Ensign-Cantwell amendment, based on my best estimates, we would add another $3 billion over the next 10 years to wind alone, and almost none of it would go over here to these other renewable electricity technologies. Now, why would I say that? It is because a new report by the Energy Information Administration, which I requested in May 2007 and received this week, said that wind power accounted for 97 percent of the total renewable electricity production tax credit in fiscal year 2007. Now, Senator BINGAMAN said earlier when we debated the Energy bill in June 2007 that he relied on the figure that 75 percent of all of the production tax credit was being used for wind power. That was an estimate from last year from the Joint Committee on Taxation. But the Energy Information Administration in this new report says that wind received 97 percent of the production tax credit in Fiscal Year 2007. I am not saying wind power is good or wind power is bad by saying this; I am saying if you are saying with the Ensign-Cantwell amendment that you are offering support for all of these different emerging technologies, that is not going to be the case because according to the Energy Information Administration, 97 percent of it went for wind.

Wind has another difference with all of these: the issue of supplying baseload power. The problem with wind is the limitation on it. Each one of these has some limitation, but one of wind's limitations is you can only use it when the wind blows. You don't store wind power; you use it when the wind blows. So if you are the city of Los Angeles or you are the city of Little Rock or the city of Nashville and it is 4 o'clock in the afternoon and you want to turn on your air-conditioners and operate your computer and turn on your light when you hear a noise, you don't want to first check to see whether the wind is blowing. So it is not a baseload power, it is not a controllable power source. It has a severe limitation.

Now, solar had much the same limitation when it was—insofar as the technology has developed so far. For solar, we generally buy panels and put them on the roof and we use the electricity that comes from the panels, and that can be very useful, just as wind mills have always been useful on farms for occasional power. But the solar industry requested to be taken out of this production tax credit because it wasn't getting any of it. It was all going to wind.

Now there is another provision for an investment tax credit for solar. Extending this investment tax credit is in

the Ensign amendment. I fully support that. That would help, for example, new solar thermal plants where you put a lot of mirrors out on the ground, collect the Sun, create steam, put the steam in the ground, and then you can use it on a continuous basis, not just when the Sun shines. Pacific Gas and Electric has a commercial plant that they are going to build out West for that. Let's see if it works. If it does, it will be a great thing for our country.

We only have a limited amount of money available to support emerging renewable energy, so why would we spend virtually all of it—97 percent—for a proven technology—wind power—that we have been subsidizing since 1992 and to which we have committed $11.5 billion over the next 10 years, if we don't do anything else, just the wind power. And, with the Ensign-Cantwell amendment, we are about to put in another $3 billion for wind power over the next ten years, acting as if we are also doing it for open-looped biomass, small irrigation power, landfill gas, trash combustion, qualified hydropower, wave and tidal, and it won't get anything. It will all go to these big wind turbines.

Let me go to another chart and give an example of what this has produced. We hear a lot of talk about Federal subsidies for oil and Federal subsidies for coal and Federal subsidies for this and that, and the oil companies are called up and everybody gets excited because we are talking about $3.50, $4 for gasoline. We have a right to be excited about that. We don't like to send our gas money overseas to people who are trying to kill us, so we are upset about that. But we are talking here about Federal subsidies for electricity, not gasoline.

I asked the Energy Information Administration in May 2007 to please tell me what is the Federal taxpayer doing to support the different ways we produce electricity in the country. The information came back this week, and it is really pretty interesting. Coal. Coal is half of all of the electricity we use in the United States. We are not a desert island. We use 25 percent of all of the energy in the world. If we are going to be realistic about it, we need to find a way to burn coal cleanly, which means we need to recapture the carbon if we care about climate change. But right now, we subsidize coal to the tune of 44 cents per megawatt hour. We may not know what a megawatt hour is, but we can compare it to what we do for others. Refined coal is a very small part of coal, and it gets a very high subsidy. That is very interesting. I didn't know about that. That is a special subsidy which was put in for refined coal, but almost all the coal we burn gets 44 cents.

Natural gas. Almost all the plants built to make new electricity in the 1990s were natural gas and petroleum. That is oil and gas. We assume it gets a lot of subsidies. It only gets 25 cents for a megawatt hour. Nuclear power. Nuclear plants generate 19 percent of all our electricity in America, but they are 70 percent of all our clean electricity. If we want to have clean air and to deal with climate change in this generation, nuclear power—other than conservation—is our best option because, with that, you have no nitrogen, no sulfur, and no mercury, which dirties the air, and you have no carbon. So 70 percent of our carbon-free electricity comes from nuclear power. How do we subsidize nuclear power? EIA's report says $1.59 per megawatt hour in Fiscal Year 2007?

Biomass is a new renewable energy, which gets 89 cents. Geothermal. They are interesting new technologies that drill way down into the ground and out comes heat and you can heat your house from that. That is 92 cents per kilowatt hour.

Hydroelectric, which is water over the dams. It is about 7 percent of all the electricity in America. It is clean, but you and I know how many new dams are going to be built. Not many more. Subsidizing that will not solve the problem of clean electricity for a country that uses 25 percent of all the electricity in the world.

Solar is misleading. We are subsidizing it at the rate of $24 per megawatt hour, about 50 times that for coal. That is an infinitesimal amount for electricity. We don't sell much solar electricity to the grid today. It is from solar panels put on the roof.

Then we have wind. That $11.5 billion we are already committed to spend to help developers build wind turbines all over America in places where it blows or doesn't blow, we are subsidizing the electricity produced by those wind turbines at the rate of $23 a megawatt hour in Fiscal Year 2007, while coal is less than a half dollar. That is 50 times the subsidy for coal.

It is $1.59 for nuclear—70 percent of our clean energy—and wind is 2 percent of our clean energy. If we were subsidizing nuclear power at the same rate as wind, it would cost us $300 billion over the next 10 years. We don't have that much money in the United States with which to subsidize electricity. So go all the way down to the bottom, past landfill gas and municipal solid waste, and I have talked about that before. In Johnson City, TN, a company is using the landfill there and paying Johnson City a million dollars a year for that purpose because it produces electricity, and Johnson City is keeping its property taxes lower. It is worth, perhaps, subsidizing that a while longer. We are doing that at the rate of 13 cents per megawatt hour.

All renewables—and this is supposed to be a bill about encouraging renewables—are being subsidized at $2.80 per megawatt hour. Yet the Ensign-Cantwell legislation would add $3 billion to wind power, which is already being subsidized at $24 per megawatt hour. That is not a wise stewardship of dollars. What Senator KYL and I are seeking to do is improve the Ensign-Cantwell bill.

The objective there, if I can go back to the other chart, is this. The objective is to identify some of these emerging renewable technologies that have the capacity to turn into base-load technologies and encourage them. They are more likely to be encouraged if we give them a 2-year extension for the production tax credit instead of 1 year. That is what we would do. They are more likely to get some of the money if we don't let wind gobble it all up, as it did last year. Why give $3 billion more to a proven technology when our goal is to support emerging technology? That is what we are trying to do. If the Senate would like to resolve the gridlock and spend $6 billion or $7 billion in support of helping us find ways to encourage new emerging base-load technologies, the way to do that would be to support Ensign-Cantwell as amended by Alexander-Kyl. Wind is getting $11.5 billion over 10 years, plus many other subsidies. With the Alexander-Kyl amendment, wind would get 1 cent per kilowatt hour and most of the $3 billion we are talking about over a longer, two-year period.

But some of these other emerging renewable energies would have a fighting chance to get some of the money because they would have more time to plan and invest. I have been visited by a lot of people who want to see some support for renewable energy. I want to see that too. I was the principal sponsor of the solar energy tax credit, increasing it in 2005. I would like to see solar thermal plants. I would like to see support for open-loop biomass, and small irrigation power, landfill gas, trash combustion, qualified hydropower and wave and tidal. But the Ensign legislation would not do it by extending the production tax credit for 1 year because wind will gobble it all up such as it did last year. The others will have a fighting chance if we extend the production tax credit for 2 years and treat wind like all these other ones, particularly now that it is proven. That is a wiser use of our money and puts us on a better path toward cleaner air and dealing with climate change.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, Rhode Island currently has the highest foreclosure rate in New England. According to the most recent National Delinquency Survey from the Mortgage Bankers Association, 3.9 percent of all the loans being serviced in the State are in foreclosure. Foreclosure initiations were up 11.8 percent from the previous quarter. As far as subprime adjustable rate mortgage loans, ARMs, are concerned, 8.2 percent of them are in foreclosure, which is up 18.8 percent from last quarter. And we know that a majority of these ARMs have not yet reset and are scheduled to do so sometime during the next year.

Many families' homes are now worth less than their mortgages, giving them no ability to refinance or sell their homes. With the cost of energy, food, health care, education, and other needs at an all time high, they are trapped between a rock and a hard place.

The legislation before us, the Foreclosure Prevention Act of 2008, is a start. I want to thank Senators Dodd and Shelby and their respective staffs for all of their hard work in helping us move forward on this legislation.

I am pleased that the bill contains the provision I authored, from my bill, S. 2153, to amend the Truth-in-Lending Act to improve home loan disclosures. This provision will ensure that consumers are provided with timely and meaningful disclosures in connection with not just home purchase mortgages, but also for loans that refinance a home or provide a home equity line of credit.

The bill requires that disclosures be provided no later than 7 business days prior to closing so borrowers can shop for another loan if not satisfied with the terms. If the terms of the loan change, the consumer must be notified 3 days before closing of the changed terms.

If consumers apply for adjustable rate or variable payment loans there will now be an explicit warning on the one page TILA form that the payments will change, depending on the interest rate, and an estimate of how those payments will change under the terms of the contract based on the current interest rate. The bill also requires a new disclosure that informs borrowers of the maximum monthly payments possible under their loan.

The bill provides a right to waive the early disclosure or requirements if the consumer has a bona fide financial emergency that requires that they close on the loan quickly, and increases the range of statutory damages for TILA violations from the current $200 to $2,000 to $400 to $4,000.

Finally, it requires lenders to include a statement that the consumer is not obligated on the mortgage loan just because they have received the disclosures. This will give consumers the opportunity to truly shop around for the best mortgage terms for the first time ever. They will be able to compare the payments and costs associated with a certain loan product, and decide not to sign on the dotted line if they do not like the basic terms of the loan.

I believe that giving consumers the information they need regarding the maximum payments is critical. Borrowers need to better understand the full financial impact of entering into a particular loan early in the process, and before they actually consummate the loan. They also need to have the chance of backing out of a loan with bad terms before they get to the closing table. I am pleased that my Republican colleagues agreed that improved disclosures are an important part of the process moving forward.

Importantly, FHA modernization legislation has been included in the bill, which will provide more safe, fixed-rate mortgages, a particular help for families who would like to refinance out of more exotic mortgage products. This section of the bill also contains provisions I authored to improve the HUD Post-Purchase Housing Counseling Program. This amendment expands access to HUD-approved counseling programs by allowing any low- or moderate-income homeowner to be eligible for financial counseling services.

Since we know that millions of homeowners are facing resets of their mortgages during the upcoming year, this change, combined with the additional funding that we are providing in this bill for housing counseling, should help at least 250,000 families to get the advice or assistance they need to help keep their home. I believe we need more funding for this, and I will keep advocating for these housing counseling services.

Additionally, the bill contains language that allows $25 million in FHA savings every year to be used for the purpose of improving FHA's technology, processes, and program performance, and for providing appropriate staffing for the FHA mortgage insurance programs. This funding is critical to ensuring the success of FHA modernization since it will allow FHA to access cutting-edge mortgage insurance industry practices and procedures.

The FHA section of the bill also contains some of the provisions that I coauthored with Senator ALLARD to improve the home equity conversion mortgages, HECM, for seniors.

Other noteworthy provisions include: $10 billion in Federal tax-exempt private activity bond authority that will provide for the refinancing of subprime loans, mortgages for first-time homebuyers, and multifamily rental housing: $4 billion in new community development block grant, CDBG, funding to help communities impacted by foreclosures by allowing localities with high foreclosure rates to purchase foreclosed properties for rehabilitation, rent, or resale; assistance for returning soldiers to avoid foreclosure by lengthening the time a lender must wait before starting foreclosure from three months to nine months after a soldier returns from service and providing returning soldiers with one year relief from increases in mortgage interest rates; the requirement that the Department of Defense establish a counseling program to ensure veterans and active service members can access assistance if facing financial difficulties; and an increase in the VA loan guarantee amount, so that veterans have additional homeownership opportunities.

However, I think that this legislation has failed to deal with the core issue at the center of this crisis—helping struggling families whose homes are now worth less than their mortgage loan—the so-called ''underwater mortgages.'' I think the Durbin amendment, which I cosponsored, would have helped substantially in this regard. To help families save their homes, the Durbin amendment was strictly limited and would have only applied to families that could pass the strict means test in bankruptcy—and therefore could prove that they couldn't afford the current mortgage. It also would have limited the provisions to families that were currently struggling with nontraditional and subprime loans.

Moreover, a judge's authority to change the terms of a mortgage was strictly limited. Judges would have only been able to reduce interest rates to the prime interest rate plus a reasonable premium for risk and could only have extended the life of the loan up to 30 years. In addition, if a family sold their home within 5 years of the court-supervised mortgage change, any increase in the market value of the home up to the original mortgage amount would have been given back to the lender.

There is no credible evidence to support the claim that the mere possibility of a small subset of mortgages being changed in bankruptcy would have somehow raised the cost of all mortgages by 1.5 to 2 percentage points, as some have claimed. In fact, a study released earlier this month concluded that allowing strip downs would have had no impact on the cost of credit at all.

The Senate should have had a straight up or down vote on this amendment, so that we could start the process of helping the families who want to honor their financial obligations get a court-ordered payment plan that will enable them to stay in their homes at no additional cost to taxpayers. However, the minority did not allow that to happen. This was unfortunate, and I believe a mistake. We are going to have to figure out a way to help the housing market deal with all of these underwater mortgages in an efficient and orderly manner.

As the housing crisis deepens, it is clear that its effects are reverberating throughout our entire economy. Indeed, employers shed 80,000 jobs in March, the worst decline in 5 years. In addition, the jobless rate jumped to 5.1 percent from 4.8 percent in February, the highest since September 2005. Unfortunately, Rhode Island has been hit especially hard in the current economic downturn as the unemployment rate has climbed to 5.8 percent. As I mentioned, families throughout Rhode Island are coping with rising energy, food, health care, and education costs, all while workers are losing their jobs and wages have remained stagnant. That is why I spearheaded a letter earlier this year urging the inclusion of an extension of unemployment insurance, UI, benefits in the original stimulus package.

Given that this extension was not included in the package signed into law and the economic situation has since worsened, I believe Congress needs to act now to ensure Americans who have played by the rules and worked hard all of their lives can make ends meet. It is critical that we extend this important program. Doing so would not only

stimulate our economy, but help workers who have lost their jobs by providing much-needed and temporary income support. Indeed, economists have found that the extension of UI benefits provides a very high return on the investment, generating approximately $1.64 in gross domestic product per dollar spent.

Although I support the Foreclosure Prevention Act, I hope that we can revisit the Durbin amendment, look more closely at Senator DODD's proposal to deal with underwater loans, and analyze other remedies that will deal with the heart of this crisis—millions of families trapped in loans that cost more than the value of their homes. If we do not provide an orderly unwinding to this problem, I fear our entire economy is going to be affected for quite some time.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, it is critical that the Senate extend renewable tax credits now so that capital for next year's wind and solar projects do not dry up.

Unfortunately my friends on the other side of the aisle have blocked every previous attempt to extend these much-needed tax credits.

Why have they decided to block something as popular as renewable energy tax credits? One can only wonder if it's because they prefer to defend something as unpopular as record oil company profits over reducing record family energy costs.

Every single time we have attempted to fund a renewable energy tax credit by rolling back completely unnecessary oil subsidies, the other side of the aisle has sided with Big Oil over the American people.

Well now it is time to try another strategy. We have been blocked from taking the financially responsible path of paying for the renewable energy tax credits. But we simply cannot afford to stand by and do nothing as our economy continues to slump and energy prices continue to put more unnecessary financial stress on New Jersey families. We must find a way forward.

Anyone who is not living under a rock understands three things:

Our economy is in serious trouble; the climate crisis is getting worse and we must act immediately to avert the worst affects of global warming; and energy prices are rising through the roof.

The majority has repeatedly offered to extend the renewable energy tax credits which would go a long way toward fixing all three of these serious problems.

If we let the renewable energy tax credits expire we will set back the tremendous growth in renewables at least a couple of years. This setback would cost the U.S. economy the creation of roughly 100,000 jobs and billions in economic development. In my home State of New Jersey, letting these tax credits lapse would cost the State over 3000 good, high paying jobs. We cannot let the economy suffer this kind of hit at this critical juncture.

Of course setting back renewables a couple of years will also be devastating to our environment. In the face of global warming we simply do not have 2 years to waste. We are in the midst of a climate crisis in which we must do everything we can to reduce our dependence on carbon. Delays like this one simply do not make any sense.

One last economic point makes this an easy call in my view. Electricity prices are skyrocketing because the price of coal and natural gas are skyrocketing. For every watt of energy we make from renewables, demand is eased on our natural gas and coal markets. If we suddenly pull the rug out from the renewable industry, wind and solar production will plummet, demand for coal and natural gas will spike and our families' electricity bills will get even higher.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting Senator CANTWELL's and Senator ENSIGN's amendment to provide an extension of the renewable energy tax credits and help deliver a stronger, greener economy for our country.

(Ms. CANTWELL assumed the chair.)

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following morning business on Thursday, April 10, the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 3221, and the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed, and if a point of order is raised against an amendment, then there be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the motion to waive the point of order, equally divided and controlled in the usual form: Senator ALEXANDER's second-degree amendment No. 4429; Senator ENSIGN's amendment No. 4419, as amended, if amended. I also ask unanimous consent that Senator ALEXANDER and Senator ENSIGN be recognized for 5 minutes apiece in consideration of their amendments; that all remaining pending amendments be withdrawn, except the substitute, and that a managers' amendment that has been cleared by the managers and the leaders also be in order; that the managers' package be considered and agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that upon disposition of the listed amendments, the substitute, as amended, be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that upon disposition of the substitute amendment, the bill be read a third time, and the Senate vote on passage of the bill without further intervening action or debate; that upon passage, the title amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to, and that the cloture motion on the bill be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 4398, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 4387

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 402. CREDIT COUNSELING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Entities approved by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation or the Secretary and State housing finance entities receiving funds under this title shall work to identify and coordinate with nonprofit organizations operating national or statewide toll-free foreclosure prevention hotlines, including those that—

(1) serve as a consumer referral source and data repository for borrowers experiencing some form of delinquency or foreclosure;

(2) connect callers with local housing counseling agencies approved by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation or the Secretary to assist with working out a positive resolution to their mortgage delinquency or foreclosure; or

(3) facilitate or offer free assistance to help homeowners to understand their options, negotiate solutions, and find the best resolution for their particular circumstances.

AMENDMENT NO. 4444 TO AMENDMENT NO. 4387

At the end, insert the following:

TITLE VIII—SENSE OF THE SENATE

SEC. 801. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that in implementing or carrying out any provision of this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, the Senate supports a policy of noninterference regarding local government requirements that the holder of a foreclosed property maintain that property.

AMENDMENT NO. 4446, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 4387

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NATIONWIDE DISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or the amendments made by this Act, each State shall receive not less than 0.5 percent of funds made available under section 301 (relating to emergency assistance for the redevelopment of abandoned and foreclosed homes).

AMENDMENT NO. 4449, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 4387

(Purpose: To sunset the ability of States to reinvent profits generated under title III, and for other purposes)

On page 54, strike line 17 and all that follows through page 55, line 9, and insert the following:

(3) REINVESTMENT OF PROFITS.—

(A) PROFITS FROM SALES, RENTALS, AND REDEVELOPMENT.—

(i) 5-YEAR REINVESTMENT PERIOD.—During the 5-year period following the date of enactment of this Act, any revenue generated from the sale, rental, redevelopment, rehabilitation, or any other eligible use that is in excess of the cost to acquire and redevelop (including reasonable development fees) or rehabilitate an abandoned or foreclosed upon home or residential property shall be provided to and used by the State or unit of general local government in accordance with, and in furtherance of, the intent and provisions of this section.

(ii) DEPOSITS IN THE TREASURY.—

(I) PROFITS.—Upon the expiration of the 5-year period set forth under clause (i), any revenue generated from the sale, rental, redevelopment, rehabilitation, or any other eligible use that is in excess of the cost to acquire and redevelop (including reasonable development fees) or rehabilitate an abandoned or foreclosed upon home or residential property shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, unless the Secretary approves a request to use the funds for purposes under this Act.

(II) OTHER AMOUNTS.—Upon the expiration of the 5-year period set forth under clause (i), any other revenue not described under subclause (I) generated from the sale, rental, redevelopment, rehabilitation, or any other eligible use of an abandoned or foreclosed upon

home or residential property shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(B) OTHER REVENUES.—Any revenue generated under subparagraphs (A), (C) or (D) of subsection (c)(3) shall be provided to and used by the State or unit of general local government in accordance with, and in furtherance of, the intent and provisions of this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 4454, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 4387

(Purpose: To require enhanced reporting regarding certain loans guaranteed by the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund)

On page 12, at the end of line 22, add the following: ''The report shall also include an evaluation of the quality control procedures and accuracy of information utilized in the process of underwriting loans guaranteed by the Fund. Such evaluation shall include a review of the risk characteristics of loans based not only on borrower information and performance, but on risks associated with loans originated or funded by various entities or financial institutions.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 4458, AS MODIFIED

On page 58 between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 302. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS WITH RESPECT TO EMINENT DOMAIN.

No State or unit of general local government may use any amounts received pursuant to section 301 to fund any project that seeks to use the power of eminent domain, unless eminent domain is employed only for a public use: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section, public use shall not be construed to include economic development that primarily benefits private entities.

AMENDMENT NO. 4464, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 4387

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INVESTMENT AUTHORITY FOR DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.

(a) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INVESTMENTS.—

(1) NATIONAL BANKS.—The first sentence of the paragraph designated as the ''Eleventh'' of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (12 U.S.C. 24) (as amended by section 305(a) of the Financial Services Regulatory Relief Act of 2006) is amended by striking ''promotes the public welfare by benefitting primarily'' and inserting ''is designed primarily to promote the public welfare, including the welfare of''.

(2) STATE MEMBER BANKS.—The first sentence of the 23rd paragraph of section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 338a) is amended by striking ''promotes the public welfare by benefitting primarily'' and inserting ''is designed primarily to promote the public welfare, including the welfare of''.

AMENDMENT NO. 4473, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 4387

On page 12, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 202. LIMITATION ON DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds made available under this title or title III shall be distributed to—

(1) an organization which has been indicted for a violation under Federal law relating to an election for Federal office; or

(2) an organization which employs applicable individuals.

(b) APPLICABLE INDIVIDUALS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''applicable individual'' means an individual who—

(1) is—

(A) employed by the organization in a permanent or temporary capacity;

(B) contracted or retained by the organization; or

(C) acting on behalf of, or with the express or apparent authority of, the organization; and

(2) has been indicted for a violation under Federal law relating to an election for Federal office.

AMENDMENT NO. 4480 TO AMENDMENT NO. 4387

(Purpose: To require the Federal Housing Finance Board to permit the Federal home loan banks to use affordable housing program funds to refinance certain single-family first mortgages)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK REFINANCING AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE LOANS.

Section 10(j)(2) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1430(j)(2) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) during the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this subparagraph, refinance loans that are secured by a first mortgage on a primary residence of any family having an income at or below 80 percent of the median income for the area.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 4489, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 4387

On page 18, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 20, line 24, and insert the following:

SEC. 122. HOME EQUITY CONVERSION MORTGAGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 255 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–20) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2), insert '' 'real estate,' '' after '' 'mortgagor','';

(2) by amending subsection (d)(1) to read as follows:

''(1) have been originated by a mortgagee approved by the Secretary;'';

(3) by amending subsection (d)(2)(B) to read as follows:

''(B) has received adequate counseling, as provided in subsection (f), by an independent third party that is not, either directly or indirectly, associated with or compensated by a party involved in-

''(i) originating or servicing the mortgage;

''(ii) funding the loan underlying the mortgage; or

''(iii) the sale of annuities, investments, long-term care insurance, or any other type of financial or insurance product;'';

(4) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking ''(f) INFORMATION SERVICES FOR MORTGAGORS.—'' and inserting ''(f) COUNSELING SERVICES AND INFORMATION FOR MORTGAGORS.—''; and

(B) by amending the matter preceding paragraph (1) to read as follows: ''The Secretary shall provide or cause to be provided adequate counseling for the mortgagor, as described in subsection (d)(2)(B). Such counseling shall be provided by counselors that meet qualification standards and follow uniform counseling protocols. The qualification standards and counseling protocols shall be established by the Secretary within 12 months of the date of enactment of the Reverse Mortgage Proceeds Protection Act. The protocols shall require a qualified counselor to discuss with each mortgagor information which shall include—''

(5) in subsection (g), by striking ''established under section 203(b)(2)'' and all that follows through ''located'' and inserting ''limitation established under section 305(a)(2) of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act for a 1-family residence'';

(6) in subsection (i)(1)(C), by striking ''limitations'' and inserting ''limitation'';

(7) by striking subsection (l);

(8) by redesignating subsection (m) as subsection (l);

(9) by amending subsection (l), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

''(l) FUNDING FOR COUNSELING.—The Secretary may use a portion of the mortgage insurance premiums collected under the program under this section to adequately fund the counseling and disclosure activities required under subsection (f), including counseling for those homeowners who elect not to take out a home equity conversion mortgage, provided that the use of such funds is based upon accepted actuarial principles.''; and

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

''(m) AUTHORITY TO INSURE HOME PURCHASE MORTGAGE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Secretary may insure, upon application by a mortgagee, a home equity conversion mortgage upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, when the home equity conversion mortgage will be used to purchase a 1- to 4-family dwelling unit, one unit of which that the mortgagor will occupy as a primary residence, and to provide for any future payments to the mortgagor, based on available equity, as authorized under subsection (d)(9).

''(2) LIMITATION ON PRINCIPAL OBLIGATION.—A home equity conversion mortgage insured pursuant to paragraph (1) shall involve a principal obligation that does not exceed the dollar amount limitation determined under section 305(a)(2) of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act for a 1-family residence.

''(n) REQUIREMENTS ON MORTGAGE ORIGINATORS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The mortgagee and any other party that participates in the origination of a mortgage to be insured under this section shall—

''(A) not participate in, be associated with, or employ any party that participates in or is associated with any other financial or insurance activity; or

''(B) demonstrate to the Secretary that the mortgagee or other party maintains, or will maintain, firewalls and other safeguards designed to ensure that—

''(i) individuals participating in the origination of the mortgage shall have no involvement with, or incentive to provide the mortgagor with, any other financial or insurance product; and

''(ii) the mortgagor shall not be required, directly or indirectly, as a condition of obtaining a mortgage under this section, to purchase any other financial or insurance product.

''(2) APPROVAL OF OTHER PARTIES.—All parties that participate in the origination of a mortgage to be insured under this section shall be approved by the Secretary.

''(o) PROHIBITION AGAINST REQUIREMENTS TO PURCHASE ADDITIONAL PRODUCTS.—The mortgagee or any other party shall not be required by the mortgagor or any other party to purchase an insurance, annuity, or other additional product as a requirement or condition of eligibility for a mortgage authorized under subsection (c).

''(q) STUDY TO DETERMINE CONSUMER PROTECTIONS AND UNDERWRITING STANDARDS.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to examine and determine appropriate consumer protections and underwriting standards to ensure that the purchase of products referred to in subsection (o) is appropriate for the consumer. In conducting such study, the

Secretary shall consult with consumer advocates (including recognized experts in consumer protection), industry representatives, representatives of counseling organizations, and other interested parties.''.

(b) MORTGAGES FOR COOPERATIVES.—Subsection (b) of section 255 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–20(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by inserting ''a first or subordinate mortgage or lien'' before ''on all stock'';

(B) by inserting ''unit'' after ''dwelling''; and

(C) by inserting ''a first mortgage or first lien'' before ''on a leasehold''; and

(2) in paragraph (5), by inserting ''a first or subordinate lien on'' before ''all stock''.

(c) LIMITATION ON ORIGINATION FEES.—Section 255 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–20), as amended by the preceding provisions of this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(r) LIMITATION ON ORIGINATION FEES.—The Secretary shall establish limits on the origination fee that may be charged to a mortgagor under a mortgage insured under this section, which limitations shall—

''(1) equal 1.5 percent of the maximum claim amount of the mortgage unless adjusted thereafter on the basis of—

''(A) the costs to the mortgagor; and

''(B) the impact of such fees on the reverse mortgage market;

''(2) be subject to a minimum allowable amount;

''(3) provide that the origination fee may be fully financed with the mortgage;

''(4) include any fees paid to correspondent mortgagees approved by the Secretary; and

''(5) have the same effective date as subsection (m)(2) regarding the limitation on principal obligation.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 4518 TO AMENDMENT NO. 4387

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 4390, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 4387

At the end add the following:

TITLE VIII—REIT INVESTMENT DIVERSIFICATION AND EMPOWERMENT

SEC. 800. SHORT TITLE; AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the ''REIT Investment Diversification and Empowerment Act of 2008''.

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

Subtitle B—Taxable Reit Subsidiaries

SEC. 811. CONFORMING TAXABLE REIT SUBSIDIARY ASSET TEST.

Section 856(c)(4)(B)(ii) is amended by striking ''20 percent'' and inserting ''25 percent''.

Subtitle C—Dealer Sales

SEC. 821. HOLDING PERIOD UNDER SAFE HARBOR.

Section 857(b)(6) (relating to income from prohibited transactions) is amended—

(1) by striking ''4 years'' in subparagraphs (C)(i), (C)(iv), and (D)(i) and inserting ''2 years'',

(2) by striking ''4-year period'' in subparagraphs (C)(ii), (D)(ii), and (D)(iii) and inserting ''2-year period'', and

(3) by striking ''real estate asset'' and all that follows through ''if'' in the matter preceding clause (i) of subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively, and inserting ''real estate asset (as defined in section 856(c)(5)(B)) and which is described in section 1221(a)(1) if''.

SEC. 822. DETERMINING VALUE OF SALES UNDER SAFE HARBOR.

Section 857(b)(6) is amended—

(1) by striking the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (C)(iii) and inserting '', or (III) the fair market value of property (other than sales of foreclosure property or sales to which section 1033 applies) sold during the taxable year does not exceed 10 percent of the fair market value of all of the assets of the trust as of the beginning of the taxable year;'', and

(2) by adding ''or'' at the end of subclause (II) of subparagraph (D)(iv) and by adding at the end of such subparagraph the following new subclause:

''(III) the fair market value of property (other than sales of foreclosure property or sales to which section 1033 applies) sold during the taxable year does not exceed 10 percent of the fair market value of all of the assets of the trust as of the beginning of the taxable year,''.

Subtitle D—Health Care Reits

SEC. 831. CONFORMITY FOR HEALTH CARE FACILITIES.

(a) RELATED PARTY RENTALS.—Subparagraph (B) of section 856(d)(8) (relating to special rule for taxable REIT subsidiaries) is amended to read as follows:

''(B) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN LODGING FACILITIES AND HEALTH CARE PROPERTY.—The requirements of this subparagraph are met with respect to an interest in real property which is a qualified lodging facility (as defined in paragraph (9)(D)) or a qualified health care property (as defined in subsection (e)(6)(D)(i)) leased by the trust to a taxable REIT subsidiary of the trust if the property is operated on behalf of such subsidiary by a person who is an eligible independent contractor. For purposes of this section, a taxable REIT subsidiary is not considered to be operating or managing a qualified health care property or qualified lodging facility solely because it—

''(i) directly or indirectly possesses a license, permit, or similar instrument enabling it to do so, or

''(ii) employs individuals working at such property or facility located outside the United States, but only if an eligible independent contractor is responsible for the daily supervision and direction of such individuals on behalf of the taxable REIT subsidiary pursuant to a management agreement or similar service contract.''.

(b) ELIGIBLE INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR.—Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 856(d)(9) (relating to eligible independent contractor) are amended to read as follows:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'eligible independent contractor' means, with respect to any qualified lodging facility or qualified health care property (as defined in subsection (e)(6)(D)(i)), any independent contractor if, at the time such contractor enters into a management agreement or other similar service contract with the taxable REIT subsidiary to operate such qualified lodging facility or qualified health care property, such contractor (or any related person) is actively engaged in the trade or business of operating qualified lodging facilities or qualified health care properties, respectively, for any person who is not a related person with respect to the real estate investment trust or the taxable REIT subsidiary.

''(B) SPECIAL RULES.—Solely for purposes of this paragraph and paragraph (8)(B), a person shall not fail to be treated as an independent contractor with respect to any qualified lodging facility or qualified health care property (as so defined) by reason of the following:

''(i) The taxable REIT subsidiary bears the expenses for the operation of such qualified lodging facility or qualified health care property pursuant to the management agreement or other similar service contract.

''(ii) The taxable REIT subsidiary receives the revenues from the operation of such qualified lodging facility or qualified health care property, net of expenses for such operation and fees payable to the operator pursuant to such agreement or contract.

''(iii) The real estate investment trust receives income from such person with respect to another property that is attributable to a lease of such other property to such person that was in effect as of the later of—

''(I) January 1, 1999, or

''(II) the earliest date that any taxable REIT subsidiary of such trust entered into a management agreement or other similar service contract with such person with respect to such qualified lodging facility or qualified health care property.''.

(c) TAXABLE REIT SUBSIDIARIES.—The last sentence of section 856(l)(3) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''or a health care facility'' after ''a lodging facility'', and

(2) by inserting ''or health care facility'' after ''such lodging facility''.

Subtitle E—Effective Dates and Sunset

SEC. 841. EFFECTIVE DATES AND SUNSET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the amendments made by this title shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) REIT INCOME TESTS.—

(1) The amendment made by section 801(a) and (b) shall apply to gains and items of income recognized after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) The amendment made by section 801(c) shall apply to transactions entered into after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) The amendment made by section 801(d) shall apply after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) CONFORMING FOREIGN CURRENCY REVISIONS.—

(1) The amendment made by section 803(a) shall apply to gains recognized after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) The amendment made by section 803(b) shall apply to gains and deductions recognized after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) DEALER SALES.—The amendments made by subtitle C shall apply to sales made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) SUNSET.—All amendments made by this title shall not apply to taxable years beginning after the date which is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act. The Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied and administered to taxable years described in the preceding sentence as if the amendments so described had never been enacted.

AMENDMENT NO. 4433 TO AMENDMENT NO. 4387

(Purpose: To modify the increase in volume cap for housing bonds in 2008)

On page 70, strike lines 14 through 22 and insert the following:

''(A) INCREASE FOR 2008.—In the case of calendar year 2008, the State ceiling for each State shall be increased by an amount equal to the greater of—

''(i) $10,000,000,000 multiplied by a fraction—

''(I) the numerator of which is the population of such State, and

''(II) the denominator of which is the total population of all States, or

''(ii) the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

''(B) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—The amount determined under this subparagraph is—

''(i) in the case of a State (other than a possession), $90,300,606, and

''(ii) in the case of a possession of the United States with a population less than the least populous State (other than a possession), the product of—

''(I) a fraction the numerator of which is $90,300,606 and the denominator of which is population of the least populous State (other than a possession), and

''(II) the population of such possession.

In the case of any possession of the United States not described in clause (ii), the amount determined under this subparagraph shall be zero.

''(C) SET ASIDE.—

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I thank you, I thank Senator SHELBY and his staff, our staff, and the leaders. The majority leader has been tremendously valuable. Senator BAUCUS, Senator GRASSLEY, the Republican leader, and his staff as well.

This has been a long week but satisfying. I will have more remarks to add about the details of what is here. This is a very important moment, and the leadership deserves an immense amount of credit for making this possible. I thank them immensely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 2739

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that upon disposition of H.R. 3221, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 616, S. 2739, the energy lands bills; that when the bill is considered, the only first-degree amendments in order be the four amendments at the desk by Senator COBURN, with no other amendments in order; that there be a total of 2 hours for debate with respect to the amendments, equally divided and controlled in the usual form; that upon disposition of the amendments, the bill be read a third time, and with no further intervening action or debate, the Senate proceed to vote on passage of S. 2739, as amended, if amended; further, that the amendments be printed in the RECORD once this agreement is entered; and that the cloture motion on the motion to proceed to S. 2739 be withdrawn, and the order with respect to S. 2483 be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 4519

(Purpose: To require the transfer of certain funds to be used by the Director of the National Park Service to dispose of assets described in the candidate asset disposition list of the National Park Service)

At the end, add the following:

TITLE IX—DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN FUNDS

SEC. 901 CANDIDATE ASSET DISPOSITION LIST.

For fiscal year 2008, and each fiscal year thereafter, amounts made available to be used by the Director of the National Park Service to dispose of assets described in the candidate asset disposition list of the National Park Service shall be equal to 1 percent of, and derived by transfer from, all amounts made available to the Secretary of the Interior carry out this Act for each such fiscal year.

AMENDMENT NO. 4520

(Purpose: To ensure that all individuals who reside, or own property that is located, in a proposed National Heritage Area are informed of the designation of the National Heritage Area)

On page 203, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

Subtitle G—Notification and Consent Requirements Relating to National Heritage Areas

SEC. 491 NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.

The Secretary of the Interior shall not approve a management plan for a National Heritage Area designated by this title unless the local coordinating entity of the proposed National Heritage Area provides written notification through the United States mail of the designation to each individual who resides, or owns property that is located, in the proposed National Heritage Area.

SEC. 492. WRITTEN CONSENT REQUIREMENT.

With respect to each National Heritage Area designated by this title, no employee of the National Park Service or member of the local coordinating entity of the National Heritage Area (including any designee of the National Park Service or the local coordinating entity) may enter a parcel of private property located in the proposed National Heritage Area without the written consent of the owner of the parcel of property.

AMENDMENT NO. 4521

(Purpose: To require approval prior to the assumption of control by the Federal Government of State property)

At the end, add the following:

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 901. REQUIREMENT OF APPROVAL OF CERTAIN CITIZENS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Department of the Interior, the Department of Energy, and the Forest Service, acting individually or in coordination, shall not assume control of any parcel of land located in a State unless the citizens of each political subdivision of the State in which a portion of the parcel of land is located approve the assumption of control by a referendum.

(b) NATIONAL EMERGENCIES.—The requirement described in subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of a national emergency, as determined by the President.

(c) PRIVATE LANDOWNERS.—The requirement described in subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of a voluntary exchange between a private landowner and the Federal Government of a parcel of land.

(d) DURATION OF APPROVAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a parcel of land described in subsection (a), the approval of the citizens of each political subdivision in which a portion of the parcel of land is located terminates on the date that is 10 years after the date on which the citizens of each political subdivision approve the control of the parcel of land by the Department of the Interior, the Department of Energy, or the Forest Service under that subsection.

(2) RENEWAL OF APPROVAL.—With respect to a parcel of land described in subsection (a), the Department of the Interior, the Department of Energy, or the Forest Service, as applicable, may renew, by referendum, the approval of the citizens of each political subdivision in which a portion of the parcel of land is located.

AMENDMENT NO. 4522

(Purpose: To require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to determine on an annual basis the quantity of land that is owned by the Federal Government and the cost to taxpayers of the ownership of the land)

At the end, add the following:

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 901. ANNUAL REPORT RELATING TO LAND OWNED BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), not later than May 15, 2009, and annually thereafter, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (referred to in this section as the ''Director'') shall ensure that a report that contains the information described in subsection (b) is posted on a publicly available website.

(2) EXTENSION RELATING TO CERTAIN SEGMENT OF REPORT.—With respect to the date on which the first annual report is required to be posted under paragraph (1), if the Director determines that an additional period of time is required to gather the information required under subsection (b)(3)(B), the Director may—

(A) as of the date described in paragraph (1), post each segment of information required under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)(A) of subsection (b); and

(B) as of May 15, 2010, post the segment of information required under subsection (b)(3)(B).

(b) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—An annual report described in subsection (a) shall contain, for the period covered by the report—

(1) a description of the total quantity of—

(A) land located within the jurisdiction of the United States, to be expressed in acres;

(B) the land described in subparagraph (A) that is owned by the Federal Government, to be expressed—

(i) in acres; and

(ii) as a percentage of the quantity described in subparagraph (A); and

(C) the land described in subparagraph (B) that is located in each State, to be expressed, with respect to each State—

(i) in acres; and

(ii) as a percentage of the quantity described in subparagraph (B);

(2) a description of the total annual cost to the Federal Government for maintaining all parcels of administrative land and all administrative buildings or structures under the jurisdiction of each Federal agency; and

(3) a list and detailed summary of—

(A) with respect to each Federal agency—

(i) the number of unused or vacant assets;

(ii) the replacement value for each unused or vacant asset;

(iii) the total operating costs for each unused or vacant asset; and

(iv) the length of time that each type of asset described in clause (i) has been unused or vacant, organized in categories comprised of periods of—

(I) not more than 1 year;

(II) not less than 1, but not more than 2, years; and

(III) not less than 2 years; and

(B) the estimated costs to the Federal Government of the maintenance backlog of each Federal agency, to be—

(i) organized in categories comprised of buildings and structures; and

(ii) expressed as an aggregate cost.

(c) USE OF EXISTING ANNUAL REPORTS.—An annual report required under subsection (a) may be comprised of any annual report relating to the management of Federal real property that is published by a Federal agency.

Mr. REID. Madam President, let me say this: This has taken some time to get done. I appreciate Senator BINGAMAN's hard work. I appreciate the understanding of Senator COBURN. He came to my office. We had a very warm discussion. If there was a misunderstanding—and obviously there was—I certainly apologize to everyone for any inconvenience I caused.

As I have indicated, I think this accomplishes what we need to do. Again, I appreciate the understanding of Senator COBURN.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—NOMINATIONS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, April 10, upon disposition of S. 2739, following consultation with Senator MCCONNELL, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 476, 477, 478, 479, and 515; that there be a total of 4 hours of debate on the nominations, with 2 hours each under the control of Chairman LEAHY and Ranking Member SPECTER; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order listed above; that after the first vote in the sequence, the vote time be limited to 10 minutes; and that upon confirmation, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, let me say this also. The first agreement that Senator DODD and Senator SHELBY did could not have been reachable without the understanding and cooperation of Senator KYL. He reached a long distance to agree to this request. I appreciate his understanding and his willingness to let us move forward.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4389, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding its adoption the Landrieu amendment No. 4389, as further modified, be further modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified further, is as follows:

On page 82, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

SEC. 605. USE OF AMENDED INCOME TAX RETURNS TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT RECEIPT OF CERTAIN HURRICANE-RELATED CASUALTY LOSS GRANTS BY DISALLOWING PREVIOUSLY TAKEN CASUALTY LOSS DEDUCTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, if a taxpayer claims a deduction for any taxable year with respect to a casualty loss to a personal residence (within the meaning of section 121 of such Code) resulting from Hurricane Katrina, Hurricane Rita, or Hurricane Wilma and in a subsequent taxable year receives a grant under Public Law 109-148, 109-234, or 110-116 as reimbursement for such loss, such taxpayer may elect to file an amended income tax return for the taxable year in which such deduction was allowed and disallow such deduction. If elected, such amended return must be filed not later than the due date for filing the tax return for the taxable year in which the taxpayer receives such reimbursement or the date that is 4 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is later. Any increase in Federal income tax resulting from such disallowance if such amended return is filed—

(1) shall be subject to interest on the underpaid tax for one year at the underpayment rate determined under section 6621(a)(2) of such Code; and

(2) shall not be subject to any penalty under such Code.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—For purposes of Senate enforcement, all provisions of this section are designated as emergency requirements and necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to section 204 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008.

SEC. 606. WAIVER OF DEADLINE ON CONSTRUCTION OF GO ZONE PROPERTY ELIGIBLE FOR BONUS DEPRECIATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 1400N(d)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(B) without regard to 'and before January 1, 2009' in clause (i) thereof,''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2007.

(c) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—For purposes of Senate enforcement, all provisions of this section are designated as emergency requirements and necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to section 204 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008.

SEC. 607. TEMPORARY TAX RELIEF FOR KIOWA COUNTY, KANSAS AND SURROUNDING AREA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following provisions of or relating to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall apply, in addition to the areas described in such provisions, to an area with respect to which a major disaster has been declared by the President under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (FEMA-1699-DR, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act) by reason of severe storms and tornados beginning on May 4, 2007, and determined by the President to warrant individual or individual and public assistance from the Federal Government under such Act with respect to damages attributed to such storms and tornados:

(1) SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON PERSONAL CASUALTY LOSSES.—Section 1400S(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, by substituting ''May 4, 2007'' for ''August 25, 2005''.

(2) EXTENSION OF REPLACEMENT PERIOD FOR NONRECOGNITION OF GAIN.—Section 405 of the Katrina Emergency Tax Relief Act of 2005, by substituting ''on or after May 4, 2007, by reason of the May 4, 2007, storms and tornados'' for ''on or after August 25, 2005, by reason of Hurricane Katrina''.

(3) EMPLOYEE RETENTION CREDIT FOR EMPLOYERS AFFECTED BY MAY 4 STORMS AND TORNADOS.—Section 1400R(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986—

(A) by substituting ''May 4, 2007'' for ''August 28, 2005'' each place it appears,

(B) by substituting ''January 1, 2008'' for ''January 1, 2006'' both places it appears, and

(C) only with respect to eligible employers who employed an average of not more than 200 employees on business days during the taxable year before May 4, 2007.

(4) SPECIAL ALLOWANCE FOR CERTAIN PROPERTY ACQUIRED ON OR AFTER MAY 5, 2007.—Section 1400N(d) of such Code—

(A) by substituting ''qualified Recovery Assistance property'' for ''qualified Gulf Opportunity Zone property'' each place it appears,

(B) by substituting ''May 5, 2007'' for ''August 28, 2005'' each place it appears,

(C) by substituting ''December 31, 2008'' for ''December 31, 2007'' in paragraph (2)(A)(v),

(D) by substituting ''December 31, 2009'' for ''December 31, 2008'' in paragraph (2)(A)(v),

(E) by substituting ''May 4, 2007'' for ''August 27, 2005'' in paragraph (3)(A),

(F) by substituting ''January 1, 2009'' for ''January 1, 2008'' in paragraph (3)(B), and

(G) determined without regard to paragraph (6) thereof.

(5) INCREASE IN EXPENSING UNDER SECTION 179.—Section 1400N(e) of such Code, by substituting ''qualified section 179 Recovery Assistance property'' for ''qualified section 179 Gulf Opportunity Zone property'' each place it appears.

(6) EXPENSING FOR CERTAIN DEMOLITION AND CLEAN-UP COSTS.—Section 1400N(f) of such Code—

(A) by substituting ''qualified Recovery Assistance clean-up cost'' for ''qualified Gulf Opportunity Zone clean-up cost'' each place it appears, and

(B) by substituting ''beginning on May 4, 2007, and ending on December 31, 2009'' for ''beginning on August 28, 2005, and ending on December 31, 2007'' in paragraph (2) thereof.

(7) TREATMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITY PROPERTY DISASTER LOSSES.—Section 1400N(o) of such Code.

(8) TREATMENT OF NET OPERATING LOSSES ATTRIBUTABLE TO STORM LOSSES.—Section 1400N(k) of such Code—

(A) by substituting ''qualified Recovery Assistance loss'' for ''qualified Gulf Opportunity Zone loss'' each place it appears,

(B) by substituting ''after May 3, 2007, and before on January 1, 2010'' for ''after August 27, 2005, and before January 1, 2008'' each place it appears,

(C) by substituting ''May 4, 2007'' for ''August 28, 2005'' in paragraph (2)(B)(ii)(I) thereof,

(D) by substituting ''qualified Recovery Assistance property'' for ''qualified Gulf Opportunity Zone property'' in paragraph (2)(B)(iv) thereof, and

(E) by substituting ''qualified Recovery Assistance casualty loss'' for ''qualified Gulf Opportunity Zone casualty loss'' each place it appears.

(9) TREATMENT OF REPRESENTATIONS REGARDING INCOME ELIGIBILITY FOR PURPOSES OF QUALIFIED RENTAL PROJECT REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1400N(n) of such Code.

(10) SPECIAL RULES FOR USE OF RETIREMENT FUNDS.—Section 1400Q of such Code—

(A) by substituting ''qualified Recovery Assistance distribution'' for ''qualified hurricane distribution'' each place it appears,

(B) by substituting ''on or after May 4, 2007, and before January 1, 2009'' for ''on or after August 25, 2005, and before January 1, 2007'' in subsection (a)(4)(A)(i),

(C) by substituting ''qualified storm distribution'' for ''qualified Katrina distribution'' each place it appears,

(D) by substituting ''after November 4, 2006, and before May 5, 2007'' for ''after February 28, 2005, and before August 29, 2005'' in subsection (b)(2)(B)(ii),

(E) by substituting ''beginning on May 4, 2007, and ending on November 5, 2007'' for ''beginning on August 25, 2005, and ending on February 28, 2006'' in subsection (b)(3)(A),

(F) by substituting ''qualified storm individual'' for ''qualified Hurricane Katrina individual'' each place it appears,

(G) by substituting ''December 31, 2007'' for ''December 31, 2006'' in subsection (c)(2)(A),

(H) by substituting ''beginning on June 4, 2007, and ending on December 31, 2007'' for ''beginning on September 24, 2005, and ending

on December 31, 2006'' in subsection (c)(4)(A)(i),

(I) by substituting ''May 4, 2007'' for ''August 25, 2005'' in subsection (c)(4)(A)(ii), and

(J) by substituting ''January 1, 2008'' for ''January 1, 2007'' in subsection (d)(2)(A)(ii).

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—For purposes of Senate enforcement, all provisions of this section are designated as emergency requirements and necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to section 204 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008.

AMENDMENT NO. 4478, AS AMENDED

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the unanimous consent agreement, the Murray amendment No. 4478, as amended by the Mikulski amendment, be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 4494), as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. _____.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount appropriated under section 301(a) of this Act shall be $3,920,000,000 and the amount appropriated under section 401 of this Act shall be $180,000,000: Provided, That, of amounts appropriated under such section 401 $30,000,000 shall be used by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation (referred to in this section as the ''NRC'') to make grants to counseling intermediaries approved by the Department of Housing and Urban Development or the NRC to hire attorneys to assist homeowners who have legal issues directly related to the homeowner's foreclosure, delinquency or short sale. Such attorneys shall be capable of assisting homeowners of owner-occupied homes with mortgages in default, in danger of default, or subject to or at risk of foreclosure and who have legal issues that cannot be handled by counselors already employed by such intermediaries: Provided further, That of the amounts provided for in the prior provisos the NRC shall give priority consideration to counseling intermediaries and legal organizations that (1) provide legal assistance in the 100 metropolitan statistical areas (as defined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget) with the highest home foreclosure rates, and (2) have the capacity to begin using the financial assistance within 90 days after receipt of the assistance: Provided further, That no funds provided under this Act shall be used to provide, obtain, or arrange on behalf of a homeowner, legal representation involving or for the purposes of civil litigation.

The amendment (No. 4478), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FIREARMS INFORMATION USE ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, it is a privilege to join my colleagues in supporting the Firearms Information Use Act to repeal the most extreme provisions in the Tiahrt amendment and lift the veil of secrecy that currently surrounds the flow of guns in our country. The act will give law enforcement agencies the support they need to do their job, while protecting information about undercover officers, confidential informants, ongoing investigations, and lawful firearms purchasers. It is a basic open-government measure that is critical for the public safety of communities across America.

The Tiahrt amendment is an appropriations rider enacted in 2003 that restricts public access to information gathered by the Justice Department's Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. It prevents law enforcement organizations from sharing gun trace data with each other and from obtaining gun trace data outside their geographic jurisdiction. It prohibits such information from being used as evidence in State license revocations, civil lawsuits, or any other administrative proceedings, unless specifically filed by the Bureau. It also prevents the Bureau from publishing reports that use gun trace data to analyze the flow of guns at the national level.

Numerous mayors, law enforcement officers, and researchers have spoken out against these restrictions. Mayors Against Illegal Guns, a bipartisan coalition of over 250 mayors led by Mayor Tom Menino of Boston and Mayor Michael Bloomberg of New York City, is staunchly opposed to the Tiahrt amendment, and one of the coalition's top priorities is to have the amendment repealed. The International Association of Chiefs of Police recently emphasized that we can reduce gun violence in our communities by making gun trace data publicly available.

In a 2006 report, the Brady Center to Prevent Gun Violence documented the harmful consequences of the Tiahrt amendment. The Brady Center found that the amendment ''had an immediate chilling effect on the Bureau's activities,'' that ''academic researchers have already found their work stymied,'' and that the amendment has ''crippled'' efforts by law enforcement to investigate patterns of gun trafficking on a nationwide basis and to identify sources of guns used in crime. The report unequivocally concludes that the ''Tiahrt Amendment is a transparent attempt by the gun lobby . . . to shield the public, as well as government and law enforcement agencies, from the truth about guns and crime.''

In spite of these criticisms, the amendment has been included in the Justice Department appropriations bill every year since 2003, and even more restrictive versions of it have been proposed in recent months. By enacting the Firearms Information Use Act, Congress can restore sanity to our policy on gun trace data. Scaling back the Tiahrt amendment will give our State and local officials the information they need to halt gun trafficking and the reckless dealers who facilitate it. Whatever one's views of the second amendment, surely we can all agree that it does not confer a right to sell firearms illegally. I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

HEALTH CARE COSTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, one of the most pressing concerns of American families and businesses these days is the skyrocketing cost of health care. Health costs are now the No. 1 cause of personal bankruptcy and many businesses are dropping coverage for their employees because they can no longer afford it.

Required reading for anyone seeking to address the challenge of high health costs is an insightful article in this month's New England Journal of Medicine. It was authored by Dr. James Mongan, who is CEO of Partners HealthCare in Massachusetts, which includes Massachusetts General and Brigham and Women's, two of the Nation's leading hospitals. He is joined by Dr. Timothy Ferris and Dr. Thomas Lee.

The article states that there is no single answer to reducing health costs. However, it identifies a number of initiatives that hold significant promise, including pay-for-performance programs, use of electronic medical records and more.

I commend this compelling article to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New England Journal of Medicine, Apr. 3, 2008]

OPTIONS FOR SLOWING THE GROWTH OF HEALTH CARE COSTS

(By James J. Mongan, M.D., Timothy G. Ferris, M.D., M.P.H., and Thomas H. Lee, M.D.)

Health care costs continue to be an important concern in the United States, and they are already a central issue of the 2008 presidential campaign. Numerous strategies for cost containment are being proposed, but specific options are usually presented in isolation, with little disciplined discussion of their potential impact or the barriers they face. In this article, we provide a survey of major options for slowing the growth of health care spending. We also provide a qualitative assessment of the likely effectiveness of these options and our recommendation for a package that could be collectively pursued.

Underlying our analysis are three basic assumptions. First, health care spending has high intrinsic social value, and the primary driver of cost increases is technical progress—for example, new tests and therapies or new knowledge about the benefits of

existing ones. This perspective is supported by the observation that health care costs are increasing throughout the world, regardless of the system for financing health care. The aging of the population and increasing numbers of patients with chronic illnesses contribute to the problem, but the increasing numbers of effective therapies for these populations are major factors in cost trends.

Second, the value obtained for health care expenditures must be enhanced. Unconstrained growth in medical spending is threatening the incomes of individual patients, the cost structures of employers, and the fiscal balance of government. Third, the high social value of health care limits policy options for containing health care spending.

In short, we want cost control, but we also want broad access to health care and continued innovation in medical science. Trade-offs among these goals are inevitable, and they can be minimized only through thoughtful policies.

Table 1 lists 12 major options for reducing health care spending, with comments regarding barriers to their implementation. Rigorous experimental studies of the effect of these options are scarce, and estimates of their independent effects are not available. For example, estimates of the savings that might be derived from the use of electronic medical records include savings from other options, including improved care for patients with chronic conditions.

Nevertheless, the pressures to address increasing costs are so intense that policy decisions cannot be delayed until long-term studies are completed. We therefore classified these options into three groups on the basis of a qualitative assessment of their potential effect on costs. These assessments were influenced by our judgment of the near-term political viability of these options.

Our belief is that there is no single ''magic bullet'' among these choices; our goal is to promote discussion leading to effective policies that support several approaches. We do not think responsible health care leaders can be against all of these options; indeed, we think it is insufficient for leaders to support only one or two. Policymakers must identify an array of choices with sufficient cost-savings potential to moderate financial pressures on health care.

TABLE 1.—APPROACHES TO REDUCING MEDICAL EXPENDITURES

Proposal	Comments
Highest potential for cost savings:	
Payment reform (e.g., capitation, case rates, pay-for-performance programs).	Capitation limited by patients' preference for choice of providers and public discomfort with potential perverse incentives for clinicians; case rates applicable only to a small percentage of procedures (e.g., coronary-artery-bypass grafting); pay-for-performance programs still evolving and require organized providers to adopt efficiency goals.
Effectiveness review for new drugs and forms of technology before reimbursement.	Important step to ensure value for future medical advances; risk of limiting innovation and delaying arrival of products in the market.
Electronic medical records	Real value in decision support to reduce variation among physicians in use of services; will require time, resources, and considerable cultural change.
Improved care of patients with chronic conditions.	Promising because 10% of people account for 70% of costs; requires organized providers and payment reform.
Intermediate potential for cost savings:	
Restructured end-of-life care	Requires culture change within medicine and in society.
Consumerism (e.g., transparency and health savings accounts).	Limited ability of 10% of patients who are very sick and account for 70% of costs to function as informed consumers.
Substantially reduced administrative costs (e.g., eliminate insurance role as currently structured).	Value of savings offset for some providers and patients by loss of choice and potential for innovation that many believe come with private insurance; concerns by some people about implications of larger government role, including potential delays, deterioration in service, and limitations on benefits.
Lowest potential for cost savings:	
Malpractice reform	Much potential for improvement, but limited effect on costs.
Drug-pricing reform	Modest effect on costs; concern about effect on innovation.
Enhanced primary prevention activities.	Not shown to yield savings to overall health care system; could shift costs from employers to Medicare.
Rationing options:	
Indirect rationing by setting fixed all-payer budget ceilings for health expenditures.	Does not fit U.S. political culture; difficult to ensure equity across geographic areas and services; very large government role; questionable success in other countries.
Indirect rationing by letting markets work for new and expanded services, restricting Medicare and Medicaid coverage of such services.	Such a dramatic and visible increase in the two-class nature of our health system not sustainable with our core values.

GREATEST POTENTIAL FOR COST SAVINGS

Several types of payment reform have been suggested and are being tried throughout the country. All of them are potentially disruptive to providers whose businesses are based on fee-forservice payments. Nonetheless, improving quality and efficiency in a pure fee-for-service environment is so challenging that we believe the question is not whether payment reform should be pursued, but how to pursue it without precipitating major discontent or disruptions in care.

The most potent version of payment reform is budget-based capitation, in which providers receive a fixed amount of money to cover all health care needs of a population of patients. Experiments with capitation in commercially insured populations demonstrate reductions in cost, but they have often resulted in consumer and provider dissatisfaction. Patients have rebelled against limitations on their choices of providers, and providers have rebelled against capped budgets and inadequate risk adjustments to payments. Although capitation is successfully used in some staff-model delivery systems, efforts to extend this payment approach more broadly have had limited success.

Short of full budget-based capitation are a variety of options, including partial capitation (e.g., a fixed payment to primary care physicians for their populations); case rates, in which a lump sum is provided for specific procedures; and pay-for-performance systems, in which bonuses for improved quality and efficiency are available to augment fee-for-service payments. Despite the limited data on the effect of such approaches, we cannot conceive of a meaningful attempt to decrease the trend in costs that does not include some form of payment reform. We also believe that payment reform is likely to be most effective when providers are organized into delivery systems that can accept responsibility for cost-mitigation goals.

Another promising approach to cost containment is strengthening effectiveness reviews for new drugs and forms of technology. Some candidates and many policy experts support a new national institute to conduct such analyses, which could be required before decisions regarding reimbursement are made. Concern about this approach comes from members of industry, who worry about the possible effects of such reviews on the time and costs associated with getting products to market.

Health information systems that include electronic records have significant potential for cost savings and enjoy strong political support. Policymakers often focus on the personal health record (e.g., a small data-storage device carrying key clinical information), but we believe the greatest cost-reducing effect of electronic records will result from improved coordination among health care providers and from decision support that improves clinicians' use of tests and treatments. Such decision support has the potential to decrease variation among physicians in the use of health care services, thereby reducing both baseline costs and cost trends.

This potential is largely unrealized to date, however. Critical barriers include the requirements for capital investment and standardization of administrative and clinical data. Even more daunting is the need for cultural change among physicians, who must be willing to use decision-support systems if electronic records are to improve their care.

The improved care of patients with chronic conditions such as diabetes mellitus or coronary artery disease is a promising focus for cost reduction, because about 70% of health care costs are generated by 10% of patients, most of whom have one or more chronic diseases. Improved reliability and coordination of the care of these patients could reduce their need for hospitalization. This strategy has moderate bipartisan support, reflecting awareness of the frequent failure of our health care system to deliver interventions that are likely to be beneficial to patients with these conditions.

As is true with information technology, however, the evidence that improvement in the care of patients with chronic conditions reduces costs falls short of the apparent opportunity. Numerous interventions are known to be cost-effective—that is, they improve health at a reasonable incremental cost. However, few interventions (e.g., disease-management programs for patients with heart failure) have been shown to actually save money while improving patients' health.

Nevertheless, we believe that the cost-saving potential of improvement in the care of patients with chronic conditions may yet turn out to be meaningful. Effective care-improvement programs generally require organized systems of care, as compared with a fragmented system of independent practitioners who often find these programs difficult to maintain. Implementation of these programs will also require some payment reform because institutions and practitioners currently lose money by reducing preventable hospitalizations, and proactive care-management services are typically not covered.

INTERMEDIATE POTENTIAL FOR COST SAVINGS

The observation that health care costs are concentrated in the period just before the patient's death raises concern that our health system uses excessive resources to extend the life of dying patients. Political candidates are understandably wary of engaging in this discussion, but health care providers are exploring the effect of greater use of hospice and palliative care services and more complete disclosure to patients of the risks and benefits of proposed interventions.

Medicare data from Oregon indicate that the use of hospitalization and intensive care units in the last months of life can be decreased without compromising the care of dying patients and their families. However, these data show that any serious attempt to change end-of-life care requires deep cultural change that extends well beyond the provider community.

Two broader approaches to cost control have support from opposite ends of the political spectrum. Political conservatives have championed consumerism, expressed through insurance products with high deductibles or copayments, health savings accounts, and ''transparency.'' Transparency means making available information about the cost and

quality of health care services so that patients can become informed consumers.

Although the impact of this approach is unknown, we believe that cost savings are likely to be limited by the medical needs of the 10% of people who account for 70% of costs. These patients tend to exceed their financial liabilities associated with these products quickly, and their ability and willingness to behave like shoppers who can make trade-offs in cost and quality are uncertain at best. In addition, these insurance products have thus far proved unpopular with employees despite their lower effect on their paychecks, and enrollment to date has been low.

On the political left, advocates of the single-payer approach argue that elimination of the employer-based commercial insurance system would dramatically reduce administrative costs. Despite the large savings that would result, political support for this approach is currently limited. The strongest resistance to the single-payer approach comes from the commercial insurance industry, but providers worry that this approach would extend the lower reimbursement structure of Medicare and Medicaid to all patients, and these payments would not increase fast enough to cover increasing provider costs. Thus, for the time being at least, the development of a broad coalition around a single-payer system is unlikely. There is, however, widespread interest in reducing administrative costs by pursuing standardization of the claims-payment systems of U.S. private insurers (e.g., through adoption of a universal billing form).

LOWEST POTENTIAL FOR COST SAVINGS

Two familiar targets for cost reduction are malpractice and drug-pricing reform, but the potential savings from these approaches are probably small. Although the current malpractice system is an inefficient way to protect patients from negligent care, the direct costs of malpractice premiums and estimated costs of ''defensive medicine'' are not major factors in overall health care spending. In any case, political support for malpractice reform is partisan and weak because of the resistance to major changes on the part of plaintiffs' lawyers.

Costs can be reduced through more restrictive drug formularies and tougher price negotiations, but the savings are modest because pharmaceuticals account for just 10 to 15% of health care spending. The political appetite for tight government control of drug pricing is also limited by concerns about its effect on the development of new drugs.

Enhanced primary prevention efforts (e.g., programs to reduce smoking, alcohol abuse, or obesity) have strong bipartisan support, and they would lead to important general health benefits. This approach makes particular sense for employers, who can enhance the health of their workforce, and also delay the onset of serious illness among their employees by many years, at which point most costs would be absorbed by Medicare.

However, candidates would be ill-advised to believe they can fund broader access to health care through savings derived from primary prevention. Prevention is more likely to delay than to eliminate long-term societal costs, because longer life spans mean more years of health care adding to overall costs. Controversy persists regarding whether improved care can lead to significant savings through a ''compression of morbidity''—that is, longer and healthier lives with a relatively quick, low-cost period of illness just before death. Regardless of what the right answer is, savings from increased primary prevention will not be substantial in the near term.

RATIONING OPTIONS

Should other options fail to provide sufficient cost reductions, policymakers may be forced to consider various forms of rationing, including two types that have been proposed from different ends of the political spectrum. From the left comes the proposal for fixed, all-payer budget ceilings for health expenditures, such as those that are used in Canada and some European countries with multiple payers. The U.S. experiment with this approach is the Medicare funding policy that requires decreases in payments to physicians when overall spending increases.

Although there would certainly be considerable savings from this approach, inflation in health care spending in countries that use it does not lag far behind ours because of the constant political pressure to increase spending for essential services. Administration of these budgets would require a large government role, and such a strong government regulatory role is not likely to gain consensus in the U.S. culture.

From the right come proposals for indirect rationing by limiting Medicare and Medicaid payment for new or ''discretionary'' services. This approach would have Medicare evolve to provide a defined contribution toward the health care costs of the U.S. elderly instead of defined benefits. Under this framework, patients who are able to pay for the services that are not covered would do so with their own money, and patients who are unable to pay would go without. We think such a dramatic and visible increase in the two-class nature of our health system is too obviously inconsistent with our core values to be politically viable.

DISCUSSION

We see three paths toward controlling health care costs. First, we could allow the current situation to persist. Consequences would almost certainly include increased taxation and financial burdens on individual patients and businesses, greater competition for scarce governmental resources, and a continued increase in the number of uninsured Americans. The alternative extreme would move our country toward one of the indirect rationing methods described above. This path would be practical only as a last resort. The third path would be to assemble the most reasonable package, short of rationing, using a combination of the other ideas mentioned above, and to try to bend the trend line in increasing health care costs.

While recognizing that the many stakeholders in health care will have different preferences, we suggest the following. First, modify reimbursement with the explicit goal of rewarding the practice of evidence-based medicine, reductions in variance among physicians in the use of services, and improvement in the care of patients with chronic conditions. We recommend consideration of blended arrangements including pay-for-performance programs, case rates, and even adequately funded and appropriately risk-adjusted capitation.

Second, invest in new effectiveness-review bodies. These groups would inform decisions regarding the coverage for and use of health care tests and treatments in the future.

Third, maximize support for electronic medical records with computerized decision support, recognizing that this will involve considerable national investment and cultural change. Such support can come in the form of higher reimbursement for physicians who have adopted electronic records or grants from hospitals, payers, or government to provide support for their implementation.

Fourth, enhance the standardization of health care transactions in order to drive down administrative costs. Fifth, provide support for regional efforts to improve the quality of care at the end of life. Finally, provide support for prevention programs, not because they save money, but because they lead to a better quality of life and a more productive workforce.

We recognize that many ideas for cost containment are not addressed here and that there are many potential cost-containment packages besides our approach. Our intent has been to set out a framework for considering various proposals. To deal successfully with this important issue, we must move away from cliches that fit our own political beliefs and grapple seriously with the true effectiveness and the political reality of each of these ideas. We need a real and honest dialogue on this issue—particularly in a presidential election year.

NATIONAL ALCOHOL AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, today I rise to recognize April as National Alcohol Awareness Month. We must all remain aware that alcohol is a drug that can pose serious health and well-being risks if used improperly. From underage drinking to drunk driving to alcohol addiction, this substance can have catastrophic and long-reaching effects on the lives of Americans.

I wish to take the opportunity in a month dedicated to alcohol awareness to promote awareness of a devastating alcohol-related condition. Fetal alcohol spectrum disorders, FASD, is an umbrella term describing the varied range of alcohol-related birth defects that may result from the use of alcohol during pregnancy. The effects of this disorder may be mental, behavioral, and/or involve learning disabilities. FASD is the leading known cause of preventable cognitive impairment in America. It is estimated FASD effects 1 in 100 live births each year.

We must move past the stigma of this devastating disease to truly help those and their families who are affected by FASD get the health, education, counseling and support services they need and deserve. We must also address the tragedy of FASD at the source, by increasing awareness that any amount of alcohol during pregnancy can have heartbreaking, lifelong effects, and by ensuring this is understood by all women of child-bearing age and by providing treatment and counseling services for these women.

Earlier this year, several of my colleagues and I reintroduced legislation to address FASD issues within families, at schools, in health care centers, in our legal system, and at its source. In addition to supporting those living with FASD and their families, this bill works to educate our health practitioners, educators and members of our judicial system to recognize the special needs of these individuals. While we increase awareness of the effects alcohol can have on individuals and their families, increasing FASD awareness must also be included to advance the fight against these damaging disorders.

NATIONAL AUTISM AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, today I rise to recognize April as National Autism Awareness Month. As many as 1 in 166 children is diagnosed with autism spectrum disorders each year, yet the cause and cure remain unknown. Our commitment to finding answers and solving the puzzle of autism must continue.

While the diagnosis of autism is the beginning of a challenging road, it can also be the welcome end to a frustrating process for families. Early detection is an important step towards obtaining appropriate treatment to ensure children are able to grow to reach their full potential. As the prevalence of autism spectrum disorders continues to grow, we must also ensure these treatment options are available in our communities and accessible to those who need them.

I also take this opportunity to recognize the parents, professionals, and advocates who work day after day to be a powerful voice for autistic individuals. They create an important network to share information, experiences and challenges, as well as to celebrate accomplishments. We must all join them in their efforts to pursue increased funding for biomedical research and public health awareness campaigns, education programs that reflect special needs, and expanded diagnosis and treatment options.

I urge all citizens to support the search for the cause, cure and prevention of autism and support those individuals and families who live with this challenging disorder on a daily basis.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

IN MEMORY OF BRENT A. LOVRIEN

● Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, flags across California flew at half-mast recently to honor the life of firefighter Brent A. Lovrien. The city of Los Angeles and the firefighter community lost an exemplary leader when Firefighter Lovrien was killed in the line of duty.

A 10-year veteran of the Los Angeles Fire Department and a member of platoon ''A'' at Fire Station 95, Firefighter Lovrien is the first Los Angeles City firefighter to die in the line of duty since 2004. I would like to take a few moments to recognize his many important accomplishments and the impact he made as a leader in both his personal and professional life.

Firefighter Lovrien was a leader to his fellow firefighters and a highly respected leader in his community. He has been called an inspiration by his superior officers and has been a mentor to his fellow firefighters. Firefighter Lovrien has also been recognized by residents of Fire Station 95's local community for his efforts to protect and improve their quality of life. Lovrien was an asset to his community and his presence will truly be missed.

Firefighter Lovrien is survived by his father, mother, and brother—to whom I send my heartfelt condolences. He leaves a lasting legacy of caring and compassion that serves as a model to us all. Firefighters are too often called upon to protect our communities while putting themselves in grave danger. Despite this, they are the first to go into burning buildings, or similar dangerous situations, all to save lives and property. Firefighter Lovrien stepped forward and paid the ultimate price for our protection. We will miss his service and dedication to the city of Los Angeles and the firefighting community.●

CONGRATULATING TENNESSEE COLLEGE DANCERS

● Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I wish to congratulate the dance teams at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville and the University of Memphis, who each won their second consecutive Division I–A national title at the Universal Dance Association College Nationals in January.

Each team worked relentlessly over the holiday break in order to defend their 2007 national titles, practicing up to three times a day—and the hard work certainly paid off. The University of Tennessee squad was ranked first in the Jazz division after the semifinal round, while the University of Memphis squad topped the hip-hop division. Both teams continued their flawless performances in the final round, captivating the audience and comfortably securing their spots on top.

The University of Tennessee Spirit Program is the only Division I–A program in the country to place in the top three in the dance, cheerleading and mascot divisions. In addition to their national title, the Tennessee dancers placed fifth in the hip-hop division. The Tennessee mascot, Smokey, also clinched a national title, his first since 2001. The Volunteer Cheer Squad placed second.

The University of Memphis Spirit program had a strong showing as well. The Memphis dancers took home seventh place in the Jazz division while the Tigers' All-Girl squad took home a Division I national title, and the Co-Ed Squad placed fourth in Division I–A.

I would also like to congratulate Tennessee head coach Kelley Eidenmuller and Memphis coaches Carol Lloyd and Frankie Conklin for their outstanding work with these groups of dancers.

It is an honor to represent the great State of Tennessee and these extremely talented and dedicated young people. I extend my heartfelt congratulations to these athletes for their tremendous accomplishments.●

TRIBUTE TO LOUISIANA WWII VETERANS

● Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I am proud to honor a group of 92 World War II veterans from the Acadiana region of Louisiana who are traveling to Washington, DC, this weekend to visit the various memorials and monuments that recognize the sacrifices of our nation's invaluable service members.

Louisiana HonorAir, a group based in Lafayette, LA, is sponsoring this Saturday's trip to the Nation's Capital. The organization is honoring each surviving World War II Louisiana veteran by giving them an opportunity to see the memorials dedicated to their service. On this trip, the veterans will visit the World War II, Korea, Vietnam, and Iwo Jima memorials. They will also travel to Arlington National Cemetery to lay a wreath on the Tomb of the Unknowns.

This is the sixth flight Louisiana HonorAir has made to Washington, DC, and there will be three additional flights this spring.

World War II was one of America's greatest triumphs, but was also a deadly conflict. More than 60 million people worldwide were killed, including 40 million civilians, and more than 400,000 American servicemembers were slain during the long war. The ultimate victory over enemies in the Pacific and in Europe is a testament to the valor of American soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines. The years 1941 to 45 also witnessed an unprecedented mobilization of domestic industry, which supplied our military on two distant fronts.

In Louisiana, there remain today more than 40,000 living WWII veterans, and each one has a heroic tale of achieving the noble victory of freedom over tyranny. Veterans in this HonorAir group began their service in 1940 before the bombing of Pearl Harbor, and served as late as 1950 in the European and Pacific theaters as well as stateside. They served in various branches of the military—25 members in the Army, 24 in the Army Air Corps, 37 in the Navy, three in the Navy Air Corps, one in the Navy Reserve, two in the Marines, and one in the Merchant Marines. Several served during World War II and the Korean War, and one of our veterans spent 30 years in active service in the Army, serving through the Vietnam war.

One of our heroes served as a Control Tower Operator with the 104th AACS Squadron. Another was aboard the USS *Proteus*, alongside the USS *Missouri*, during the Japanese surrender on September 2, 1945. And yet another hero went on 35 bombing missions over Europe between 1942 and 1945. Some participated in the Battle of the Bulge and the D-Day Invasion of France at Utah Beach. Many fought in the South Pacific. Some served in the China-Burma-India Theater, and others in Africa.

Also traveling to Washington on Saturday's trip is an active member of the service. Army MAJ Robert Gutierrez of Lafayette finished a tour of duty in Iraq in February. I ask the Senate to recognize him for his commitment to our country.

I also ask the Senate to join me in honoring these 89 men and three

women, all Louisiana heroes, that we welcome to Washington this weekend and Louisiana HonorAir for making these trips a reality.●

THE NATIONAL CRITTENTON FOUNDATION

● Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I ask my colleagues to join me today in commemorating the 125th anniversary of the National Crittenton Foundation and the Crittenton Family of Agencies.

For the last 113 years, Florence Crittenton Services Inc. in Wheeling, WV has served thousands of teen mothers and their children as the State's only maternity home—one that is nationally recognized for its unique gender-responsive program. In recognition of its continuing contribution to the State, the State Journal recently named this innovative agency one of the ''55 Good Things About West Virginia.'' The honor is well deserved.

In 1895, Florence Crittenton Services Inc. first opened its doors to provide shelter and support for ''wayward'' women in crisis. Over the past century, it has evolved from being a group home and adoption agency to a nationally-accredited and respected therapeutic residential program that serves abused, neglected, and behaviorally-challenged girls.

Among its many forward-thinking programs is Wellspring Family Services, a comprehensive, community-based behavioral health, parenting support and education service provider. Cradles to Crayons, a child care program for young mothers in care, provides a structured and safe environment for children while their parents complete their education and participate in therapeutic programming. This child care program continues today and serves the child care needs of Crittenton residents and community members.

Grounded in its original mission to help children and families in need achieve self-sufficiency, all of the agency's programs pay close attention to the underlying challenges that keep young women from succeeding, including addiction, domestic violence, and sexual abuse.

Throughout its history, Florence Crittenton Services, Inc. has maintained a unique cooperative relationship with The National Crittenton Foundation. This partnership is based on founder Charles Crittenton's and Dr. Kate Waller Barrett's belief that the most effective way to address compelling national social issues was through a network of affiliated independent, local organizations supported by a national body.

More than a century after Charles Crittenton founded his first home, the National Crittenton Foundation is re-emerging as an active force for social change. The foundation and its agencies continue their work to break the cycles of intergenerational issues like teen pregnancy, violence and substance abuse through a mix of strength-based gender and culturally-specific services tailored to meet the needs of young girls in local communities. For years, I have worked to improve services and support of needy children and families, and I have been proud to work with the Florence Crittenton Society in Wheeling.

As the National Crittenton Foundation and West Virginia's Florence Crittenton Services, Inc. come to Capitol Hill to celebrate 125 years of service to young women at risk and their children, I ask you to help me congratulate them on their achievements and thank them for their profound commitment to our children and our communities.●

RECOGNIZING BERRY, FOWLES & CO.

● Ms. SNOWE. Madam President, as tax time is once again upon us, I recognize the contributions that small businesses have made, and continue to make, toward ensuring that our Nation's financial sector operates in a fair and effective manner. In particular, I must highlight a Maine business that has excelled in taking care of both its customers and employees. Berry, Fowles & Co., a small, full-service accounting firm located in Falmouth, recently earned the prestigious distinction of being named the 2007 Small Business Best Place to Work in Maine.

The ''Best Places to Work in Maine'' program is sponsored by the Society for Human Resource Management Maine State Council, in partnership with several other entities, including The Employment Times and the Maine State Chamber of Commerce. Awards are issued in categories of large, medium, and small businesses operating in Maine, and determinations are based on employer benefits and policies, as well as employee responses to satisfaction surveys.

Berry, Fowles & Co. is clearly deserving of this acknowledgement of its remarkable steps to maintain its employees' well-being.

Doing business under various names since 1915, Berry, Fowles & Co. has consistently impressed its clientele by adhering to a strong set of core values, including a philosophy of empowerment and community involvement.

Offering an array of services, including auditing, accounting, and tax preparation, Berry, Fowles & Co. serves cities and towns, businesses, individuals, local governments, and nonprofits across Maine. The company offers free consultations for its services, from personal financial planning to small business accounting.

The company's Web site is an invaluable source for both the client and the public. Replete with a plethora of financial guides on investment, tax, and business strategies, the Web site provides readers with clear and comprehensive information. Additionally, the site contains links to a number of calculators that compute everything from college and retirement savings to the monthly payment of an auto loan. Combined with an online newsletter proposing perceptive counsel in a number of areas, Berry, Fowles & Co.'s Web site is a goldmine for the financially curious.

While the company's services are wide-ranging, what positions Berry, Fowles & Co. so well in today's fast-paced world is the time it takes to appreciate and celebrate the work and welfare of its 16 dedicated employees. Berry, Fowles & Co. provides its workers with a wide range of benefits, including health and life insurance, cutting-edge technology, and a retirement pension plan. And while all of us may cringe at the thought of April 15, the employees at Berry, Fowles & Co. know firsthand the stress that comes with a tax filing deadline. That is why the company has designed a tax-season wellness program for its employees, which includes enjoyable games and giveaways, healthy snacks, Saturday lunches, and even massages! To me, that certainly adds up to a great place to work!

Over the past century, Berry, Fowles & Co. and its predecessors have made a name for themselves by helping others succeed financially. Now, the company is attracting just recognition because of its sound efforts to support its employees. Berry, Fowles & Co. lays claim to a distinctly successful business model that presents all small businesses a magnanimous example upon which to draw. I congratulate the team at Berry, Fowles & Co. and wish them well at tax time and beyond.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:16 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1198. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act regarding early detection, diagnosis, and treatment of hearing loss.

H.R. 1237. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide revised standards for quality assurance in screening and evaluation of gynecologic cytology preparations, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2063. An act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, to develop a voluntary policy for managing the risk of food allergy and anaphylaxis in schools.

H.R. 2464. An act to amend the Public Health Services Act to provide a means for continued improvement in emergency medical services for children.

H.J. Res. 70. Joint resolution congratulating the Army Reserve on its centennial, which will be formally celebrated on April 23, 2008, and commemorating the historic contributions of its veterans and continuing contributions of its soldiers to the vital national security interests and homeland defense missions of the United States.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 793. An act to provide for the expansion and improvement of traumatic brain injury programs.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 845. An act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to expand and intensify programs with respect to research and related activities concerning elder falls.

S. 1858. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish grant programs to provide for education and outreach on newborn screening and coordinated followup care once newborn screening has been conducted, to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 3:26 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 550. An act to preserve existing judgeships on the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1198. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act regarding early detection, diagnosis, and treatment of hearing loss; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 1237. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide revised standards for quality assurance in screening and evaluation of gynecologic cytology preparations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 2063. To direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, to develop a voluntary policy for managing the risk of food allergy and anaphylaxis in schools; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 2464. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a means for continued improvement in emergency medical services for children; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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–5718. A communication from the Chief, Programs and Legislation Division, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, notification of the Department's intent to initiate a competition of the Civil Engineer Function at Schriever Air Force Base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5719. A communication from the Attorney, Office of the Secretary , Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Organizational and Delegation of Powers and Duties; Secretarial Succession'' (RIN2105–AD73) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5720. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Enhanced Airworthiness Program for Airplane Systems/Fuel Tank Safety'' (RIN2120–AI31) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5721. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment to Class E Airspace; Provo, UT'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(Docket No. 06–AWP–5)) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5722. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Offshore Airspace Area 1485L and Revision of Control 1485H; Barrow, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(Docket No. 06–AAL–9)) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5723. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of High Altitude Area Navigation Routes; South Central United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(Docket No. 05–ASO–7)) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5724. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Low Altitude Reporting Point; AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(Docket No. 06–AAL–17)) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5725. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Hamilton Sundstrand Model 14RF–19 Propellers'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2005–NE–13)) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5726. 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 A318, A319, A320, and A321 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–NW–110)) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5727. 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 Tay 611–8, Tay 611–8C, Tay 620–15, Tay 650–15, and Tay 651–54 Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2007–NE–11)) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5728. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; EADS SOCATA Model TBM 700 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–CE–40)) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5729. 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 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2004–NM–32)) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5730. 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. 2007–NM–126)) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5731. 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 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2007–NM–070)) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5732. 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 Airplanes and Model 720 and 720B Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2007–NM–010)) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5733. 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 430 Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2005–SW–21)) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5734. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Airworthiness Certification of New Aircraft'' ((RIN2120–AH90)(Docket No. FAA–2003–14825)) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5735. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Model 680 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2007–NM–331)) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5736. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Flight Simulation Training Device Initial and Continuing Qualification and Use'' ((RIN2120–AH07)(Docket No. FAA–2002–12461)) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5737. A communication from the Acting Director of Regulations, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Administrative Procedures, Address Updates, and Technical Amendments'' (RIN2137–AE29) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5738. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Locomotive Sanders'' (RIN2130–AB83) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5739. A communication from the Regulations Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Indian Reservation Road Bridge Program'' (RIN2125–AF20) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5740. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Puerto Rican Tobacco Products and Cigarette Papers and Tubes Shipped from Puerto Rico to the United States'' (RIN1513–AB38) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5741. A communication from the Acting Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Documents Required for Travelers Departing From or Arriving in the United States at Sea and Land Ports-of-Entry From Within the Western Hemisphere'' (RIN1651–AA69) received on April 4, 2008; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5742. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the certification of an application for a license for the export of defense articles to Italy to provide support for the C–130J aircraft; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5743. A communication from the Deputy Under Secretary of Homeland Security (Management), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Future Years Homeland Security Program for fiscal year 2009 through fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5744. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the growth of violent street gangs in suburban areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BIDEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1418. A bill to provide assistance to improve the health of newborns, children, and mothers in developing countries, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 110–282).

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. CORNYN:

S. 2832. A bill to authorize the International Boundary and Water Commission to reimburse State and local governments for expenses incurred by such governments in designing, constructing, and rehabilitating the Lower Rio Grande Valley Flood Control Project; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CRAPO:

S. 2833. A bill to provide for the management of certain public land in Owyhee County, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2834. A bill to establish wilderness areas, promote conservation, and improve public land in Washington County, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Mr. KYL, Mr. BURR, Mr. COBURN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. VITTER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. CORKER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 2835. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the purchase of health insurance with pre-tax dollars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. SMITH):

S. 2836. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to include service after September 11, 2001, as service qualifying for the determination of a reduced eligibility age for receipt of non-regular service retired pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 2837. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 225 Cadman Plaza East, Brooklyn, New York, as the ''Theodore Roosevelt United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MARTINEZ (for himself and Mr. KOHL):

S. 2838. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 9 of United States Code with respect to arbitration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VITTER:

S.J. Res. 31. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to United States citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. Res. 507. A resolution supporting the mission and goals of National Crime Victims' Rights week in order to increase public awareness of the rights, needs, and concerns of victims and survivors of crime in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. CORKER):

S. Res. 508. A resolution congratulating the University of Tennessee women's basketball team for winning the 2008 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Women's Basketball Championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. NELSON of Florida):

S. Res. 509. A resolution recognizing the week of April 7, 2008 to April 13, 2008, as ''National Public Health Week''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 329

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 329, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for cardiac rehabilitation and pulmonary rehabilitation services.

S. 561

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 561, a bill to repeal the sunset of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 with respect to the expansion of the adoption credit and adoption assistance programs.

S. 691

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 691, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the benefits under the Medicare program for beneficiaries with kidney disease, and for other purposes.

S. 972

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 972, a bill to provide for the reduction of adolescent pregnancy, HIV rates, and other sexually transmitted diseases, and for other purposes.

S. 1052

At the request of Mr. SALAZAR, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1052, a bill to amend title XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option to provide nurse home visitation services under Medicaid and the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

S. 1069

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1069, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act regarding early detection, diagnosis, and treatment of hearing loss.

S. 1120

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1120, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants for the training of graduate medical residents in preventive medicine and public health.

S. 1392

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1392, a bill to increase the authorization for the major medical facility project to consolidate the medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs at the University Drive

and H. John Heinz III divisions, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

S. 1437

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1437, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the semicentennial of the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

S. 1499

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1499, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to reduce air pollution from marine vessels.

S. 1512

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1512, a bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to expand Federal eligibility for children in foster care who have attained age 18.

S. 1638

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1638, a bill to adjust the salaries of Federal justices and judges, and for other purposes.

S. 1795

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1795, a bill to improve access to workers' compensation programs for injured Federal employees.

S. 1980

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1980, a bill to improve the quality of, and access to, long-term care.

S. 2051

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2051, a bill to amend the small rural school achievement program and the rural and low-income school program under part B of title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

S. 2166

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2166, a bill to provide for greater responsibility in lending and expanded cancellation of debts owed to the United States and the international financial institutions by low-income countries, and for other purposes.

S. 2182

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2182, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to mental health services.

S. 2314

At the request of Mr. SALAZAR, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make geothermal heat pump systems eligible for the energy credit and the residential energy efficient property credit, and for other purposes.

S. 2337

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2337, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow long-term care insurance to be offered under cafeteria plans and flexible spending arrangements and to provide additional consumer protections for long-term care insurance.

S. 2381

At the request of Mr. SALAZAR, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2381, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend and improve protections for sole community hospitals under the Medicare program.

S. 2420

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2420, a bill to encourage the donation of excess food to nonprofit organizations that provide assistance to food-insecure people in the United States in contracts entered into by executive agencies for the provision, service, or sale of food.

S. 2510

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2510, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide revised standards for quality assurance in screening and evaluation of gynecologic cytology preparations, and for other purposes.

S. 2559

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2559, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the level of earnings under which no individual who is blind is determined to have demonstrated an ability to engage in substantial gainful activity for purposes of determining disability.

S. 2668

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2668, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove cell phones from listed property under section 280F.

S. 2673

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2673, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10799 West Alameda Avenue in Lakewood, Colorado, as the ''Felix Sparks Post Office Building''.

S. 2702

At the request of Mr. SALAZAR, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 2702, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to, and increase utilization of, bone mass measurement benefits under the Medicare part B Program.

S. 2755

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2755, a bill to provide funding for summer youth jobs.

S. 2760

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 2760, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the national defense through empowerment of the National Guard, enhancement of the functions of the National Guard Bureau, and improvement of Federal-State military coordination in domestic emergency response, and for other purposes.

S. 2766

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. DOLE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2766, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to address certain discharges incidental to the normal operation of a recreational vessel.

S. 2767

At the request of Mr. DODD, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2767, a bill to provide for judicial discretion regarding suspensions of student eligibility under section 484(r) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

S. 2774

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2774, a bill to provide for the appointment of additional Federal circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

S. 2785

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2785, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Security Act to preserve access to physicians' services under the Medicare program.

S. 2812

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2812, a bill to amend title

XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the provision of telehealth services under the Medicare program.

S. 2819

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2819, a bill to preserve access to Medicaid and the State Children's Health Insurance Program during an economic downturn, and for other purposes.

S. 2821

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2821, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the limited continuation of clean energy production incentives and incentives to improve energy efficiency in order to prevent a downturn in these sectors that would result from a lapse in the tax law.

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2821, supra.

S. 2822

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2822, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to repeal a section of that Act relating to exportation or importation of natural gas.

S. 2829

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2829, a bill to make technical corrections to section 1244 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, which provides special immigrant status for certain Iraqis, and for other purposes.

S. 2831

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2831, a bill to reauthorize the Federal Trade Commission, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 118

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 118, a resolution urging the Government of Canada to end the commercial seal hunt.

S. RES. 468

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 468, a resolution designating April 2008 as ''National 9–1–1 Education Month''.

S. RES. 470

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 470, a resolution calling on the relevant governments, multilateral bodies, and non-state actors in Chad, the Central African Republic, and Sudan to devote ample political commitment and material resources towards the achievement and implementation of a negotiated resolution to the national and regional conflicts in Chad, the Central African Republic, and Darfur, Sudan.

S. RES. 504

At the request of Mr. REID, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 504, a resolution condemning the violence in Tibet and calling for restraint by the Government of the People's Republic of China and the people of Tibet.

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 504, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 4384

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4384 proposed to H.R. 3221, moving the United States toward greater energy independence and security, developing innovative new technologies, reducing carbon emissions, creating green jobs, protecting consumers, increasing clean renewable energy production, and modernizing our energy infrastructure, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the production of renewable energy and energy conservation.

AMENDMENT NO. 4419

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4419 proposed to H.R. 3221, moving the United States toward greater energy independence and security, developing innovative new technologies, reducing carbon emissions, creating green jobs, protecting consumers, increasing clean renewable energy production, and modernizing our energy infrastructure, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the production of renewable energy and energy conservation.

AMENDMENT NO. 4431

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4431 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3221, moving the United States toward greater energy independence and security, developing innovative new technologies, reducing carbon emissions, creating green jobs, protecting consumers, increasing clean renewable energy production, and modernizing our energy infrastructure, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the production of renewable energy and energy conservation.

AMENDMENT NO. 4447

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4447 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3221, moving the United States toward greater energy independence and security, developing innovative new technologies, reducing carbon emissions, creating green jobs, protecting consumers, increasing clean renewable energy production, and modernizing our energy infrastructure, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the production of renewable energy and energy conservation.

AMENDMENT NO. 4478

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 4478 proposed to H.R. 3221, moving the United States toward greater energy independence and security, developing innovative new technologies, reducing carbon emissions, creating green jobs, protecting consumers, increasing clean renewable energy production, and modernizing our energy infrastructure, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the production of renewable energy and energy conservation.

AMENDMENT NO. 4487

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4487 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3221, moving the United States toward greater energy independence and security, developing innovative new technologies, reducing carbon emissions, creating green jobs, protecting consumers, increasing clean renewable energy production, and modernizing our energy infrastructure, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the production of renewable energy and energy conservation.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MARTINEZ (for himself and Mr. KOHL):

S. 2838. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 9 of United States Code with respect to arbitration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, today Senator HERB KOHL and I are introducing the Fairness in Nursing Home Arbitration Act. In my State and many others, elderly Americans—as a condition of their being admitted to a nursing home—are unfairly asked to agree to arbitrate any claims they may have against that nursing home before their claim actually occurs. This is not only unfair to those seeking residence, but it is also unfair to their families, who often times have no choice but to forfeit their loved one's legal rights in order to find them the care they need.

The basis for arbitration is accorded under the Federal Arbitration Act, FAA, which Congress enacted in 1925. The FAA was intended to allow parties an alternative forum to efficiently resolve business disputes. But over time, the FAA has expanded into nonbusiness disputes, including those involving nursing homes.

The legislation I am introducing today is in keeping with the FAA's original intent by requiring that agreements to arbitrate nursing home disputes be made after the dispute has arisen—not before prospective residents move in. While this bill won't prevent arbitration from occurring, it will prevent nursing home corporations with greater bargaining power from forcing residents to enter into pre-dispute arbitration through a non-negotiable contract.

The trend we are seeing at far too many nursing homes around the country is an unwarranted intrusion into a vulnerable population's right to access the civil justice system. This bill protects those who are otherwise unprotected, and helps to give their families peace of mind in knowing their loved ones are able to retain their full legal rights should they be abused or injured.

I applaud my colleague, Senator KOHL for recognizing the egregious injustices happening in nursing homes around the Nation, and I urge my colleagues to support this necessary bill.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today with Senator MARTINEZ to introduce the Fairness in Nursing Home Arbitration Act of 2008. This legislation is a narrowly targeted measure that protects nursing home residents, one of our Nation's most vulnerable populations, from losing the right to hold nursing homes accountable in court for negligent and abusive care.

The process of admission to a long-term care facility is traumatic for the prospective resident and their family. Often these facilities are a last resort for families and residents, and many times these decisions are arrived at under desperate, and sometimes emergency, circumstances. Even admission to an assisted-living facility by a relatively healthy senior citizen is a stressful and emotional event. Adding to the difficulty, many families face limited options in nursing care when it comes to both geographic location and the level of care required for their loved one.

During the admissions process, prospective residents and their families have little choice other than to accept the terms of the admission agreement with no ability to negotiate. Many facilities now require residents, or their responsible family members, to sign contracts that include predispute mandatory arbitration agreements. This means that any dispute between the resident and the facility will automatically be subject to arbitration. In other words, by agreeing to the contract, and before a dispute ever arises, they are unwittingly signing away their constitutional right to have their case heard by an impartial judge or jury.

Unlike other uses of arbitration, arbitration in the nursing home context is usually related to health care and often involves cases of abuse and neglect that result in serious injuries or death. While civil court proceedings are generally open to the public, most arbitration requires that all parts of the process be kept confidential. As a result, long term care facilities are not held publicly accountable for their substandard care. Even worse, this potentially lifesaving information may be concealed from current and prospective residents, regulatory agencies, and the public.

Another troubling aspect of arbitration clauses in nursing home admissions agreements is that they are often buried in long contracts and presented on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, without any opportunity to negotiate. While some facilities may attempt to explain the meaning of the arbitration clause and make it seem voluntary, the focus of the admissions process is on the loved one in need of care and not on these technical legal aspects of the agreement. Family members of prospective residents, whether or not they understand the arbitration provision, feel compelled to sign it in order to ensure that their loved one will be admitted and that their care will not be compromised by their refusal.

One of many tragic examples we have learned about is the case of Ella Needham. After being hospitalized with a urinary tract infection, she was taken to a nursing home by her daughter. During the hasty admissions process, her daughter signed a mandatory arbitration agreement. Both were unaware that they were signing away their constitutional right to a jury trial. During Ella's stay, the nursing home staff abused her, failed to adequately hydrate her, and did not adequately treat her illness. As a result of this negligence and abuse, Mrs. Needham died. When her daughter sued the home, she discovered that she was not allowed to go to court because of the arbitration agreement. After months of litigation challenging the agreement, the appeals court upheld the requirement to arbitrate. The daughter was forced to settle her claims of abuse and neglect in arbitration.

It is important to note that our bill does not preclude arbitration as an option for resolving disputes between nursing home residents and long term care facilities. The legislation simply says that families and prospective residents cannot be forced into arbitration through a nonnegotiable contract prior to the dispute. This will ensure that arbitration is a voluntary forum to resolve these unique disputes that can have far reaching consequences.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 507—SUPPORTING THE MISSION AND GOALS OF NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS WEEK IN ORDER TO INCREASE PUBLIC AWARENESS OF THE RIGHTS, NEEDS, AND CONCERNS OF VICTIMS AND SURVIVORS OF CRIME IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCHUMER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 507

Whereas 23,000,000 Americans are victims of crime each year, and of those, 5,200,000 are victims of violent crime;

Whereas a just society acknowledges crime's impact on individuals, families, and communities by ensuring that rights, resources, and services are available to help rebuild lives;

Whereas victims' rights are a critical component of the promise of ''justice for all'', the foundation for our system of justice in the United States;

Whereas although our Nation has steadily expanded rights, protections, and services for victims of crime, too many victims are still not able to realize the hope and promise of these gains;

Whereas we must do better to ensure that services are available for underserved segments of our population, including crime victims with disabilities, victims with mental illness, victims who are teenagers, victims who are elderly, victims in rural areas, and victims in communities of color;

Whereas observing victims' rights and treating victims with dignity and respect serves the public interest by engaging victims in the justice system, inspiring respect for public authorities, and promoting confidence in public safety;

Whereas the United States recognizes that we make our homes, neighborhoods, and communities safer and stronger by serving victims of crime and ensuring justice for all;

Whereas our Nation must strive to protect, expand, and observe crime victims' rights so that there truly is justice for victims and justice for all; and

Whereas National Crime Victims' Rights Week, April 13 through April 19, 2008, provides an opportunity for us to strive to reach the goal of justice for all by ensuring that all victims are afforded their legal rights and provided with assistance as they face the financial, physical, and psychological impact of crime: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the mission and goals of National Crime Victims' Rights Week in order to increase public awareness of the impact of crime on victims and survivors of crime, and of the rights and needs of such victims and survivors; and

(2) requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the Office for Victims of Crime in the Department of Justice.

SENATE RESOLUTION 508—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2008 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I WOMEN'S BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. CORKER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 508

Whereas, on April 8, 2008, before a crowd of over 21,000 fans, the University of Tennessee women's basketball team (referred to in this preamble as the ''Lady Vols'') defeated the Cardinal of Stanford by a score of 64–48 to win the 2008 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Women's Basketball Championship;

Whereas that victory marked the second national title for the Lady Vols in 2 years, and the 8th national title of the Lady Vols in the last 20 years;

Whereas the University of Tennessee became the first school to accomplish back-to-back national titles twice, having previously achieved that feat during its 3-peat from 1996 through 1998;

Whereas the Lady Vols were successful due to the leadership of Head Coach Pat Summitt, the Nation's all-time winningest National Collegiate Athletic Association basketball coach among men's and women's teams, with 983 wins over 34 seasons at the University of Tennessee;

Whereas Joan Cronan, the Women's Athletics Director of the University of Tennessee, has—

(1) shown vision and leadership throughout her 25-year career at the University of Tennessee; and

(2) created 1 of the most visible and respected athletic programs in the country;

Whereas the Lady Vols compiled an impressive overall record of 36 wins and 2 losses, avenging 1 of those losses against Stanford in the championship game;

Whereas the Lady Vols were guided all season long by—

(1) the leadership of the seniors on the team, including—

(A) Nicky Anosike;

(B) Alberta Auguste;

(C) Shannon Bobbitt; and

(D) Alexis Hornbuckle; and

(2) the outstanding play of the 2008 Naismith Trophy winner, Candace Parker;

Whereas Candace Parker, while playing with an injured shoulder, tallied 17 points, 9 rebounds, and 4 steals, and was selected as the Most Outstanding Player for the 2008 tournament, becoming—

(1) the 4th player in history to achieve that honor 2 years in a row; and

(2) the 5th member of the University of Tennessee women's basketball team to be so honored, following in the footsteps of—

(A) Chamique Holdsclaw, who was honored in 1997 and 1998;

(B) Michelle Marciniak, who was honored in 1996;

(C) Bridgette Gordon, who was honored in 1989; and

(D) Tonya Edwards, who was honored in 1987;

Whereas Shannon Bobbitt, who at only 5 feet, 2 inches, is the shortest player ever to play on the University of Tennessee women's basketball team, and whose 3 first half 3-pointers and transition defense helped establish an early lead, finished the game with 13 points, and was named to the 2008 All-Tournament Team;

Whereas Nicky Anosike, who finished the game with 12 points, 8 rebounds, and a game-high 6 steals, was named to the 2008 All-Tournament Team;

Whereas Alberta Auguste scored 7 points to go along with 7 rebounds;

Whereas Alexis Hornbuckle, whose dogged defense helped hold the Stanford team to a season-low 48 points and a season-high 25 turnovers, finished with 6 points and 3 assists;

Whereas freshman Vicki Baugh provided a nice boost off the bench with 8 points and 4 rebounds; and

Whereas Head Coach Pat Summitt's Lady Vols set an example off the court as well, by continuing to sustain a remarkable graduation rate, with every student athlete who has completed her eligibility at the University of Tennessee graduating or working toward all of the requirements for graduation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the University of Tennessee women's basketball team for—

(A) being champions on and off the court; and

(B) the victory of the team in the 2008 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Women's Basketball Championship (referred to in this resolution as the ''NCAA women's basketball championship'');

(2) recognizes the significant achievements of the players, coaches, students, alumni, and support staff whose dedication and hard work helped the University of Tennessee Lady Volunteers win the NCAA women's basketball championship; and

(3) respectfully requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit for appropriate display an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) Dr. John D. Petersen, President of the University of Tennessee;

(B) Joan Cronan, Women's Athletics Director of the University of Tennessee; and

(C) Pat Summitt, Women's Basketball Head Coach of the University of Tennessee.

SENATE RESOLUTION 509—RECOGNIZING THE WEEK OF APRIL 7, 2008 TO APRIL 13, 2008, AS ''NATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH WEEK''

Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. NELSON of Florida) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 509

Whereas the week of April 7th, 2008, is National Public Health Week, and the theme is ''Climate Change: Our Health in the Balance'';

Whereas, since 1996, the American Public Health Association, through its sponsorship of National Public Health Week, has educated the public, policy-makers, and public health professionals about issues important to improving the public's health;

Whereas, according to the World Health Organization (WHO), climate change is a significant and emerging threat to public health and the WHO estimates that human-induced changes in the Earth's climate lead to at least 5,000,000 cases of illness and more than 150,000 deaths each year;

Whereas, according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), climate change contributes to the global burden of disease, premature death, and other adverse health impacts due to extreme weather events and changes in infectious disease patterns, air quality, quality and quantity of water and food, ecosystem changes, and economic impacts;

Whereas, according to the IPCC, the United States will be challenged by increased heat waves, air pollution, and forest fires during the course of the century, with potential risk for adverse health impacts, such as heat stress and increases in asthma, allergies, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease;

Whereas the Director of the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Dr. Julie Gerberding, testified in October 2007 that, ''Climate change is anticipated to have a broad range of impacts on the health of Americans and the nation's public health infrastructure'';

Whereas, according to the World Health Organization, the negative public health impacts of climate change will likely disproportionately impact communities that are already vulnerable;

Whereas these communities include developing countries, young children, the elderly, people with chronic illnesses or otherwise compromised health, people in underserved communities, communities of color, traditional societies, subsistence farmers, and coastal populations;

Whereas it is estimated that more than 900,000,000 people worldwide live in slum-like conditions and are particularly vulnerable to the possible health impacts of climate change due to a lack of access to health care, sanitation, and vulnerability to displacement;

Whereas future vulnerability to the health impacts of climate change will depend not only on the degree of climate change the Earth experiences, but also on development and adaptation measures; and

Whereas the public health system will be a first-line responder to emergency conditions related to impacts of climate change and plays a key role in informing, educating, and empowering local communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes ''National Public Health Week'';

(2) recognizes the efforts of public health professionals, first responders, States, municipalities, and local communities to incorporate measures to adapt health care systems to address impacts of climate change;

(3) recognizes the role of adaptation in preventing impacts of climate change on vulnerable communities, the potential for improvement of health status and health equity through efforts to address climate change, and the need to include health policy in the development of climate responses;

(4) encourages further research, interdisciplinary partnership, and collaboration between stakeholders to understand and monitor the health impacts of climate change, for preparedness activities and for improvement of health care infrastructure; and

(5) encourages each and every American to learn about the impacts of climate change on health.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4518. Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. SHELBY) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4387 submitted by Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. SHELBY) to the bill H.R. 3221, moving the United States toward greater energy independence and security, developing innovative new technologies, reducing carbon emissions, creating green jobs, protecting consumers, increasing clean renewable energy production, and modernizing our

energy infrastructure, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the production of renewable energy and energy conservation.

SA 4519. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2739, to authorize certain programs and activities in the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service, and the Department of Energy, to implement further the Act approving the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, to amend the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4520. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2739, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4521. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2739, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4522. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2739, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4518. Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. SHELBY) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4387 submitted by Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. SHELBY) to the bill H.R. 3221, moving the United States toward greater energy independence and security, developing innovative new technologies, reducing carbon emissions, creating green jobs, protecting consumers, increasing clean renewable energy production, and modernizing our energy infrastructure, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the production of renewable energy and energy conservation; as follows:

On page 49, line 6, insert, ''the second place it appears'' after ''in excess of 6 percent''.

At the end, add the following:

TITLE VIII—VETERANS HOUSING MATTERS

SEC. 801. HOME IMPROVEMENTS AND STRUCTURAL ALTERATIONS FOR TOTALLY DISABLED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES BEFORE DISCHARGE OR RELEASE FROM THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 1717 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d)(1) In the case of a member of the Armed Forces who, as determined by the Secretary, has a disability permanent in nature incurred or aggravated in the line of duty in the active military, naval, or air service, the Secretary may furnish improvements and structural alterations for such member for such disability or as otherwise described in subsection (a)(2) while such member is hospitalized or receiving outpatient medical care, services, or treatment for such disability if the Secretary determines that such member is likely to be discharged or released from the Armed Forces for such disability.

''(2) The furnishing of improvements and alterations under paragraph (1) in connection with the furnishing of medical services described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(2) shall be subject to the limitation specified in the applicable subparagraph.''.

SEC. 802. ELIGIBILITY FOR SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING BENEFITS AND ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES AND INDIVIDUALS RESIDING OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

(a) ELIGIBILITY.—Chapter 21 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2101 the following new section:

''§ 2101A. Eligibility for benefits and assistance: members of the Armed Forces with service-connected disabilities; individuals residing outside the United States

''(a) MEMBERS WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES.—(1) The Secretary may provide assistance under this chapter to a member of the Armed Forces serving on active duty who is suffering from a disability that meets applicable criteria for benefits under this chapter if the disability is incurred or aggravated in line of duty in the active military, naval, or air service. Such assistance shall be provided to the same extent as assistance is provided under this chapter to veterans eligible for assistance under this chapter and subject to the same requirements as veterans under this chapter.

''(2) For purposes of this chapter, any reference to a veteran or eligible individual shall be treated as a reference to a member of the Armed Forces described in subsection (a) who is similarly situated to the veteran or other eligible individual so referred to.

''(b) BENEFITS AND ASSISTANCE FOR INDIVIDUALS RESIDING OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may, at the Secretary's discretion, provide benefits and assistance under this chapter (other than benefits under section 2106 of this title) to any individual otherwise eligible for such benefits and assistance who resides outside the United States.

''(2) The Secretary may provide benefits and assistance to an individual under paragraph (1) only if—

''(A) the country or political subdivision in which the housing or residence involved is or will be located permits the individual to have or acquire a beneficial property interest (as determined by the Secretary) in such housing or residence; and

''(B) the individual has or will acquire a beneficial property interest (as so determined) in such housing or residence.

''(c) REGULATIONS.—Benefits and assistance under this chapter by reason of this section shall be provided in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED AUTHORITY.—Section 2101 of such title is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(2) LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE.—Section 2102 of such title is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking ''veteran'' each place it appears and inserting ''individual''; and

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking ''veteran's'' and inserting ''individual's'';

(B) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''a veteran'' and inserting ''an individual'';

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking ''a veteran'' and inserting ''an individual''; and

(ii) by striking ''the veteran'' each place it appears and inserting ''the individual''; and

(D) in subsection (d), by striking ''a veteran'' each place it appears and inserting ''an individual''.

(3) ASSISTANCE FOR INDIVIDUALS TEMPORARILY RESIDING IN HOUSING OF FAMILY MEMBER.—Section 2102A of such title is amended—

(A) by striking ''veteran'' each place it appears (other than in subsection (b)) and inserting ''individual'';

(B) in subsection (a), by striking ''veteran's'' each place it appears and inserting ''individual's''; and

(C) in subsection (b), by striking ''a veteran'' each place it appears and inserting ''an individual''.

(4) FURNISHING OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS.—Section 2103 of such title is amended by striking ''veterans'' both places it appears and inserting ''individuals''.

(5) CONSTRUCTION OF BENEFITS.—Section 2104 of such title is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''veteran'' each place it appears and inserting ''individual''; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking ''A veteran'' and inserting ''An individual'';

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking ''a veteran'' and inserting ''an individual''; and

(iii) by striking ''such veteran'' each place it appears and inserting ''such individual''.

(6) VETERANS' MORTGAGE LIFE INSURANCE.—Section 2106 of such title is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking ''any eligible veteran'' and inserting ''any eligible individual''; and

(ii) by striking ''the veterans' '' and inserting ''the individual's'';

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''an eligible veteran'' and inserting ''an eligible individual'';

(C) in subsection (e), by striking ''an eligible veteran'' and inserting ''an individual'';

(D) in subsection (h), by striking ''each veteran'' and inserting ''each individual'';

(E) in subsection (i), by striking ''the veteran's'' each place it appears and inserting ''the individual's'';

(F) by striking ''the veteran'' each place it appears and inserting ''the individual''; and

(G) by striking ''a veteran'' each place it appears and inserting ''an individual''.

(7) HEADING AMENDMENTS.—(A) The heading of section 2101 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''§ 2101. Acquisition and adaptation of housing: eligible veterans''.

(B) The heading of section 2102A of such title is amended to read as follows:

''§ 2102A. Assistance for individuals residing temporarily in housing owned by a family member''.

(8) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 21 of such title is amended—

(A) by striking the item relating to section 2101 and inserting the following new item:

''2101. Acquisition and adaptation of housing: eligible veterans.'';

(B) by inserting after the item relating to section 2101, as so amended, the following new item:

''2101A. Eligibility for benefits and assistance: members of the Armed Forces with service-connected disabilities; individuals residing outside the United States.'';

and

(C) by striking the item relating to section 2102A and inserting the following new item:

''2102A. Assistance for individuals residing temporarily in housing owned by a family member.''.

SEC. 803. SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH SEVERE BURN INJURIES.

Section 2101 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) The disability is due to a severe burn injury (as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary).''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) by striking ''either'' and inserting ''any''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) The disability is due to a severe burn injury (as so determined).''.

SEC. 804. EXTENSION OF ASSISTANCE FOR INDIVIDUALS RESIDING TEMPORARILY IN HOUSING OWNED BY A FAMILY MEMBER.

Section 2102A(e) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''after the end of the five-year period that begins on the date of the enactment of the Veterans' Housing Opportunity and Benefits Improvement Act of 2006'' and inserting ''after December 31, 2011''.

SEC. 805. INCREASE IN SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING BENEFITS FOR DISABLED VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2102 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''$10,000'' and inserting ''$12,000'';

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''$50,000'' and inserting ''$60,000''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''$10,000'' and inserting ''$12,000''; and

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

''(e)(1) Effective on October 1 of each year (beginning in 2009), the Secretary shall increase the amounts described in subsection (b)(2) and paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d) in accordance with this subsection.

''(2) The increase in amounts under paragraph (1) to take effect on October 1 of a year shall be by an amount of such amounts equal to the percentage by which—

''(A) the residential home cost-of-construction index for the preceding calendar year, exceeds

''(B) the residential home cost-of-construction index for the year preceding the year described in subparagraph (A).

''(3) The Secretary shall establish a residential home cost-of-construction index for the purposes of this subsection. The index shall reflect a uniform, national average change in the cost of residential home construction, determined on a calendar year basis. The Secretary may use an index developed in the private sector that the Secretary determines is appropriate for purposes of this subsection.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 1, 2008, and shall apply with respect to payments made in accordance with section 2102 of title 38, United States Code, on or after that date.

SEC. 806. REPORT ON SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2008, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that contains an assessment of the adequacy of the authorities available to the Secretary under law to assist eligible disabled individuals in acquiring—

(1) suitable housing units with special fixtures or movable facilities required for their disabilities, and necessary land therefor;

(2) such adaptations to their residences as are reasonably necessary because of their disabilities; and

(3) residences already adapted with special features determined by the Secretary to be reasonably necessary as a result of their disabilities.

(b) FOCUS ON PARTICULAR DISABILITIES.—The report required by subsection (a) shall set forth a specific assessment of the needs of—

(1) veterans who have disabilities that are not described in subsections (a)(2) and (b)(2) of section 2101 of title 38, United States Code; and

(2) other disabled individuals eligible for specially adapted housing under chapter 21 of such title by reason of section 2101A of such title (as added by section 802(a) of this Act) who have disabilities that are not described in such subsections.

SEC. 807. REPORT ON SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO RESIDE IN HOUSING OWNED BY A FAMILY MEMBER ON PERMANENT BASIS.

Not later than December 31, 2008, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the advisability of providing assistance under section 2102A of title 38, United States Code, to veterans described in subsection (a) of such section, and to members of the Armed Forces covered by such section 2102A by reason of section 2101A of title 38, United States Code (as added by section 802(a) of this Act), who reside with family members on a permanent basis.

SEC. 809. DEFINITION OF ANNUAL INCOME FOR PURPOSES OF SECTION 8 AND OTHER PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAMS.

Section 3(b)(4) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(3)(b)(4)) is amended by inserting ''or any deferred Department of Veterans Affairs disability benefits that are received in a lump sum amount or in prospective monthly amounts'' before ''may not be considered''.

SEC. 810. PAYMENT OF TRANSPORTATION OF BAGGAGE AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO RELOCATE DUE TO FORECLOSURE OF LEASED HOUSING.

Section 406 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (k) and (l) as subsections (l) and (m), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (j) the following new subsection (k):

''(k) A member of the armed forces who relocates from leased or rental housing by reason of the foreclosure of such housing is entitled to transportation of baggage and household effects under subsection (b)(1) in the same manner, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as similarly circumstanced members entitled to transportation of baggage and household effects under that subsection.''.

SEC. 811.

Strike section 502 and insert the following:

SEC. 502. ENHANCED MORTGAGE LOAN DISCLOSURES.

(a) TRUTH IN LENDING ACT DISCLOSURES.—Section 128(b)(2) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(A)'' before ''In the'';

(2) by striking ''a residential mortgage transaction, as defined in section 103(w)'' and inserting ''any extension of credit that is secured by the dwelling of a consumer'';

(3) by striking ''before the credit is extended, or'';

(4) by inserting '', which shall be at least 7 business days before consummation of the transaction'' after ''written application'';

(5) by striking '', whichever is earlier''; and

(6) by striking ''If the'' and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting the following:

''(B) In the case of an extension of credit that is secured by the dwelling of a consumer, the disclosures provided under subparagraph (A), shall be in addition to the other disclosures required by subsection (a), and shall—

''(i) state in conspicuous type size and format, the following: 'You are not required to complete this agreement merely because you have received these disclosures or signed a loan application.'; and

''(ii) be provided in the form of final disclosures at the time of consummation of the transaction, in the form and manner prescribed by this section.

''(C) In the case of an extension of credit that is secured by the dwelling of a consumer, under which the annual rate of interest is variable, or with respect to which the regular payments may otherwise be variable, in addition to the other disclosures required by subsection (a), the disclosures provided under this subsection shall do the following:

''(i) Label the payment schedule as follows: 'Payment Schedule: Payments Will Vary Based on Interest Rate Changes'.

''(ii) State in conspicuous type size and format examples of adjustments to the regular required payment on the extension of credit based on the change in the interest rates specified by the contract for such extension of credit. Among the examples required to be provided under this clause is an example that reflects the maximum payment amount of the regular required payments on the extension of credit, based on the maximum interest rate allowed under the contract, in accordance with the rules of the Board. Prior to issuing any rules pursuant to this clause, the Board shall conduct consumer testing to determine the appropriate format for providing the disclosures required under this subparagraph to consumers so that such disclosures can be easily understood.

''(D) In any case in which the disclosure statement under subparagraph (A) contains an annual percentage rate of interest that is no longer accurate, as determined under section 107(c), the creditor shall furnish an additional, corrected statement to the borrower, not later than 3 business days before the date of consummation of the transaction.

''(E) The consumer shall receive the disclosures required under this paragraph before paying any fee to the creditor or other person in connection with the consumer's application for an extension of credit that is secured by the dwelling of a consumer. If the disclosures are mailed to the consumer, the consumer is considered to have received them 3 business days after they are mailed. A creditor or other person may impose a fee for obtaining the consumer's credit report before the consumer has received the disclosures under this paragraph, provided the fee is bona fide and reasonable in amount.

''(F) WAIVER OF TIMELINESS OF DISCLOSURES.—To expedite consummation of a transaction, if the consumer determines that the extension of credit is needed to meet a bona fide personal financial emergency, the consumer may waive or modify the timing requirements for disclosures under subparagraph (A), provided that—

''(i) the term 'bona fide personal emergency' may be further defined in regulations issued by the Board;

''(ii) the consumer provides to the creditor a dated, written statement describing the emergency and specifically waiving or modifying those timing requirements, which statement shall bear the signature of all consumers entitled to receive the disclosures required by this paragraph; and

''(iii) the creditor provides to the consumers at or before the time of such waiver or modification, the final disclosures required by paragraph (1).

''(G) The requirements of subparagraphs (B), (C), (D) and (E) shall not apply to extensions of credit relating to plans described in section 101(53D) of title 11, United States Code.''.

(b) CIVIL LIABILITY.—Section 130(a) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1640(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A)(iii), by striking ''not less than $200 or greater than $2,000'' and inserting ''not less than $400 or greater than $4,000''; and

(2) in the penultimate sentence of the undesignated matter following paragraph (4)—

(A) by inserting ''or section 128(b)(2)(C)(ii),''after ''128(a),''; and

(B) by inserting ''or section 128(b)(2)(C)(ii)'' before the period.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) GENERAL DISCLOSURES.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by subsection (a) shall become effective 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) VARIABLE INTEREST RATES.—Subparagraph (C) of section 128(b)(2) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(b)(2)(C)), as added by subsection (a) of this section, shall become effective on the earlier of—

(A) the compliance date established by the Board for such purpose, by regulation; or

(B) 30 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 4519. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2739, to authorize certain programs and activities in the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service, and the Department of Energy, to implement further the Act approving the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, to amend the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE IX—DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN FUNDS

SEC. 901 CANDIDATE ASSET DISPOSITION LIST.

For fiscal year 2008, and each fiscal year thereafter, amounts made available to be used by the Director of the National Park Service to dispose of assets described in the candidate asset disposition list of the National Park Service shall be equal to 1 percent of, and derived by transfer from, all amounts made available to the Secretary of the Interior carry out this Act for each such fiscal year.

SA 4520. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2739, to authorize certain programs and activities in the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service, and the Department of Energy, to implement further the Act approving the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, to amend the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 203, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

Subtitle G—Notification and Consent Requirements Relating to National Heritage Areas

SEC. 491 NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.

The Secretary of the Interior shall not approve a management plan for a National Heritage Area designated by this title unless the local coordinating entity of the proposed National Heritage Area provides written notification through the United States mail of the designation to each individual who resides, or owns property that is located, in the proposed National Heritage Area.

SEC. 492. WRITTEN CONSENT REQUIREMENT.

With respect to each National Heritage Area designated by this title, no employee of the National Park Service or member of the local coordinating entity of the National Heritage Area (including any designee of the National Park Service or the local coordinating entity) may enter a parcel of private property located in the proposed National Heritage Area without the written consent of the owner of the parcel of property.

SA 4521. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2739, to authorize certain programs and activities in the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service, and the Department of Energy, to implement further the Act approving the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, to amend the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 901. REQUIREMENT OF APPROVAL OF CERTAIN CITIZENS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Department of the Interior, the Department of Energy, and the Forest Service, acting individually or in coordination, shall not assume control of any parcel of land located in a State unless the citizens of each political subdivision of the State in which a portion of the parcel of land is located approve the assumption of control by a referendum.

(b) NATIONAL EMERGENCIES.—The requirement described in subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of a national emergency, as determined by the President.

(c) PRIVATE LANDOWNERS.—The requirement described in subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of a voluntary exchange between a private landowner and the Federal Government of a parcel of land.

(d) DURATION OF APPROVAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a parcel of land described in subsection (a), the approval of the citizens of each political subdivision in which a portion of the parcel of land is located terminates on the date that is 10 years after the date on which the citizens of each political subdivision approve the control of the parcel of land by the Department of the Interior, the Department of Energy, or the Forest Service under that subsection.

(2) RENEWAL OF APPROVAL.—With respect to a parcel of land described in subsection (a), the Department of the Interior, the Department of Energy, or the Forest Service, as applicable, may renew, by referendum, the approval of the citizens of each political subdivision in which a portion of the parcel of land is located.

SA 4522. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2739, to authorize certain programs and activities in the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service, and the Department of Energy, to implement further the Act approving the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, to amend the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 901. ANNUAL REPORT RELATING TO LAND OWNED BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), not later than May 15, 2009, and annually thereafter, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (referred to in this section as the ''Director'') shall ensure that a report that contains the information described in subsection (b) is posted on a publicly available website.

(2) EXTENSION RELATING TO CERTAIN SEGMENT OF REPORT.—With respect to the date on which the first annual report is required to be posted under paragraph (1), if the Director determines that an additional period of time is required to gather the information required under subsection (b)(3)(B), the Director may—

(A) as of the date described in paragraph (1), post each segment of information required under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)(A) of subsection (b); and

(B) as of May 15, 2010, post the segment of information required under subsection (b)(3)(B).

(b) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—An annual report described in subsection (a) shall contain, for the period covered by the report—

(1) a description of the total quantity of—

(A) land located within the jurisdiction of the United States, to be expressed in acres;

(B) the land described in subparagraph (A) that is owned by the Federal Government, to be expressed—

(i) in acres; and

(ii) as a percentage of the quantity described in subparagraph (A); and

(C) the land described in subparagraph (B) that is located in each State, to be expressed, with respect to each State—

(i) in acres; and

(ii) as a percentage of the quantity described in subparagraph (B);

(2) a description of the total annual cost to the Federal Government for maintaining all parcels of administrative land and all administrative buildings or structures under the jurisdiction of each Federal agency; and

(3) a list and detailed summary of—

(A) with respect to each Federal agency—

(i) the number of unused or vacant assets;

(ii) the replacement value for each unused or vacant asset;

(iii) the total operating costs for each unused or vacant asset; and

(iv) the length of time that each type of asset described in clause (i) has been unused or vacant, organized in categories comprised of periods of—

(I) not more than 1 year;

(II) not less than 1, but not more than 2, years; and

(III) not less than 2 years; and

(B) the estimated costs to the Federal Government of the maintenance backlog of each Federal agency, to be—

(i) organized in categories comprised of buildings and structures; and

(ii) expressed as an aggregate cost.

(c) USE OF EXISTING ANNUAL REPORTS.—An annual report required under subsection (a) may be comprised of any annual report relating to the management of Federal real property that is published by a Federal agency.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 9, 2008, at 9:30 a.m., in open session to receive testimony on the situation in Iraq and progress made by the Government of Iraq in meeting benchmarks and achieving reconciliation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 9, 2008, at 2:30 p.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 9, 2008, at 10 a.m. in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to hold a hearing entitled, ''Legislative Hearing on S. 1870, the Clean Water Restoration Act of 2007.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 9, 2008, at 9:30 a.m. to hold a hearing on sexual assault in combat environments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 9, 2008, at 3:15 p.m. to hold a nomination hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERAN'S AFFAIRS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 9, 2008, to conduct an oversight hearing on Making the VA the Workplace of Choice for Health Care Providers. The committee will meet in room 418 of the Russell Senate Office Building, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIRLAND

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Airland of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 9, 2008, at 2 p.m., in open session to receive testimony on Air Force and Navy aviation programs in review of the Defense authorization request for fiscal year 2009 and the Future Years Defense Program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH CARE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance Subcommittee on Health Care be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 9, 2008, at 2:30 p.m., in room 215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Covering Uninsured Children: The Impact of the August 17 CHIP Directive.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate to conduct a hearing on Wednesday, April 9, 2008, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Bill Hutzel, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the duration of debate on H.R. 3221.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ben Brown, a fellow in my office, be allowed the privilege of the floor for the remainder of the debate on the housing bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DESIGNATING APRIL 2008 AS ''NATIONAL 9–1-1 EDUCATION MONTH''

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 629, S. Res. 468.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 468) designating April 2008 as ''National 9–1-1 Education Month.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 468) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 468

Whereas 9–1–1 is nationally recognized as the number to call in an emergency to receive immediate help from police, fire, emergency medical services, or other appropriate emergency response entities;

Whereas, in 1967, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice recommended that a ''single number should be established'' nationwide for reporting emergency situations, and other Federal Government agencies and various governmental officials also supported and encouraged the recommendation;

Whereas, in 1968, the American Telephone and Telegraph Company (AT&T) announced that it would establish the digits 9–1–1 as the emergency code throughout the United States;

Whereas 9–1–1 was designated by Congress as the national emergency call number under the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–81; 113 Stat. 1286);

Whereas section 102 of the ENHANCE 911 Act of 2004 (47 U.S.C. 942 note) declared an enhanced 9–1–1 system to be ''a high national priority'' and part of ''our Nation's homeland security and public safety'';

Whereas it is important that policy makers at all levels of government understand the importance of 9–1–1, how the system works today, and the steps that are needed to modernize the 9–1–1 system;

Whereas the 9–1–1 system is the connection between the eyes and ears of the public and the emergency response system in the United States and is often the first place emergencies of all magnitudes are reported, making 9–1–1 a significant homeland security asset;

Whereas more than 6,000 9–1–1 public safety answering points serve more than 3,000 counties and parishes throughout the United States;

Whereas dispatchers at public safety answering points answer more than 200,000,000 9–1–1 calls each year in the United States;

Whereas a growing number of 9–1–1 calls are made using wireless and Internet Protocol-based communications services;

Whereas a growing segment of the population, including the deaf, hard of hearing, and deaf-blind, and individuals with speech disabilities, are increasingly communicating with nontraditional text, video, and instant messaging communications services and expect those services to be able to connect directly to 9–1–1;

Whereas the growth and variety of means of communication, including mobile and Internet Protocol-based systems, impose challenges for accessing 9–1–1 and implementing an enhanced 9-1-1 system and require increased education and awareness about the capabilities of different means of communication;

Whereas numerous other N–1–1 and 800 number services exist for nonemergency situations, including 2–1–1, 3–1–1, 5–1–1, 7–1–1, 8–1–1, poison control centers, and mental

health hotlines, and the public needs to be educated on when to use those services in addition to or instead of 9–1–1;

Whereas international visitors and immigrants make up an increasing percentage of the United States population each year, and visitors and immigrants may have limited knowledge of our emergency calling system;

Whereas people of all ages use 9–1–1 and it is critical to educate those people on the proper use of 9–1–1;

Whereas senior citizens are at high risk for needing to access to 9–1–1 and many senior citizens are learning to use new technology;

Whereas thousands of 9–1–1 calls are made every year by children properly trained in the use of 9–1–1, which saves lives and underscores the critical importance of training children early in life about 9–1–1;

Whereas the 9–1–1 system is often misused, including by the placement of prank and nonemergency calls;

Whereas misuse of the 9–1–1 system results in costly and inefficient use of 9–1–1 and emergency response resources and needs to be reduced;

Whereas parents, teachers, and all other caregivers need to play an active role in 9–1–1 education for children, but will do so only after being first educated themselves;

Whereas there are many avenues for 9–1–1 public education, including safety fairs, school presentations, libraries, churches, businesses, public safety answering point tours or open houses, civic organizations, and senior citizen centers;

Whereas children, parents, teachers, and the National Parent Teacher Association contribute importantly to the education of children about the importance of 9–1–1 through targeted outreach efforts to public and private school systems;

Whereas we as a Nation should strive to host at least 1 educational event regarding the proper use of 9–1–1 in every school in the country every year;

Whereas programs to promote proper use of 9–1–1 during National 9–1–1 Education Month could include—

(1) public awareness events, including conferences and media outreach, training activities for parents, teachers, school administrators, other caregivers and businesses;

(2) educational events in schools and other appropriate venues; and

(3) production and distribution of information about the 9–1–1 system designed to educate people of all ages on the importance and proper use of 9–1–1; and

Whereas the people of the United States deserve the best education regarding the use of 9–1–1: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 2008 as ''National 9–1–1 Education Month''; and

(2) urges Government officials, parents, teachers, school administrators, caregivers, businesses, nonprofit organizations, and the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate ceremonies, training events, and activities.

CONDEMNING THE VIOLENCE IN TIBET AND CALLING FOR RESTRAINT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 504, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 504) condemning the violence in Tibet and calling for restraint by the Government of the People's Republic of China and the people of Tibet.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of a resolution condemning the violence in Tibet and calling for restraint by the Government of the People's Republic of China and the people of Tibet.

Cosponsoring this resolution with me is Senator GORDON SMITH of Oregon.

The measure is also cosponsored by Senator JOE BIDEN, the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Senators KLOBUCHAR, BROWN, CANTWELL, DOLE, OBAMA, SNOWE, MENENDEZ, VOINOVICH, SCHUMER, COLLINS, BYRD, MURRAY, DURBIN, LIEBERMAN, STABENOW, SANDERS, REED, CLINTON and FEINGOLD.

The resolution also calls for dialogue between the leadership of China and His Holiness the Dalai Lama on meaningful religious and cultural autonomy for Tibet within China; the release of individuals who protested in a peaceful manner; a cessation of China's efforts to ''reeducate'' Tibetan Buddhist monks and nuns; China to open Tibet to international journalists, as it promised the international community it would do during the lead up to the Olympic games; and asks for a full accounting of the protests in Tibet which began in March.

Starting on March 10, Tibetan Monks and other Tibetans began protesting in Tibetan autonomous areas of Western China.

The protests, begun peacefully by monks who marched in their robes, were an expression of these religious people's desire to practice their religion freely and without government interference.

The protesters took this action at great personal risk. Many monks and marchers carried pictures of the Dalai Lama, the most revered figure in Tibetan Buddhism. Possession of such a picture is considered a crime in China.

Unfortunately and tragically, on March 14 protests in Lhasa, the capital of the Tibet Autonomous Region, turned violent. Long suppressed animosity boiled over. Innocent people were killed in the violence. Homes and businesses were burned in what appears to have been a riot.

Over the days and weeks that followed, the protests spread. Protests reportedly occurred in 42 separate Chinese counties. Most were peaceful, and in some case they were met with brute force by the Chinese police.

This resolution condemns the violence on both sides.

The Chinese government has now begun the punishment process.

Thousands of paramilitary police and possibly the People's Liberation Army are in Tibet rounding up protest participants.

International journalists and official representatives are still being kept out, making accurate information difficult to obtain.

But we know that dozens of people or more have died. And we know that more than 1,000 people have been incarcerated. We know that the monasteries have been surrounded by armed force.

On Monday I spoke about the underlying issues including a lack of religious freedom and economic opportunity that have caused Tibetans to take to the streets.

I also spoke about my long standing work to open the door between China and San Francisco and about my sincere friendship with China and its leaders.

Most importantly, I discussed my efforts since 1991 to establish dialogue between the Chinese Leadership and the Dalai Lama.

I read from letters that I carried from the Dalai Lama to the President of China in 1992, 1997, and 1998.

In those letters, the Dalai Lama expressed that he does not seek Independence as China's leaders assert.

In the Dalai Lama's 1998 letter, he wrote:

I would like to reiterate here that I am not seeking independence for Tibet. My main concern is for the six million Tibetan people . . . to be able to enjoy the opportunity to fully preserve their civilisation and the distinct Tibetan culture, religion, and language. I am convinced that this could be achieved through genuine autonomy or self-rule within the framework of the People's Republic of China.

The Dalai Lama neither calls for independence nor supports the use of violence. He has encouraged the Tibetan people to use restraint both in Tibet and also in the cities, such as San Francisco, where the Olympic torch visits.

On Sunday, The Dalai Lama reiterated his call. In a message to the Tibetan people, he said:

I want to urge my fellow Tibetans who live in freedom outside Tibet to be extra vigilant as they voice their feelings on the developments in Tibet. We should not engage in any action that could be even remotely interpreted as violent. Even under the most provocative of situations we must not allow our most precious and deeply held values to be compromised. I firmly believe that we will achieve success through our nonviolent path. We must be wise to understand where the unprecedented affection and support for our cause stems from.

I sincerely hope the people of San Francisco will heed the Dalai Lama's call.

I would like to commend the people of my city for holding a peaceful rally and candlelight vigil at San Francisco's United Nations Plaza.

And I call on the people of San Francisco that plan to take to the streets today to embrace the nonviolence advocated by the Dalai Lama.

As a friend of China and the Dalai Lama, I am saddened to see the situation in Tibet deteriorate to this point.

Violence cannot solve this matter.

The United States must use its influence to bring the Government of China and the people of Tibet together to

begin the process of reconciliation and dialogue.

To bring this issue to a settlement, the leaders must be involved.

It is in the interest of both the Chinese government and the Tibetan people for the leaders to sit down and negotiate how to bring about meaningful cultural and religious autonomy for the Tibetan people and faith.

For nearly three decades, I have worked to bring this about.

The events in Tibet over the past month have been tragic.

But they renew my commitment and belief.

China has an opportunity to negotiate with a moderate leader capable of quelling the anger within the new generation of Tibetans.

I hope that China's leaders will see this as an opportunity to open the long overdue dialogue with the Dalai Lama.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 504) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 504

Whereas, beginning on March 10, 2008, Tibetans and Tibetan Buddhist monks began demonstrations in Lhasa, the capital of the Tibet Autonomous Region in the People's Republic of China;

Whereas those protests spread to elsewhere in the Tibet Autonomous Region and to Tibetan autonomous areas in the Sichuan, Gansu, and Qinghan provinces of China;

Whereas long-suppressed resentment prompted violent clashes between demonstrators and government forces in the streets of Lhasa, resulting in innocent civilian casualties, the burning of buildings, and extensive property damage;

Whereas Chinese and Tibetan sources report dozens of fatalities and the arrest of more than 1,000 protesters in the Tibet Autonomous Region and surrounding Tibetan areas of China;

Whereas Tibet is the center of Tibetan Buddhism and the Dalai Lama is the most revered figure in Tibetan Buddhism;

Whereas the Government of China continues to restrict the rights of Tibetan Buddhists to practice their religion freely;

Whereas the Dalai Lama has condemned the violence that began on March 14, 2008, and announced his continuing support for the Olympic Games to be held in Beijing, China;

Whereas the Dalai Lama has specifically stated that he does not seek independence for Tibet from China and has called for negotiations to bring about meaningful autonomy for Tibet that allows Tibetans to maintain their distinctive identity within China;

Whereas the Constitution of the People's Republic of China guarantees freedom of religious belief for all citizens, but the 2007 Annual Report on International Religious Freedom of the Department of State states that ''[d]uring the period covered by this report, the Government [of China]'s respect for freedom of religion remained poor''; and

Whereas, following the demonstrations that began on March 10, 2008, the Government of China began severely restricting access to journalists and diplomats and creating a shortage of independent verification of the situation on the ground in Tibet: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the violence in Tibet and calls for restraint by the Government of the People's Republic of China and the people of Tibet;

(2) calls for a dialogue between the leadership of the Government of China and His Holiness the Dalai Lama on meaningful religious and cultural autonomy for Tibet within China and urges that these discussions take place with all deliberate speed;

(3) calls for the release of individuals who protested in a peaceful manner and for medical care for those injured and wounded in the violence that followed the protests;

(4) calls on the Government of China to cease its efforts to enter monasteries to 'reeducate' monks and nuns, to respect the right of the people of Tibet to speak of the Dalai Lama and possess his photograph, and to respect and protect basic human rights, as provided in the Constitution of the People's Republic of China;

(5) calls on the Government of China to honor its commitment to allow international journalists free access to China from mid-2007 to October 17, 2008;

(6) calls on the Government of China to provide a full accounting of the March 2008 protests in Tibet, the response of the Government of China, and the manner and number of detentions and deaths that occurred following the protests; and

(7) both—

(A) calls on the United States Department of State to fully implement the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 6901 note), including the stipulation that the Secretary of State seek ''to establish an office in Lhasa, Tibet, to monitor political, economic, and cultural developments in Tibet'', and also to provide consular protection and citizen services in emergencies; and

(B) urges that the agreement to permit China to open further diplomatic missions in the United States should be contingent upon the establishment of a United States Government office in Lhasa, Tibet.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to consideration of S. Res. 508, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 508) congratulating the University of Tennessee women's basketball team for winning the 2008 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Women's Basketball Championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 508) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 508

Whereas, on April 8, 2008, before a crowd of over 21,000 fans, the University of Tennessee women's basketball team (referred to in this preamble as the ''Lady Vols'') defeated the Cardinal of Stanford by a score of 64–48 to win the 2008 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Women's Basketball Championship;

Whereas that victory marked the second national title for the Lady Vols in 2 years, and the 8th national title of the Lady Vols in the last 20 years;

Whereas the University of Tennessee became the first school to accomplish back-to-back national titles twice, having previously achieved that feat during its 3-peat from 1996 through 1998;

Whereas the Lady Vols were successful due to the leadership of Head Coach Pat Summitt, the Nation's all-time winningest National Collegiate Athletic Association basketball coach among men's and women's teams, with 983 wins over 34 seasons at the University of Tennessee;

Whereas Joan Cronan, the Women's Athletics Director of the University of Tennessee, has—

(1) shown vision and leadership throughout her 25-year career at the University of Tennessee; and

(2) created 1 of the most visible and respected athletic programs in the country;

Whereas the Lady Vols compiled an impressive overall record of 36 wins and 2 losses, avenging 1 of those losses against Stanford in the championship game;

Whereas the Lady Vols were guided all season long by—

(1) the leadership of the seniors on the team, including—

(A) Nicky Anosike;

(B) Alberta Auguste;

(C) Shannon Bobbitt; and

(D) Alexis Hornbuckle; and

(2) the outstanding play of the 2008 Naismith Trophy winner, Candace Parker;

Whereas Candace Parker, while playing with an injured shoulder, tallied 17 points, 9 rebounds, and 4 steals, and was selected as the Most Outstanding Player for the 2008 tournament, becoming—

(1) the 4th player in history to achieve that honor 2 years in a row; and

(2) the 5th member of the University of Tennessee women's basketball team to be so honored, following in the footsteps of—

(A) Chamique Holdsclaw, who was honored in 1997 and 1998;

(B) Michelle Marciniak, who was honored in 1996;

(C) Bridgette Gordon, who was honored in 1989; and

(D) Tonya Edwards, who was honored in 1987;

Whereas Shannon Bobbitt, who at only 5 feet, 2 inches, is the shortest player ever to play on the University of Tennessee women's basketball team, and whose 3 first half 3-pointers and transition defense helped establish an early lead, finished the game with 13 points, and was named to the 2008 All-Tournament Team;

Whereas Nicky Anosike, who finished the game with 12 points, 8 rebounds, and a game-high 6 steals, was named to the 2008 All-Tournament Team;

Whereas Alberta Auguste scored 7 points to go along with 7 rebounds;

Whereas Alexis Hornbuckle, whose dogged defense helped hold the Stanford team to a season-low 48 points and a season-high 25 turnovers, finished with 6 points and 3 assists;

Whereas freshman Vicki Baugh provided a nice boost off the bench with 8 points and 4 rebounds; and

Whereas Head Coach Pat Summitt's Lady Vols set an example off the court as well, by continuing to sustain a remarkable graduation rate, with every student athlete who has completed her eligibility at the University of Tennessee graduating or working toward all of the requirements for graduation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the University of Tennessee women's basketball team for—

(A) being champions on and off the court; and

(B) the victory of the team in the 2008 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Women's Basketball Championship (referred to in this resolution as the ''NCAA women's basketball championship'');

(2) recognizes the significant achievements of the players, coaches, students, alumni, and support staff whose dedication and hard work helped the University of Tennessee Lady Volunteers win the NCAA women's basketball championship; and

(3) respectfully requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit for appropriate display an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) Dr. John D. Petersen, President of the University of Tennessee;

(B) Joan Cronan, Women's Athletics Director of the University of Tennessee; and

(C) Pat Summitt, Women's Basketball Head Coach of the University of Tennessee.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2008

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, April 10; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, that there then be a period of morning business for up to 60 minutes, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each and the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half; and that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 3211, as under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. DURBIN. Tomorrow, following morning business, the Senate will proceed to a series of up to three rollcall votes as early as 10:40 a.m., and upon disposition of the housing bill, the Senate will consider the Energy Committee's lands bill. We also expect to vote on a number of judicial nominees tomorrow. Therefore, Senators should expect a busy day of voting tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DURBIN. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:40 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, April 10, 2008, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING KAZZ MICHAEL MARSEY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Kazz Michael Marsey of Blue Springs, Missouri. Kazz is 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 1246, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Kazz has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Kazz 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 Kazz Michael Marsey for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

A PROCLAMATION HONORING COACH VINCE WALTERS FOR COACHING THE NEWARK HIGH SCHOOL BOYS' BASKETBALL TEAM TO WINNING THE BOYS' DIVISION I STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. ZACHARY T. SPACE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. SPACE. Madam Speaker:

Whereas, Coach Vince Walters showed hard work and dedication to the sport of basketball; and

Whereas, Vince Walters was a leader and mentor for the Newark High School Boys' Basketball Team; and

Whereas, Coach Walters has been a role model for sportsmanship on and off of the court; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that along with his friends, family, and the residents of the 18th Congressional District, I congratulate Coach Vince Walters for leading the Newark High School Boys' Basketball Team to winning the Boys' Division I State Basketball Championship. We recognize the tremendous hard work and leadership he has demonstrated during the 2007–2008 Basketball season.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON KLEIN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise to submit a record of how I would have voted on Thursday, April 3, when I was unavoidably detained. Had I voted, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall No. 159.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, abuses of the earmark process by Members of both parties demonstrate the need for reform. However, earmarks are hardly the most serious problem facing this country. In fact, many, if not most, of the problems with earmarks can be fixed by taking simple steps to bring greater transparency to the appropriations process. While I support reforms designed to shine greater sunlight on the process by which Members seek earmarks, I fear that some of my colleagues have forgotten that the abuses of the earmarking process are a symptom of the problems with Washington, not the cause. The root of the problem is an out-of-control Federal budget. I am also concerned that some reforms proposed by critics of earmarking undermine the separation of powers by eroding Congress's constitutional role in determining how Federal funds are spent.

Contrary to popular belief, adding earmarks to a bill does not increase Federal spending. Earmarks are added to appropriations legislation after the total funding levels have been agreed on. Therefore, earmarks simply allocate Federal money that Congress has already agreed should be spent. Thus, adding or subtracting earmarks from legislation does not increase or reduce Federal spending by even one penny.

Since reforming, limiting, or even eliminating earmarks does nothing to reduce Federal spending, I have regarded the battle over earmarks as a distraction from the real issue—the need to reduce the size of government. Recently, opponents of earmarks have embraced an approach to earmark reform that undermines the constitutional separation of powers by encouraging the President to issue an Executive order authorizing Federal agencies to disregard congressional earmarks placed in committee reports.

Since the President's Executive order would not reduce Federal spending, the practical result of such an Executive order would be to transfer power over the determination of how Federal funds are spent from Congress to unelected Federal bureaucrats. Since most earmarks are generated by requests from our constituents, including local elected officials such as mayors, this executive order has the practical effect of limiting taxpayers' ability to influence the ways the Federal Government spends tax dollars.

Madam Speaker, the drafters of the Constitution gave Congress the powers of the purse because the drafters feared that allowing the branch of government charged with executing the laws to also write the Federal budget would concentrate too much power in one branch of government. The founders correctly viewed the separation of the lawmaking and law-enforcement powers as a vital safeguard of liberty. Whenever the President blatantly disregards orders from Congress as to how Federal funds should be spent, he is undermining the constitutional separation of powers.

Congress has already all but ceded its authority to declare war to the executive branch. Now we are giving away our power of the purse. Madam Speaker, the logical conclusion of the arguments that it is somehow illegitimate for Members of Congress to control the disbursement of Federal funds in their district is that Congress should only meet one week a year to appropriate a lump sum to be given to the President for him to allocate to the Federal Government as he sees fit.

Madam Speaker, all Members should support efforts to bring greater transparency to the earmarking process. However, we must not allow earmarking reform to distract us from what should be our main priority—restricting Federal spending by returning the Government to its constitutional limitations. I also urge my colleagues not to allow the current hysteria over earmarks to justify further erosion of our constitutional authority to control the Federal budget.

NATIONAL MONTH OF THE MILITARY CHILD

SPEECH OF

HON. TODD TIAHRT

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2008

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in support of H. Res 265, honoring military children during "National Month of the Military Child." While we understand and praise the personal sacrifices our brave men and women make in defending our great nation, we frequently forget about the sacrifices and burdens that children and families face while their parents are serving in the United States Armed Forces.

In peacetime, children of military parents bear the burdens of numerous military moves, both overseas and in the United States. In these moves, they cope with attending several different schools, losing good friends, leaving good communities, and typically have parents who cannot attend their sporting events, music recitals, and other after school activities. The military duty is a 24–7, 365-day commitment for the soldier and also their families.

In wartime, children of deployed military parents spend every day living in fear of the unknown. When will my mom or dad return? Will they be severely injured? Will they be killed? In years past, military children often faced one deployment lasting anywhere from 4 to 18 months. However, in today's long Global War

on Terror, many military members and families are facing their second, third, or fourth deployments.

The impacts of these additional and prolonged separations are not clear and may have lasting adverse effects on military children and families. When military members return from deployments, we focus on the impact of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder; we also need to study and analyze the impacts of traumas created by war and deployments on the children of these military parents.

The children of military members play a vital role in the defense of this country. Their contributions and sacrifices have not gone unnoticed. This is our opportunity as a Nation to recognize their dedication and support. We honor our brave men and women in the Armed Forces who have dedicated their lives to defending our freedoms, but we must also pay great tribute to the children and the families of soldiers, who bear the burden of their tremendous sacrifice.

I encourage my colleagues to support this important resolution and am pleased that today the House recognizes the role of the military children.

HONORING MICHAEL ANTHONY LIERMANN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Michael Anthony Liermann of Kansas City, Missouri. Michael is 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 1009, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Michael has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Michael 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 Michael Anthony Liermann for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

A PROCLAMATION HONORING COACH JEFF BROWN FOR COACHING THE NEWARK HIGH SCHOOL BOYS' BASKETBALL TEAM TO WINNING THE BOYS' DIVISION I STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. ZACHARY T. SPACE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. SPACE. Madam Speaker:

Whereas, Coach Jeff Brown showed hard work and dedication to the sport of basketball; and

Whereas, Jeff Brown was a leader and mentor for the Newark High School Boys' Basketball Team; and

Whereas, Coach Brown has been a role model for sportsmanship on and off of the court; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that along with his friends, family, and the residents of the 18th Congressional District, I congratulate Coach Jeff Brown for leading the Newark High School Boys' Basketball Team to winning the Boys' Division I State Basketball Championship. We recognize the tremendous hard work and leadership he has demonstrated during the 2007–2008 Basketball season.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO JAMES AND ALICE RAE SMALLEY

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to rise today to honor my good friends James and Alice Rae Smalley by entering their names in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the official record of the proceedings and debates of the United States Congress since 1873. I rise today to honor James and Alice Rae Smalley for their contributions to the Southern Nevada community, and commend them on receiving the honor of having an elementary school named after them in the Clark County School District.

James began his teaching career within the school district in 1949 where he taught math at the Fifth Street School in Las Vegas. He later transferred to the Jefferson School in North Las Vegas where he taught Social Studies. After teaching at Jefferson, James taught at Henderson Junior High where he taught for 29 years. While teaching, he served as the President of the Henderson Teachers Association, and continued to be an active member throughout the Henderson community. James was also active in Nevada politics and along with his wife Alice Rae, served as campaign managers for former Governor Grant Sawyer and Ralph Denton. In 1970, Jim successfully ran for Nevada State Assembly where he served on the Assembly Education and Government Affairs Committees.

Alice Rae was born and raised in Caliente, Nevada where she attended the University of Colorado and obtained a bachelor's degree in nursing, becoming the first member of her family to go to college. Along with her husband, Alice Rae was politically active within the State of Nevada, and served two terms on the Nevada State Welfare Board during Governor Grant Sawyer's term. In 1962, she became a nurse for Paradise Elementary, Ullom Elementary, and Whitney School. She dedicated much of her time to help define the role of school nurses within the Clark County School District. She worked for the Clark County School District until she retired in 1988.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to honor the accomplishments of James and Alice Rae Smalley for their dedication to the Southern Nevada Community. I commend them for their contributions and would like to congratulate them on an elementary school being named in their honor by the Clark County School District.

HONORING DADA J.P. VASWANI

HON. RON KLEIN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dada J.P. Vaswani, the spiritual head of Sadhu Vaswani Mission in Pune, India. Dada visits my Congressional District from India on a mission to bring peace, grace and compassion. It is with these qualities that he imparts through word and action to thousands of people in countries all over the world.

Today, Dada J.P. Vaswani is the spiritual head of The Sadhu Vaswani Mission, and also the inspiring force behind its myriad activities.

Dada Vaswani is universally acclaimed as a humanitarian, philosopher, educator, acclaimed writer, powerful orator and spiritual leader. He has been a voice for animal rights and has captivated the hearts of millions worldwide. In the eyes of many, Dada is a man who symbolizes the true spirit of India as a harbinger of love, peace and hope.

At a time when this country knows all too well the devastation of war, Dada J.P. Vaswani is a force of peace. I rise to honor all peace-loving people, and hope that the example of Dada Vaswani will prevail around the world.

NEWBORN SCREENING SAVES LIVES ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2008

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, as an OB–GYN I take a back seat to no one when it comes to caring about the health of newborn children. However, as a Representative who has taken an oath to uphold the Constitution, I cannot support legislation, no matter how much I sympathize with the legislation's stated goals, that exceeds the Constitutional limitations on Federal power or in any way threatens the liberty of the American people. Since S. 1858 violates the Constitution, and may have unintended consequences that will weaken the American health care system and further erode medical privacy, I must oppose it.

S. 1858 gives the Federal bureaucracy the authority to develop a model newborn screening program. Madam Speaker, the Federal Government lacks both the constitutional authority and the competence to develop a newborn screening program adequate for a nation as large and diverse as the United States. Some will say that the program is merely a guide for local hospitals. However, does anyone seriously doubt that, whatever the flaws contained in the model eventually adopted by the Federal Government, almost every hospital in the country will scrap their own newborn screening programs in favor of the Federal model? After all, no hospital will want to risk losing Federal funding because they did not adopt the "federally approved" plan for newborn screening. Thus, this bill takes another step toward the nationalization of health care.

As the Federal Government assumes more control over health care, medical privacy has increasingly come under assault. Those of us in the medical profession should be particularly concerned about policies allowing Government officials and State-favored interests to access our medical records without our consent. After all, patient confidentiality is the basis of the trust that must underline a positive physician-patient relationship. Yet my review of S. 1858 indicates the drafters of the legislation made no effort to ensure these newborn screening programs do not violate the privacy rights of parents and children.

In fact, by directing Federal bureaucrats to create a contingency plan for newborn screening in the event of a ''public health'' disaster, this bill may lead to further erosions of medical privacy. As recent history so eloquently illustrates, politicians are more than willing to take, and people are more than willing to cede, liberty during times of ''emergency.'' Thus, most people will gladly sacrifice their families' medical privacy if they are told it is necessary to protect them from a Government-declared health emergency, while the Federal Government will be very unlikely to relinquish its new powers when the emergency passes.

I am also skeptical, to say the least, that a top-down Federal plan to screen any part of the population will effectively help meet the challenges facing the health care system in the event of a real public emergency. State and local Governments working together with health care providers, can better come up with effective ways to deal with public health emergencies than can any Federal bureaucracy. It is for these reasons, Madam Speaker, that I oppose S. 1858.

RECOGNIZING THE TREMENDOUS SERVICE THAT MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES HAVE GIVEN TO THE NATION

SPEECH OF

HON. TODD TIAHRT

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2008

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1020, a resolution recognizing the tremendous service that members of the Armed Forces, especially those who have been wounded in combat, have given.

As an original cosponsor of this resolution, I want to thank the lead sponsor, Mr. WELCH, for bringing this resolution to the floor and his leadership on this important issue. I also want to thank Mr. WALBERG and Mr. HIGGINS for joining Mr. WELCH and me in spearheading this effort to honor those who have given so much in service to our country.

Only 1 percent of Americans serve in the military. Only 1 percent have answered the call to arms in defense of our Nation, our values, and our freedoms. To this 1 percent, we owe so much; so much that can never be fully repaid.

Throughout our history, many Americans have given the ultimate sacrifice for this Nation, and many more have had their minds and bodies wounded for the same cause. In the current Global War on Terror, around 30,000 servicemembers have been wounded, including almost 400 from Kansas. Their lives and those of their families have been dramatically impacted.

I have had the honor to meet with many of these wounded warriors, both in Kansas and at Walter Reed. Though their lives have been forever changed, they continue their commitment to duty, country, and family. They are a great inspiration to me and those who are blessed to meet them.

Every American has a responsibility to thank these brave Americans. We must vocally honor them. We must honor them by providing excellent medical care, access to quality jobs and education, support for their families, and the resources to live fulfilling and productive lives. But, we also need to remember to say ''thank you.'' ''Thank you'' for your service and your sacrifice. This resolution is just one more way the House of Representatives can say ''thank you'' to our Nation's veterans.

In addition to this resolution, Misters WELCH, WALBERG, HIGGINS and I are helping organize an April 16th reception for Members of Congress and wounded warriors from Walter Reed. This reception will provide Members of Congress the honor to personally meet with these brave heroes. I encourage all my colleagues to attend. This reception will encourage you, humble you, and challenge you to push harder in support of our veterans.

We can never fully honor or repay the sacrifice made by our Nation's veterans. Our veterans deserve so much, and, in comparison, we have so little to offer. But, I hope that this resolution and upcoming reception will take a step in the right direction. I ask that all my colleagues support this important resolution.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTION OF NURSES

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. MCCOTTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge the noble and essential role nurses play in providing quality health care across our Nation.

Our Nation's health care system is complex and every day people with all types of needs are cared for by qualified and professional nurses. Every individual can remember an experience when someone they loved needed health care and a nurse was the first person by their side providing compassionate and essential care. My wife, a registered nurse works on the front lines of caring for Americans and like so many nurses, her devotion extends beyond the workforce; as she goes home every day after work and is just as thoughtful and attentive to the needs of our family. The tireless efforts made by nurses to provide nurture and solace are an inspiration to all.

A growing number of nurses are essential to ensuring all people receive quality care; and our Nation's public health infrastructure has the professionals necessary to respond to natural and manmade disasters. The Department of Health and Human Services projects the current ten percent vacancy rates in registered nurses will grow to 36 percent by the year 2020, representing more than one million unfilled jobs. We must make sure to provide strong Congressional leadership, unflagging support, and the Federal funding necessary to ensure the United States continues to maintain a steady supply of nurses to care for the patients of today and tomorrow.

Madam Speaker, in honor of their unwavering commitment, dedication, and selflessness, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring nurses and their exemplary service to our community and our country.

CONGRATULATING TEMPLE ISRAEL OF LAWRENCE

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate Temple Israel of Lawrence, New York, on its 100th anniversary.

Temple Israel is the oldest temple on Long Island. It was founded in 1908 as Temple Israel of Far Rockaway. The congregation moved to its current location in 1930. A new school center was created in 1948 to better accommodate the educational needs of the congregation and then again in 1966 with new social facilities. Temple Israel continues to thrive to this day, as the religious and nursery schools have unusually large enrollments.

The Temple reaches beyond just the ''Five Towns'' and extends around the world. Temple Israel participates in a number of interfaith and cross-cultural programs. There are exchange programs, such as an American Jewish and Italian Catholic exchange program with the Vatican, which help bring about greater understanding and compromise among the participants.

I applaud these efforts of the congregation because I, too, am a strong believer in bringing people with different backgrounds together to find common ground. I participated in the Women's Democracy Fund to help bring women together in Northern Ireland to contribute to the peace process. The program has more recently moved to bringing Israeli and Palestinian women together as an effort to also help bring about peace in that region.

The Temple Israel congregation is ably led by Rabbi Jay Rosenbaum and Cantor Galina Paliy. Rabbi Rosenbaum is the spiritual and education leader of Temple Israel. He is well known on Long Island and throughout the American rabbinate. He works across the international arena in building bridges of understanding and compromise between the American Jewish community and Jewish communities and foreign governments around the world and between Jews and other religions. Rabbi Rosenbaum also worked with first responders and victim's families at Ground Zero following the terrorist attacks of 9/11. I am glad to hear that Rabbi Rosenbaum will be joining me in Washington, DC, later this month in welcoming Pope Benedict XVI on his first papal visit to the United States.

Temple Israel of Lawrence is part of a rich Jewish history in the United States. In 2003, Congress passed H. Con. Res. 106, which recognizes and honors America's Jewish community on the occasion of its 350th anniversary. The first known Jews arrived from Brazil in 1654. They established the first Jewish community in New York City. Jews have contributed in so many ways to American society,

including civic, social, economic, military, and cultural life. I am glad to see that Temple Israel Lawrence has played a large role in that extensive Jewish American history.

Once again, I wish to extend my sincerest congratulations and warm wishes to Temple Israel of Lawrence on its 100th anniversary and look forward to another successful 100 years.

POLAR BEAR PROTECTION

HON. JAY INSLEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, I rise to show my dismay that it has been 3 months since the Department of Interior's Fish and Wildlife Service, FWS, missed an important deadline to determine whether they would give the polar bear protections under the Endangered Species Act.

Naysayers argue that the polar bear population is not at risk, but the studies show that an estimated 20,000 to 25,000 polar bears worldwide are threatened with ''losing their habitat over the next 50 years'' because of global warming and melting sea ice.

The U.S. Geological Survey, USGS, predicts that without action, ''11 of the 19 subpopulations will be extinct by the middle of this century, with an additional three subpopulations vanishing shortly thereafter.''

That same USGS study showed that Arctic melting is occurring faster than any scientific models have previously predicted.

Incredibly, at the same time we are seeing these sobering scientific reports, the Department of Interior has moved forward with leasing oil and gas exploration rights for almost 30 million acres of the Polar Bear Seas. Just off the northwest coast of Alaska, this environmentally sensitive area is home to about 16,000 polar bears.

This is not the time for drilling in prime polar bear habitat. It is the time for protecting polar bears and their habitat under the Endangered Species Act. FWS should act today to list the polar bear as a threatened, or even an endangered, species.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, on April 8, 2008, I was inadvertently delayed and unable to vote. Had I been present I would have voted ''aye'' on the following: rollcall No. 161 on passage of H.J. Res. 70, congratulating the Army Reserve on its centennial; rollcall No. 162 on passage of H.R. 2464, the Wakefield Act; and rollcall No. 163 on final passage of S. 793, the Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act.

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA TO END ITS CRACKDOWN IN TIBET

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2008

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 1077 and to speak about the alarming human rights situation in Tibet and the People's Republic of China.

In recent weeks, we have seen citizens of the world rising up against the Chinese Government's crackdown in Tibet and requesting that the communist regime end human rights abuses. The crackdown by the Chinese Government resulted in more than 100 deaths of Tibetans and the detention of thousands more. The Chinese government has also impeded the access of international journalists to Tibetan areas of China. It is time for this body to stand with these protests and act to protect Tibetans and Chinese citizens from further violence.

Despite the upcoming 2008 Olympic Games in Beijing, the Government's human rights record remains poor. Tibetans are not the only victims of China's human rights abuses. We must not forget the persecution of Christians, Uyghur Muslims, Falun Gong, democracy advocates, AIDS victims, journalists, and lawyers in China. There have been numerous abuses in China tied to the upcoming Olympic Games, including media and Internet censorship, sentences on charges of state subversion of government critics and forced evictions. Human rights advocates are being imprisoned for criticizing the Government's human rights record.

The Chinese Government wants to use the 2008 Summer Olympic Games to showcase the progress their country has made. It is my hope that the Chinese Government will take immediate and substantial strides to resolve the situation in Tibet and to address domestic human rights issues in China. Until that time, the voices of this Congress and the world should continue to apply pressure on the Chinese Government. The Summer Olympic Games offer the international community the opportunity to speak up against ongoing abuses in China.

Human rights should be our first priority and our first requirement when we engage with countries. It is our duty to use our economic and diplomatic leverage to make sure that fundamental rights are protected in the world.

I urge my colleagues in Congress to support H. Res. 1077, which calls on the Government of the People's Republic of China to end its crackdown in Tibet and to engage in dialogue with the Dalai Lama. The Dalai Lama's movement is not radical, and it is not violent. It is time for the Chinese to end their brutal treatment of the Tibetan people. It is time for the Tibetan people to experience the inalienable freedoms and human rights that all free peoples should enjoy. Again, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 1077.

HONORING KYLE CONNOR COOPER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Kyle Cooper Connor of Kansas City, Missouri. Kyle is 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 1155, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Kyle has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Kyle 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 Kyle Cooper Connor for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

A PROCLAMATION HONORING COACH BRENT FICKES FOR COACHING THE NEWARK HIGH SCHOOL BOYS' BASKETBALL TEAM TO WINNING THE BOYS' DIVISION I STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. ZACHARY T. SPACE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. SPACE. Madam Speaker:

Whereas, Coach Brent Fickes showed hard work and dedication to the sport of basketball; and

Whereas, Brent Fickes was a leader and mentor for the Newark High School Boys' Basketball Team; and

Whereas, Coach Fickes has been a role model for sportsmanship on and off of the court; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that along with his friends, family, and the residents of the 18th Congressional District, I congratulate Coach Brent Fickes for leading the Newark High School Boys' Basketball Team to winning the Boys' Division I State Basketball Championship. We recognize the tremendous hard work and leadership he has demonstrated during the 2007–2008 basketball season.

HONORING THE TENURE OF DR. EMILIO T. GONZALEZ AT UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity and spotlight the extraordinary leadership Dr. Emilio T. Gonzalez demonstrated while Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, USCIS.

Since his confirmation in late 2005, Director Gonzalez managed an organization of more than 17,000 Federal and contract employees responsible for the accurate, efficient, and secure processing of immigration applications.

During his tenure, USCIS underwent a period of unprecedented growth, revitalization, and expansion. The agency sharpened its fraud detection and national security efforts through the creation of the National Security and Records Verification Directorate and the deployment of Fraud Detection National Security officers to USCIS offices. The Nation's signature employment authorization program, E-Verify, grew to include 55,000 employer participants and has verified the work status of more than 3 million new employees. An ambitious facilities revitalization program was initiated by Director Gonzalez, with the goal to renovate or replace nearly 40 USCIS facilities over 3 years.

Director Gonzalez is a shining example of the contributions and excellence that the Hispanic community has brought, and will continue to bring, to the service of our great Nation.

Our grateful Nation is proud of his service, and I wish him the best in all his future endeavors. We will surely miss him dearly.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATAAN DEATH MARCH

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, today, we mark the anniversary of one of the darkest moments in American history.

For the thousands of soldiers who were surrendered to enemy forces on April 9, 1942, the years that have passed since have been filled with memories of what occurred that day and in the hundreds of days that followed. Starvation. Torture. Forced work. Captivity. Death.

But in the 66 years since, the events at Bataan have conjured other memories for the rest of us. Bravery. Sacrifice. And an unbreakable demonstration of courage.

''The Battling Bastards of Bataan,'' they were christened by Frank Hewlett, one of the last journalists to report on the troops before they were surrendered. For 4 months they fought, battling daily against the enemy, against illness, and against time. And when there was no fight left, when the time for surrender was upon them, they were alone. Neither planes in the skies nor boats in the sea appeared, ready to give the boost of firepower that would turn the tides. Instead, the men at Bataan laid down their weapons and walked into a hell that would last over 3 years.

In TIME magazine, the surrender at Bataan was reported under the headline, Death of an American Illusion. ''These U.S. soldiers had stumbled ragged, sleepless and half-starved through the last days of the most humiliating defeat in U.S. history,'' wrote the correspondent. ''In no previous battle had so many U.S. fighting men gone down before a foreign enemy, and seldom had any beaten U.S. soldiers been in such pitiable condition—believing until the last hour of destruction that their country could and surely would send them aid. The U.S. had known the end was near. But it had not, could not, beforehand, taste the taste and smell the smell of crushing defeat.''

For those of us from New Mexico, the events at Bataan strike home particularly hard because of the involvement of the 200th and 515th regiments. These New Mexico National Guardsmen came from all parts of the State and from all walks of life. On the 12 columns here we see their names and we lament at the sheer number who shipped overseas and never returned. They came to serve and they gave the ultimate sacrifice in defense of their country.

We also must take note at the number of Hispanic soldiers who served, fought, and died. Their service during a time of discrimination, both in the military and in the public, poignantly epitomizes the struggle they faced in being treated with equality, with respect, and with dignity. For those who remained unequivocally devoted to their Nation even while being treated as second-class citizens, we salute you and promise that we will not forget your service.

As a token of our remembrance, earlier this year I introduced legislation that would award the Bataan prisoners of war with the Congressional Gold Medal. This award, long past due, would be a fitting tribute and would forever signify the thanks of our Nation to the soldiers who served with honor and with courage.

Sadly, we are no longer graced with the presence of many of the original heroes who struggled and survived the ordeals of Bataan. The ravages of captivity and the passage of time have taken many of them from us and we are now left with their story and with their memory. Future generations of Americans will hear the story of Bataan second-hand, never able to meet a soldier who still bears the scars of torture or who still remembers the joy of liberation and returning home. For now, however, with those who are still here and who can still tell their story, we must grant them the widest forum and the most amplified voice to ensure that this tale of courage, this legend of the Battling Bastards of Bataan, is shared as far and wide as possible. We cannot, we must not, forget what happened at Bataan and our actions of honoring these soldiers will never meet the great sacrifice they gave on the battlefield so many years ago.

To those who suffered and who never returned, we honor your memory.

To those who have since passed, we remember your story.

And to those with us today, we praise your courage and give you our thanks.

RECOGNIZING THE 120TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TWIN OAKS ESTATE

HON. CONNIE MACK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. MACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for our friends in Taiwan as they celebrate the 120th anniversary of the Twin Oaks estate here in Washington, DC.

Twin Oaks estate was built in 1888 by Gardiner Greene Hubbard, the founder of the National Geographic Society. This beautiful home was built as a summer residence for his family. Mr. Hubbard had two daughters, Grace and Mabel. Mabel later lived at Twin Oaks with her husband, Alexander Graham Bell.

Years later, Grace inherited the property. In 1937, she rented the property to the Republic of China's Government to serve as the ambassador's residence. A decade later, the Republic of China purchased the property and it served as the official residence of each successive Republic of China ambassador.

After extensive renovation that brought it back to its original elegance in the early 1980s, Twin Oaks was recognized and named as a national historic site in Washington, DC. Over the past two decades many functions have been held at Twin Oaks and today the estate continues to stand proudly as a symbol of the strong friendship between the United States and Taiwan.

Madam Speaker, the people of Taiwan live in a vibrant democracy and, as such, Taiwan has become a beacon of freedom and an engine of prosperity in the Pacific region. As we celebrate Twin Oaks' long and vibrant history, we are reminded of our strong ties, abiding mutual relations, and deep friendship with Taiwan.

CYTOLOGY PROFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2008

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2008

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of The Cytology Proficiency Improvement Act, H.R. 1237, which would modernize and improve a Federal program aimed at promoting quality cervical cancer screening. Pathologists are already required by Federal law under the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988, CLIA, to comply with extensive quality assurance standards for Pap tests. The bill would complement CLIA by establishing a Federal continuing medical education, CME, requirement for pathologists and laboratory professionals who examine Pap tests to screen for cervical cancer.

I have been a long-time advocate of medical technology and education advancements. Earlier this year, I had the opportunity to tour the Pathology Lab at St. Francis Hospital in Wilmington, DE to get a first hand look at the practice and techniques used in Delaware. During the tour, the doctors and medical staff highlighted the need for H.R. 1237.

Regular screening can make all the difference in addressing cervical cancer and early detection can save lives. Women need access to the latest in Pap test science, principles of patient safety and technological advances such as computer-assisted screening, digital imaging, and HPV typing. Over the years, this educational requirement will also accommodate advances in science and technology without going through the long process of making changes in regulation.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support passage of The Cytology Proficiency Improvement Act, H.R. 1237.

CONGRATULATING MS. TRUDE TRUDELL FOR RECEIVING THE NAACP TEACHER OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. STEVAN PEARCE

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of Holloman Middle School teacher Ms. Trude Trudell. Ms. Trudell's hard work and dedication have earned her the Otero County, New Mexico, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP, Teacher of the Year award. It is her devotion to her students that earned her this tremendous honor. Good teachers like Ms. Trudell inspire the young minds of this country and shape our youth.

Ms. Trudell was a member of the military before becoming a teacher. Yet she has said that teaching is the toughest job she has ever held.

Ms. Trudell's work has made a tremendous impact on the lives of students in Otero County. An education is an open door to the future for our children, and teachers have a key role in helping open that door for our children. Without great educators like Ms. Trudell, our children would not be prepared to enter the economy of the future. It is also teachers like Ms. Trudell who take pride in their work and use their own ambition to drive students to succeed.

This award is a reflection of Ms. Trudell's commitment to making an impact on the lives of each and everyone of her students. Her top priority is preparing her students for the future, and for that on behalf of the people of the New Mexico, I want to thank her for her service. Teachers like Ms. Trudell give us all hope for a better future for America.

HONORING JOSHUA DEAN SLUGANTZ

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Joshua Dean Slugantz of Kansas City, MO. Joshua is 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 1155, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Joshua has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Joshua 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 Joshua Dean Slugantz for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

A PROCLAMATION HONORING COACH T.J. SOMERS FOR COACHING THE NEWARK HIGH SCHOOL BOYS' BASKETBALL TEAM TO WINNING THE BOYS' DIVISION I STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. ZACHARY T. SPACE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. SPACE. Madam Speaker:

Whereas, Coach T.J. Somers showed hard work and dedication to the sport of basketball; and

Whereas, T.J. Somers was a leader and mentor for the Newark High School Boys' Basketball Team; and

Whereas, Coach Somers has been a role model for sportsmanship on and off of the court; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that along with his friends, family, and the residents of the 18th Congressional District, I congratulate Coach T.J. Somers for leading the Newark High School Boys' Basketball Team to winning the Boys' Division I State Basketball Championship. We recognize the tremendous hard work and leadership he has demonstrated during the 2007–2008 Basketball season.

TRIBUTE TO ANHUESER-BUSCH COMPANIES FOR THEIR EXEMPLARY ACHIEVEMENT OF MAKING FORTUNE MAGAZINE'S LIST OF AMERICA'S MOST ADMIRED COMPANIES

HON. WM. LACY CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay congratulations to Anhueser-Busch Companies for their exemplary achievement in being named first among beverage companies in Fortune magazine's America's Most Admired Companies. Anhueser-Busch has been headquartered in Saint Louis, Missouri, since its establishment in 1860, and has successfully served the community since that time. I am proud to represent Anhueser-Busch's dedicated employees in the Saint Louis community who work hard to continually raise the bar for beverage companies worldwide.

Anhueser-Busch topped Fortune magazine's list of global beverage companies for the fifth consecutive year, rating first overall and first in eight of the nine categories considered: quality of products and services, people management, quality of management, innovation, social responsibility, financial soundness, long-term investment, and use of corporate assets.

Anhueser-Busch also has several other distinctions in this global list. Among every company surveyed, which was more than 350 global companies spanning 26 industries, Anhueser-Busch ranked number one for quality of products and services and number two for social responsibility. Anheuser-Busch should also be applauded for its efforts to promote diversity in its workforce, as well as in the communities that it serves. Their commitment to being in the community, as well as of the community, has led Anhueser-Busch to support community-based organizations in efforts to inform, advance, and sustain their diverse communities.

Contributing to the community and social responsibility have been very important actions for Anhueser-Busch since the company's beginnings, and the organization has quickly become a global industry leader in promoting responsibility. Since 1982, Anheuser-Busch and its nationwide network of more than 600 wholesalers have spent more than $675 million on developing more than two dozen alcohol awareness and education programs and initiatives designed to help prevent all forms of alcohol abuse, including illegal underage drinking and drunk driving. Working together with parents, educators, State and Federal regulators, law enforcement officials, and many others, Anheuser-Busch has continued its long-standing commitment to being part of the solution to these issues.

Anheuser-Busch has also dedicated its facilities to operating in a sustainable and environmentally responsible manner. At the Saint Louis area Anheuser-Busch brewery, more than 99 percent of the solid waste that is created is recycled. In addition, brewery water use has been cut by nearly 20 percent since 1990 and by more than 7 percent in the last 5 years, saving 4.7 billion liters of water.

In times of crisis for the American people, Anhueser-Busch has established a reputation of being part of the recovery by providing a helping hand to our friends in their time of need. This tradition of giving began in 1906, when Aldolphus Busch donated funds to help San Francisco earthquake victims. More recently, Anhueser-Busch has donated drinking water and made monetary donations to the American Red Cross to aid in hurricane relief efforts in the Gulf Coast in 2005, as well as to wildfire relief efforts in California in 2007 and to tornado relief efforts in the South earlier this year. Since 1988, Anhueser-Busch has provided nearly 63.5 million cans of drinking water to various relief efforts.

From these many examples, it is clear that Anhueser-Busch has rightfully earned the distinction of being named first among beverage companies as Fortune magazine's America's Most Admired Companies. I am proud to have worked directly with the dedicated employees of Anhueser-Busch in both Saint Louis, Missouri, as well as here in Washington, DC. I ask all Members of Congress to join me today in congratulating Anhueser-Busch for this extraordinary accomplishment and for their continued dedication to serving the American people.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 161, H.J. Res. 70, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall 162, H.R. 2464, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall 163, S. 793, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. THOMAS H. ALLEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, on April 3, 2008, I was unavoidably absent from the House due to a family illness.

If had been present, I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall vote No. 159, a motion by Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS of Washington to recommit H.R. 4847 to the Committee on Science and Technology with instructions.

I would have also voted ''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 160, final passage of H.R. 4847, a bill to reauthorize the United States Fire Administration.

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA TO END ITS CRACKDOWN IN TIBET

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2008

Mr. HONDA. Madam Speaker, the United States and the People's Republic of China, PRC, are friends and partners in this international community. I truly believe that the governments of both nations endeavor to support the wellbeing of not only their people, but also of those around the world. Like individuals, governments learn from experience, and learn from the experiences of others. And like individuals, perhaps with more frequency and greater impact, governments make errors in judgment. In just our short history, the United States government and its people have made more than our fair share of mistakes. We have endured social strife at home with class and racial warfare, and our Federal, State and local governments have played their ugly part, from voting rights to segregation and violence. And throughout this century, our Nation knew that the world was watching. During World War II, all eyes were on America, waiting for its actions to meet its rhetoric of freedom. It was in this backdrop that our grassroots civil rights movement pushed our society towards our own American ideals. We have learned many lessons from our own history on how to create and maintain a peaceful society, prioritizing the protection and promotion of human rights—there are many lessons to share, and many yet to learn. it

As the Olympic Summer Games near, the spotlight is now on our friend China and on its actions. China has made inroads as a new member of the global community, as their economy becomes increasingly integrated into the world economy. The groundwork for greater freedom is slowly developing, as it makes incremental gains to strengthen the rule of law. There comes a time, however, when greater scrutiny calls for greater action. As friends, I have always believed that constructive criticism should be encouraged. That is why today, I rise in support for H. Res. 1077. Friends do not always agree with each other's actions, but I know that the U.S. and China share some common values and concerns, including the wellbeing of our peoples and stability and peace in our Nations.

The Chinese government is concerned over the instability and ethnic tensions that have erupted after the protests of March 10, 2008. The widespread arrests and detentions of Tibetans and harsh statements by the Chinese government against the Dalai Lama, however, have not helped the situation, but instead have fueled the fires of resentment. Certainly, rioters and those who have perpetrated violent crimes should be tried and punished. Their departure from the doctrine of nonviolence as supported by the Dalai Lama and other great civil rights leaders, such as César Chávez, Martin Luther King, Jr. and Mahatma Gandhi, has weakened their voice. To further social stability and sustained harmony, and to decrease resentment and anger among the Tibetan people, I believe that it is of utmost importance to differentiate between those peaceful protestors and those who have turned to violence—violence reported by Chinese and international journalists.

Despite these reports, the government nevertheless removed all international journalists from the Tibetan Autonomous Region. It is difficult to know exactly what had transpired in the Tibetan areas, as well as the current situation in the region, because of this unwarranted expulsion. In the end, there were conflicting reports on the nature of the protests in China and on the numbers of those injured and killed by not only China's security forces, but also by certain Tibetan protestors. It is essential that journalists and international monitors have unfettered access to Tibetan areas to shed light on the situation on the ground.

Finally, to create a harmonious society, all members must feel a part of the process, thereby developing trust and confidence among all parties. When racial tensions have arisen in the United States, the best of us have acknowledged mistakes, embraced them, and worked toward solutions, together. In the same vain, I firmly believe that direct dialogue between the government of the People's Republic of China and His Holiness the Dalai Lama is necessary for any meaningful, short- and long-term solution to this dire situation. Previous rounds of dialogue between the PRC and representatives of the Dalai Lama have resulted in an apparent misunderstanding of the Dalai Lama's concept of Tibetan ''autonomy.'' While there are some proponents for an independent Tibet within the Tibetan community, the Dalai Lama has repeatedly shared his support for an autonomous Tibetan region within the governance of China that ensures basic freedoms for the Tibetan people with protections for their culture, language, and religion. The Chinese government should take advantage of his moderate position and considerable influence on the Tibetan population, and engage in peaceful, direct talks with the Dalai Lama. In fact, China's Regional Ethnic Autonomy Law has already laid the foundation by guaranteeing the rights of ethnic minorities to administer their internal affairs. This foundation should not be discarded, but built upon with further assurances and implementations of these guarantees.

It is in the spirit of friendship, mutual understanding, arid shared lessons that I rise to support H. Res. 1077. We know governments can make mistakes, and we can all work together to restore peace during times of social tension. The award of the Olympic bid to China is a global acknowledgement, a global celebration, of China's membership in the global community. As the Olympic torch is introduced in San Francisco for its only appearance in the United States, I hope that protestors and bystanders show their respect for the Olympic Summer Games and refrain from violence. As an advocate for human rights and a staunch supporter of our First Amendment rights, I admire the courage and conviction exhibited by peaceful protestors. Finally, I hope that China will use this opportunity of greater scrutiny to speak directly with the Dalai Lama to build the trust and confidence necessary to achieve the harmony it seeks.

HONORING JOHN EVERETT BIVEN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize John Everett Biven of Liberty, MO. John is 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 2418, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

John has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years John 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 John Everett Biven for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

A PROCLAMATION HONORING COACH MARK OBERHOLTZER FOR COACHING THE NEWARK HIGH SCHOOL BOYS' BASKETBALL TEAM TO WINNING THE BOYS' DIVISION I STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. ZACHARY T. SPACE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. SPACE. Madam Speaker:

Whereas, Coach Mark Oberholtzer showed hard work and dedication to the sport of basketball; and

Whereas, Mark Oberholtzer was a leader and mentor for the Newark High School Boys' Basketball Team; and

Whereas, Coach Oberholtzer has been a role model for sportsmanship on and off of the court; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that along with his friends, family, and the residents of the 18th Congressional District, I congratulate Coach Mark Oberholtzer for leading the Newark High School Boys' Basketball Team to winning the Boys' Division I State Basketball Championship. We recognize the tremendous hard work and leadership he has demonstrated during the 2007–2008 Basketball season.

HONORING THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR CREDIT COUNSELING 2008 FINANCIAL LITERACY POSTER CONTEST WINNERS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the winners of the National Foundation for Credit Counseling, NFCC, financial literary poster contest held among students to raise awareness of financial issues.

The winners include: National winner, Harrison Noh of Bloomfield Hills, Michigan; Elementary School winner, Christopher Saker of Bloomfield Hills, Michigan; Middle School winner, Levi Travis of U.S. Army Base, Seoul, South Korea; and High School winner, Victoria Guerra of Crowley, Texas.

I applaud the efforts to bring financial literacy to students by engaging them in proactive learning and knowledgeable ideas about how to manage money effectively. The skill of managing money wisely and effectively is something that needs to be taught early in life. The earlier a person knows the importance of good investments, solid savings, and sound purchasing, the better able that person is to successfully manage their money throughout the remainder of their lives.

With the current economic conditions, there is no better time than now to educate our youth on how to be financially savvy. The poster winners exhibited this knowledge in a creative and engaging manner as they articulated the contest's theme of ''financial responsibility begins with me.''

It is my honor to recognize the financial literary poster winners for such an outstanding job. Through their artistic abilities, it is obvious that these winners have taken it to heart that financial responsibility truly begins with each of them.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, on April 8, 2008, I was unavoidably detained and was not able to record my votes for rollcall No. 161–163.

Had I been present I would have voted:

Rollcall No. 161—''yea''—Congratulating the Army Reserve on its centennial.

Rollcall No. 162—''yea''—The Wakefield Act.

Rollcall No. 163—''yea''—Reauthorization of the Traumatic Brain Injury Act.

RECOGNIZING THE EFFORTS AND INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP OF 16-YEAR-OLD ALEXIS MONROE IN RAISING FUNDS FOR THE PURCHASE OF AMBULANCES FOR THE LEBANESE RED CROSS

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, Alexis Monroe, a 16-year-old, student at Glenelg Country School in Ellicott City, MD, raised over $5,300 to go toward ambulance purchases for the Lebanese Red Cross at her school's annual International Dinner and Fashion Show Fundraiser in 2007 and 2008. I would like to commend Alexis for her efforts as a young leader assisting a humanitarian cause that is supported by the American Red Cross. I would like to thank Alexis for her efforts, and I am submitting Alexis' speeches from 2007 and 2008 for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that her work can receive recognition as example of U.S. philanthropy to aid those in a far away land who need assistance.

LEBANESE RED CROSS PRESENTATION

(By Alexis Claire Monroe)

One of the great things about Glenelg is the sense of community one feels. When crises occur outside our own community, it's important to help and support the family and friends across the seas—as they are really just an extension of our own community. In planning this event, we learned that there are no less than 8 families of Lebanese descent here at tiny GCS—including 2 faculty—many of whom still have family and friends in Lebanon. We had four generations in our family touched by this crisis.

On July 1, 2006, my great-aunt and uncle visited our family in Lebanon. Great-grandmother Fawaz had turned 97. They were so happy to see how Lebanon had recovered from the civil war and 28 years of occupation. The streets were safe, downtown Beirut had been reconstructed, the hotels and restaurants were filled with tourists.

On July 10th, they left for a short visit to Petra, Jordan to see a 2000 year old temple that is still being excavated by their friends from Brown University. They planned to return to Lebanon on July 14th in time for my great-uncle's birthday celebration which was to be at an elegant restaurant on the harbor near Byblos.

Early July 13th, the Israelis bombed the newly finished Beirut Airport along with more than 60 bridges, all superhighways, and all ports. The combined naval, land and air blockade made travel impossible.

My great-aunt and uncle were stuck in Jordan for 10 days before they could get a flight out leaving most of their belongings behind in Lebanon. During that time, they watched, in horror, the TV broadcast of the destruction of Lebanon's infrastructure and the displacement of 800,000 Lebanese (almost 25% of the population) from their homes, half of those being children; 1,300 Lebanese were killed and 3,200 injured.

The use of force against innocent Lebanese was excessive and prolonged and destroyed over 10 years of reconstruction and re-investment efforts. Many people are still homeless and hungry and need assistance.

One of the primary sources of aid is the Lebanese Red Cross which is a non-partisan humanitarian organization whose volunteers provide medical treatment and relief services. The American Task Force on Lebanon has a commitment from a private foundation to match contributions dollar for dollar—so GCS' gift will go twice as far.

On July 22, 2006, my great-grandmother died. My family was unable to bury her in our ancestral home in Joun because the roads and bridges had been destroyed. We hope that some day, she will be able to rest there in peace.

2008 LEBANESE RED CROSS PRESENTATION

(By Alexis Clarie Monroe)

The Lebanese Red Cross is a member of the International Red Cross. It provides the most comprehensive ambulance services in the country—often under very difficult circumstances. Wherever there is a need, the Lebanese Red Cross is visible, transporting victims to hospitals and often treating the wounded on the spot.

The Lebanese Red Cross has 6,000 volunteers and 43 Centers where it administers onsite first aid, provides transport, and training. In 2005 and 2006, the Lebanese Red Cross responded to over 166,000 emergency calls—sometimes even losing some of their own in the process. Unfortunately, crises continue to plague Lebanon.

The Lebanese Red Cross needs to replace old and damaged ambulances in order to be able to respond effectively. Last year, Glenelg Country School raised over $2,300 which was contributed to the national campaign. The funds were matched by a private foundation so our contribution doubled to $4,600.

This year, in addition to the foundation match, the American Red Cross has agreed to match donations, so the effect of our charity will be quadrupled: every $10 becomes $40; every $25 becomes $100; every $50 becomes $200.

Although we may have different talents and different abilities and different cultures, in the most basic sense, as humans, we are all equal in our humanity. We are born without knowledge of our faculties, and in this state we are all equal. And this inherent equality never leaves us—we cannot rid ourselves of that intrinsic humanity. Tonight is a time to recognize that equality, to give to others in need regardless of their race or religion, to be not only tolerant, but understanding. Tonight is a time to hope that the warfare, the bloodshed, the violence, in the Middle East will come to an end—tonight is a time to do whatever we can to aid the cause of peace.

HONORING TREVOR KORCHAK

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Trevor Paul Korchak of Kansas City, Missouri. Trevor is 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 1260, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Trevor has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Trevor 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 Trevor Paul Korchak for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of

America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

A PROCLAMATION HONORING NEWARK HIGH SCHOOL FOR THEIR SUPPORT OF THE NEWARK HIGH SCHOOL'S BOYS' BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. ZACHARY T. SPACE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. SPACE. Madam Speaker:

Whereas, Newark High School has displayed incredible dedication to creating well-rounded students; and

Whereas, the Newark High School has been supportive of their athletes; and

Whereas, the Newark High School has broadened the abilities and skills of their athletes in the sport of basketball; and

Whereas, the Newark High School has always promoted sportsmanship on and off of the court; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that along with their friends, family, and the residents of the 18th Congressional District, I congratulate the Newark High School on supporting their Boys' Basketball team in winning the Boys' Division I State Basketball Championship. We recognize the tremendous amount of support they have given to their athletes.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE LATE CHARLES W. DURHAM OF OMAHA, NEBRASKA

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. TERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Charles W. Durham of Omaha, who died this past weekend at the age of 90.

Charles ''Chuck'' Durham was one of Omaha's outstanding residents. He was a community leader, visionary, philanthropist, businessman, and family man. He loved the City of Omaha, and all of us in the community loved Chuck and Margre Durham for their humble, genuine ways, in addition to their many gifts to our city.

Chuck Durham was raised in Ames, Iowa and attended Iowa State University, where he acquired two important assets—a degree in engineering and his wife and lifelong companion, Margre Henningson. He joined the Omaha-based engineering firm of Margre's dad and built the firm into one of America's largest engineering firms—HDR Inc.

HDR Inc., under the leadership of Chuck Durham, became an international powerhouse architectural and engineering firm, designing medical, military, and public works projects around the world. One area of expertise of the firm was designing hospitals and medical facilities, and many of our Omaha hospitals, notably Omaha Methodist Hospital were designed by HDR Inc.

The Durham Research Center at the University of Nebraska Medical Center in midtown Omaha is one of the most advanced medical research centers in the world, but it is just one of the facilities in Omaha that benefited from the generosity of Chuck and Margre Durham. The Henry Doorly Zoo, the Durham Museum, and the Durham Science Center at the University of Nebraska—Omaha are among many facilities that Chuck Durham brought to reality. Finally, we will always remember the many photos of Chuck with his faithful dog, Tina, at his side—a lasting symbol of his love and concern for animals and their welfare.

Madam Speaker, Chuck's vision, energy, and the sharing of his resources with our community will be a part of Omaha forever. We mourn his passing, as we celebrate his life among us. Robyn and I extend our heartfelt sympathies and prayers to his children, Steve, Sunny, Lindy, and Debby during this time of loss.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, April 8, 2008, I was unavoidably detained due to a death in the family and thus I missed rollcall votes No. 161 through 163. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

On roll vote No. 161, on H.J. Res. 70, Congratulating the Army Reserve on its centennial, which will be formally celebrated on April 23, 2008, and commemorating the historic contributions of its veterans and continuing contributions of its soldiers to the vital national security interests and homeland defense mission of the United States, I would have voted ''yea.''

On roll vote No. 162, on H.R. 2464, the Wakefield Act, I would have voted ''yea.''

On roll vote No. 163, on S. 793, the Traumatic Brain Injury Act of 2008, I would have voted ''yea.''

HONORING THE ACCOMPLISMENTS OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY CANCER INSTITUTE IN WASHINGTON, DC, IN RECOGNITION OF THE FIFTH ANNUAL GW CANCER INSTITUTE GALA

HON. CLIFF STEARNS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, Whereas, the GW Cancer Institute provides groundbreaking biomedical and clinical research, high quality educational programs, and effective outreach and outstanding patient care to the Washington, DC, area; and

Whereas, the GW Cancer Institute seeks to understand why certain cancers disproportionately affect vulnerable populations, and to eliminate cancer disparities among minority citizens in the District; and

Whereas the GW Cancer Institute's Executive Director Dr. Steven Patierno cochaired the AACR–MICR, American Association for Cancer Research and Minorities in Cancer Research, national conference titled, ''The Science of Cancer Health Disparities in Racial and Ethnic Minorities and the Medically Underserved''; and

Whereas, the GW Cancer Institute is working to uncover genetic clues that help explain cancer disparities through a grant awarded by the National Cancer Institute's Center to Reduce Cancer Health Disparities to establish a Genomics of Cancer Disparities Center; and

Whereas the GW Cancer Institute offers an Office of Cancer Prevention and Control, an Office of Cancer Education and Outreach and an Office of Cancer Survivorship;

Whereas, the GW Cancer Institute offers resources to citizens in the form of advocacy, support groups, education, outreach and clinical care;

Whereas, the GW Cancer Institute leads the Community-by-Community Cancer Control Campaign aimed at decreasing the cancer burden of Washington, DC;

Whereas, nearly 40 area churches participate in the GWCI's congregational cancer wellness initiative;

Whereas, the GWCI served as a founding member and leader of the DC Cancer Consortium;

Whereas the GW Cancer Institute's Dr. Paul Levine cochairs the Early Detection Subcommittee of the DC Cancer Consortium and Dr. Donald Henson serves as cochair of the DC Cancer Consortium;

Whereas the GW Cancer Institute, together with the GW Medical Faculty Associates, operates the GW Mammovan which offers digital mammography to more than 2,500 women per year;

Whereas, the GW Cancer Institute partners with local Washington DC based sports teams including the Washington Redskins and Washington Nationals, offering free prostate cancer screenings;

Whereas, the GW Cancer Institute works with local, Washington DC media partners, reaching thousands with messages about the importance of getting screened for prostate, breast and colorectal cancer.

Whereas, the GW Cancer Institute, working with the GW Medical Faculty Associates, has conducted free prostate cancer screenings for over 2000 men in 18 months, including nearly 700 DC area men at the 15th Annual NBC4 Health and Fitness Expo at the Washington, DC, Convention Center;

Whereas the GW Cancer Institute's Outreach Program works with barbershops in DC's Wards 4, 7 and 8 offering an outreach program in which lay health workers are trained in prostate cancer education and relay information to customers about the importance of early detection;

Whereas, the GW Cancer Institute recognizes leaders in the field every year at the annual GW Cancer Institute Gala;

Whereas, past GW Cancer Institute Gala recipients have included Carolyn R. ''Bo'' Aldige, the American Cancer Society, Lance Armstrong, Ray Michael Bridgewater, Zora Brown, Margaret M. Bush, Sam Donaldson, Andrew C. von Eschenbach, MD, First Lady of the Republic of Panama Vivian Fernandez de Torrijos, Harold P. Freeman, MD, Elmer Huerta, MD, LaSalle D. Leffall Jr., MD, FACS, the Honorable CONNIE MACK and Mrs. Priscilla Mack, Michael Milken, Nueva Vida, and Ellen Sigal, PhD;

Whereas, the GW Cancer Institute will honor Margaret Foti, MD, PhD, Robert Siegel,

MD and Mrs. Paula Siegel, RN; Sean Swarner, and Archbishop Desmond Tutu on May 3, 2008.

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. House of Representatives—

(1) honors and salutes the accomplishments of the GW Cancer Institute and recognizes its important work throughout the Washington, DC area;

(2) recognizes the accomplishments and achievements of the GW Cancer Institute in research and community outreach; and

(3) based upon the Institute's service, extends its appreciation to The George Washington University Cancer Institute in recognition of its Fifth Annual GW Cancer Institute Gala.

HONORING CAMERON MICHAEL KIEFFER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Cameron Michael Kieffer of Liberty, Missouri. Cameron is 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 1214, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Cameron has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Cameron 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 Cameron Michael Kieffer for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

A PROCLAMATION HONORING MIKE NEWMAN FOR WINNING THE BOYS' DIVISION II STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. ZACHARY T. SPACE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. SPACE. Madam Speaker:

Whereas, Mike Newman showed hard work and dedication to the sport of basketball; and

Whereas, Mike Newman was a supportive team player; and

Whereas, Mike Newman always displayed sportsmanship on and off of the court; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that along with his friends, family, and the residents of the 18th Congressional District, I congratulate Mike Newman on winning the Boys' Division II State Basketball Championship. We recognize the tremendous hard work and sportsmanship he has demonstrated during the 2007–2008 basketball season.

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA TO END ITS CRACKDOWN IN TIBET

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2008

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1077, and I thank Speaker PELOSI for bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor.

I am deeply troubled by the violence that has erupted in Lhasa and the rest of the Tibetan Autonomous Region. The enduring human rights consequences have the potential to devastate Tibet and completely abolish any chance of peaceful reconciliation. According to news reports, Beijing has sent thousands of soldiers to the region to quell the violence, and Beijing's long-term plans for the region include ramped up ideological education for youth, restrictions on worship, and even harsh retribution for Tibetans who do not demonstrate fidelity to the official party line. This is not a matter of politics; this is not even a matter of international relations; this is a matter of basic human dignity. Tibetans, as we do here in America, ought to have the right to worship freely and live in peace, without fear of punishment.

I add my voice to the rising chorus of international leaders encouraging the Chinese Government to engage His Holiness the Dalai Lama in substantive dialogue. His Holiness has committed his life to social justice and nonviolent conflict resolution. If a lasting peace is to be achieved in Tibet, the Chinese Government must also commit themselves to these ideals.

120TH ANNIVERSARY OF TWIN OAK ESTATES

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. ORTIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my sincere congratulations to the Government of the Republic of China, Taiwan, for celebrating the 120th anniversary of the Twin Oaks Estates.

Built in 1888 by Mr. Gardiner Greene Hubbard, founder of the National Geographic Society, the estate has served the Taiwanese Government in the United States since 1937.

Twin Oaks Estates has been instrumental in allowing the people of Taiwan to establish a dynamic and mutually beneficial relationship between our two countries. The people of Taiwan continue to be our partners in economic matters, democracy, and the pursuit of peace.

I look forward to continue working with the Government of Taiwan and congratulate them again on the 120th anniversary of the Twin Oak Estates.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIMOTHY V. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Madam Speaker, unfortunately last night, April 8, 2008, my plane was delayed due to a delay in my plane arriving from its previous destination and I was unable to cast my vote on suspending the rules and passing H.J. Res. 70 and wish the record to reflect my intentions had I been able to vote.

Had I been present for rollcall No. 161 on suspending the rules and passing H.J. Res. 70, Congratulating the Army Reserve on its centennial, I would have voted "aye."

HONORING ERIC STAVES

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Eric Jordan Staves of Kearney, Missouri. Eric is 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 1376, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Eric has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Eric 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 Eric Jordan Staves for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

A PROCLAMATION HONORING NATHAN WOODWORTH FOR WINNING THE BOYS' DIVISION II STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP.

HON. ZACHARY T. SPACE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. SPACE. Madam Speaker:

Whereas, Nathan Woodworth showed hard work and dedication to the sport of basketball; and

Whereas, Nathan Woodworth was a supportive team player; and

Whereas, Nathan Woodworth always displayed sportsmanship on and off of the court; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that along with his friends, family, and the residents of the 18th Congressional District, I congratulate Nathan Woodworth on winning the Boys' Division II State Basketball Championship. We recognize the tremendous hard work and sportsmanship he has demonstrated during the 2007–2008 basketball season.

A TRIBUTE TO CHARLES ''CHUCK'' LaHATTE

HON. C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise before you today to honor Charles ''Chuck'' LaHatte, recently awarded the 2008 Congressional Volunteer Recognition Award by the 2nd Congressional District of Maryland's Veterans Advisory Council.

Chuck LaHatte is a dedicated volunteer with the Disabled American Veterans, DAV, driving a DAV van to help disabled veterans get to and from Fort Howard for their medical treatment. A veteran himself, Chuck truly cares about the disabled veterans he assists on a weekly basis. He serves as an encouraging example in their lives.

Volunteering about 70 hours a month with disabled veterans, Chuck helps teach other DAV volunteers how to interact with the disabled veterans and how best to serve them. Chuck realizes the importance of the service he provides for disabled veterans, and goes above and beyond the call of duty in order to give the disabled veterans he transports the best possible service.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you join with me today to honor Chuck LaHatte. He is a remarkable volunteer for Maryland's veterans. Through his ongoing efforts, he has helped dozens of veterans to receive the medical care they need. Chuck has gone above and beyond the call of duty to aid those who have sacrificed to serve our great Nation.

TRIBUTE TO LINWARD ''LIN'' APPLING

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, let me take this opportunity to recognize the career of Lin Appling, upon his retirement from the Missouri Public Service Commission.

Mr. Appling received a B.A. from Coker College and an M.A. from Wichita State University, while serving in the U.S. Army. Mr. Appling's distinguished Army service has been recognized with the bestowing of the U.S. Army Legion of Merit Award as well as a Bronze Star for his service in Vietnam.

Since 1993, Mr. Appling has served the Missouri State government in a number of capacities, culminating with his appointment in 2004 to the Missouri Public Service Commission.

Mr. Appling has been an active member of his community through his work with the Capital City Boys & Girls Club. Inspired by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. at an early age, Mr. Appling has been instrumental in helping others reach their goals.

I am certain that Members of the House will join me in thanking Lin Appling for his service to his country and to the State of Missouri.

HONORING THE LOUISIANA HONORAIR VETERANS

HON. CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor a very special group from South Louisiana.

On April 12, 2008, a group of 96 veterans and their guardians will fly to Washington with a very special program. Louisiana HonorAir is providing the opportunity for these veterans from my home State of Louisiana to visit Washington, DC, on a chartered flight free of charge. During their visit, they will visit Arlington National Cemetery and the World War II Memorial. For many, this will be their first and only opportunity to see these sights dedicated to the great service they have provided for our nation.

Today I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring these great Americans and thanking them for their unselfish service.

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA TO END ITS CRACKDOWN IN TIBET

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2008

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my deep concern over the recent crackdown in Tibet by the Chinese government. I strongly believe that America must be a country that speaks out on behalf of those who cannot speak for themselves—men and women who are being persecuted for their religious or political beliefs.

Every person on earth has certain inalienable rights. In a 1987 Constitution Day speech, Ronald Reagan noted that the U.S. Constitution has been described ''as a kind of covenant. It is a covenant we've made not only with ourselves but with all of mankind.'' America has a profound responsibility to keep this covenant and to stand up for freedom in the world's darkest corners.

China is a perfect example of a place where these rights are not being protected. The China of today is worse than the China of yesterday, or of last year, or of the last decade. China is not progressing. It is regressing. It is more violent, more repressive, and more resistant to democratic values than ever before.

The Cardinal Kung Foundation reports that in 2007, 35 Roman Catholic bishops were in jail, under house arrest, or harassed and put under surveillance. In 2007, the Chinese government arrested 693 Christians that we know of. Renowned human rights advocate and Uyghur Muslim Rebiya Kadeer has watched from exile as the Chinese government arrests and beats her family members in her homeland. Since the crackdown on Falun Gong began in 1999, untold numbers of Falun Gong practitioners have been arrested, imprisoned and tortured.

The Tibetans have suffered terribly over the years at the hands of the Chinese government. Tibet is gradually, but brutally, being subsumed by China. Inch by inch, this region, its people, its culture, its religion, even its language is growing fainter and fainter and could one day disappear as the Chinese government persists in trying to liquidate Tibetan culture and presence in China.

The reports and images of this most recent crackdown in Tibet are deeply disturbing. Tibetan Buddhist monks and Tibetan youth have been beaten down in the street and rounded up in house-to-house searches for protesting China's rule of the Tibet region. Scores of Tibetans are believed to have been killed in the violence, and hundreds of Tibetans have been arrested by Chinese police for participating in protests.

Given this legacy of violence and discrimination by the Chinese government, I'm not surprised it would crack down with such brutal force against these Tibetan protestors. My outrage at what China is doing in Tibet led me to visit Tibet in 1997, and I have seen first-hand the repression the Tibetans live under.

And despite all of its abhorrent acts, China was still awarded the honor of hosting the 2008 Olympics. The Olympic Games are an event designed to lift up ''the educational value of good example and respect for universal fundamental ethical principles,'' according to its own charter.

Does China's behavior sound like a ''good example'' to the rest of the world? Or that it is reflecting ''fundamental ethical principles'' that all nations should aspire to? It is because of China's actions that I cannot support the President or other senior U.S. officials attending the 2008 Beijing Olympics.

While I have strenuously urged the President not to attend the Olympics, I know I cannot stop the President from going. But I am offering language in the 2008 emergency supplemental appropriations bill to prohibit U.S. government officials and employees from attending the Beijing Olympics on the taxpayers' dime.

The political prisoners in China and Chinese dissidents around the world will be deeply demoralized by what the Chinese government will surely portray as symbolic support for its regime if senior American officials attend the games.

Some say that the protection of human rights is secondary to attaining economic power and wealth. We must reject that notion. China poses a threat not only to its own citizens, but to the entire world.

A PROCLAMATION HONORING RAY CHAMBERS FOR WINNING THE BOYS' DIVISION II STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP.

HON. ZACHARY T. SPACE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. SPACE. Madam Speaker:

Whereas, Ray Chambers showed hard work and dedication to the sport of basketball; and

Whereas, Ray Chambers was a supportive team player; and

Whereas, Ray Chambers always displayed sportsmanship on and off of the court; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that along with his friends, family, and the residents of the 18th Congressional

District, I congratulate Ray Chambers on winning the Boys' Division II State Basketball Championship. We recognize the tremendous hard work and sportsmanship he has demonstrated during the 2007–2008 basketball season.

HONORING BETH GLASS FOR WINNING THE GOLD AWARD

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize Beth Glass for winning the Gold Award, the Girl Scouts of the USA's highest honor for girls 14–18 years old.

Last summer, Miss Glass set out to complete the required 50 hours of community service. Desiring to honor community firefighters, she decided to repaint fire hydrants, a task she considered both achievable and extremely important since fire fighters rely on the hydrant's color to gauge how much water can flow through an individual hydrant.

Not only did Miss Glass accomplish her community service requirement of 50 hours, she went above and beyond when she put in 69 hours of service. In addition, she managed to engage her friends. family and the community on the project. While her friends and family helped paint, community hardware stores donated supplies.

A resident of Jacksonville, Texas. Miss Glass is a senior at All-Saints Episcopal School in Tyler, Texas, and has been a Girl Scout since fourth grade.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Fifth District of Texas, I am honored to recognize Beth Glass for not only winning the highest Girl Scout honor, but for her dedication to serving her community.

CARING FOR VETERANS IN AMERICA'S HEARTLAND

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, since 1993 HVAF (Helping Homeless Veterans and Families) of Indiana, Inc. has been committed to assisting our Nation's veterans overcome the challenges of homelessness. I rise today to honor this remarkable organization, and it's most recent initiative, Operation Heartland, which has dedicated itself to taking care of the needs of our heroes.

HVAF has successfully organized projects such as small-scale supportive housing units for homeless vets and the Veteran's Service Center where homeless veterans can obtain food, clothing, hygiene products, IndyGo bus tickets, and use shower facilities; but Operation Heartland is perhaps HVAF's most ambitious project to date. The goal of Operation Heartland is to raise funds to furnish a 40 unit apartment building as the Donald W. Moreau, Sr. Veterans House. Hopefully by August of this year the Moreau House will be up and running and able to accommodate 40 homeless veterans, many of whom have substance abuse or mental health issues. While staying at the Moreau house, homeless veterans will have the opportunity to receive counseling and other rehabilitative services from HVAF staff, in hopes of returning to society as productive citizens.

In a vote of confidence that HVAF would be successful, Oprah Winfrey's Big Give program recently gave $5,000 to help Operation Heartland get off the ground. Since then, the outpouring of support for Operation Heartland generated by Hoosiers has been substantial. Many of the donors who have already committed to the program include the Indianapolis Colts, FedEx Corporation, and Cathedral High School. One individual donor personally committed to provide over 15 percent of Operation Heartland's entire goal, and a local mom, who couldn't provide funding, committed her quilting group to provide quilts for the Moreau House.

Caring for our veterans—the men and women who have provided such an incredible service to our country—is one of the most important things we can do. Operation Heartland will help to get our veterans off the streets and into safe homes and satisfying jobs. Our homeless veterans, who have served our country with the utmost courage, honor and dignity, especially deserve the kind of second chance that Operation Heartland and similar initiatives can provide. Madam Speaker, organizations like HVAF of Indiana are working hard to repay the debt we all owe to all the men and women who ever served in our Armed Forces. They deserve our support, our respect and our profound thanks; and I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing the exemplary efforts of HVAF of Indiana.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, yesterday, on April 8, 2008, I was unable to vote due to official business outside Washington. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall vote Nos. 161, 162, and 163.

TRIBUTE TO ALLEN RUBY

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Madam Speaker, tonight Allen Ruby will be honored by the University of Santa Clara School of Law. Since the House is in session, I will not be able to participate in this important event. But I do want to note that there is no one more worthy of honor and recognition as a lawyer and as a person than Allen Ruby.

In 1965, after earning his bachelor of arts from Michigan State University in only 3 years, he came west to Stanford Law School. Since graduating from Stanford Law School in 1969 he has practiced criminal and civil law in San Jose. His demonstrated skill and commitment to justice enabled him to be admitted to the Supreme Court Bar in 1993.

I first came to know Allen Ruby when I was a member of the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors. The county was embroiled as a defendant in long-standing litigation. As the only county supervisor who was also an attorney, it fell to me to recommend to my colleagues the best lawyer in town to represent the county's interest. Allen Ruby was the best. To participate with Allen Ruby in preparation of the county's case was to watch an attorney of rare talent. He acted with integrity and ingenuity and served the people of Santa Clara County well.

Allen Ruby has represented a who's who of clients not only in Silicon Valley, but around the United States.

One of his most important public interest cases was the government false claims whistle-blower case, United States of America ex rel Henry Boisvert v. FMC Corp. The matter began when Boisvert, an FMC test analyst, found deficiencies in the U.S. Army's Bradley Fighting Vehicle. The all-terrain vehicle was designed to carry troops and equipment through water and on land but it leaked, making it a danger for troops. As a result of his continued reporting of vehicle flaws, Boisvert was terminated from his employment. Allen Ruby was able to prove that the termination by FMC was wrongful after he filed suit under the False Claims Act.

Ruby's zealous representation of Boisvert for the last 5 years of this 14-year lawsuit resulted in an important victory for the public interest as well as the individual whistleblower.

Mr. Ruby's extraordinary ability in trial is also appreciated by his colleagues. Their respect for Mr. Ruby gained him membership in the American Board of Trial Advocates and the International Academy of Trial Lawyers. He is a Fellow of the American College of Trial Lawyers. In 1999, the Santa Clara County Trial Lawyers Association named him Trial Lawyer of the Year.

Mr. Ruby's integrity was not just noted by clients and colleagues, the Santa Clara County Superior Court also recognized his expertise and skill by naming him Santa Clara County Superior Court Judge Pro Tem, presiding over jury trials and court trials from 1987 to 1991.

Allen Ruby's legal career is impressive and his legal acumen has made him an attorney who has merited the trust of individuals and corporations in the most crucial of times. But the legal acumen that has inspired that trust is built on his values and deep commitment to justice.

His personal sense of responsibility to insuring access to our system of justice has moved him to take action outside of his profession as well. Amidst his landmark cases, he has still made time to serve others in several capacities, including as a Silicon Valley Law Foundation board member.

Allen Ruby is honored and famed as a trial lawyer, but he grew up in a family of modest means. He was blessed by parents who loved and nurtured him and helped him to develop the values that have served him well throughout his life. Between high school and law school Allen Ruby followed in the footsteps of his father and was a wrestler on the Midwestern professional wrestling circuit. He learned many lessons through this experience, many of which have contributed to his success as an attorney. He has stated about the experience, ''I learned how to get beat and not

whine about it, and that was the most valuable lesson I could have learned as a trial lawyer.''

Allen Ruby is not only a spectacular lawyer, he is a valued friend and a respected member of our community in Silicon Valley. I join with Santa Clara Law School in recognizing and honoring him.

HONORING PASTOR HENRY FULLER, JR.

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Henry Fuller, Jr. on his 10th anniversary as Pastor at Mt. Calvary Missionary Baptist Church in Flint, Michigan. The congregation is holding a celebration of the 10th anniversary of pastoral service on Saturday, April 12th and April 13th.

Pastor Fuller received his bachelor's degree from the United Bible Institute of the United Theological Seminary—Flint Branch. He received an honorary doctorate from United Bible Institute of the United Theological Seminary in Monroe, Louisiana. He preached his first sermon on December 12, 1971 at Mt. Calvary Missionary Baptist Church. He was inspired to organize a mission in Holly, Michigan in 1973. The mission became Faith Baptist Church. Between the years 1983 to 1998, Pastor Fuller headed the Calvary Missionary Baptist Church in Muncie, Indiana.

On April 18, 1998, Pastor Fuller returned to his roots and became the Pastor at Mt. Calvary Missionary Baptist Church. In addition to leading the congregation, Pastor Fuller has held several positions with the church and in the community. He has served as president of the Northeastern District Sunday School and BTU Congress of Christian Education of the Northeastern District Missionary Baptist Association in Muncie; president of Indiana Consolidated Congress of Christian Education of the Indiana Consolidated State Convention; served on the finance board of the National Baptist Convention of America, Inc.; was a writer with the Publishing Board Sunday School and BTU Literature National Baptist Convention of America, Inc.; as an instructor at the Central Baptist Theological Seminary of Indiana; and served as moderator of the Great Lakes Baptist District Association, 2000–2007.

He currently serves as the president of the Wolverine State Missionary Baptist Convention; member of the board of trustees of American Baptist College of ABTS Nashville; Chairman, Wolverine State Baptist Convention Constitution Committee in Saginaw; President, United Bible Institute of UTS, Flint Branch; Instructor, United Bible Institute Flint; Instructor, Great Lakes Baptist District Leadership and Education Congress: Instructor, Wolverine State Baptist Congress; Instructor/Preacher, Baptist Ministerial Alliance in Flint; Chairman of the Clergy Division, United Way of Lapeer and Genesee Counties; Executive Board Member At-Large, National Baptist Convention USA; Treasurer, Todd-Phillip Children's Home, Wolverine State Baptist Convention. Pastor Fuller also serves on the Strategic Planning Committee with the National Baptist Congress of Christian Education; and on the Mayor's Community Advisory Board in Flint. He received the ''Moderator and Builder of the Year'' award from the Wolverine State Baptist Convention Women's Auxiliary.

Madam Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in applauding the work of Pastor Henry Fuller, Jr. and congratulating Pastor Fuller, his wife, Marilyn W. Fuller, and their four children. Pastor Fuller inspires his congregation every day, provides leadership to the Baptist community, and strives to improve the lives of the people of Flint. I pray that he will continue his work for many, many more years.

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA TO END ITS CRACKDOWN IN TIBET

SPEECH OF

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2008

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and in support of nonviolence as the most powerful force in human relations.

Unnecessary force and the systemic violation of human rights have led us to this day. The recent events in Tibet have saddened many of us, and have served as a disturbing reminder of the suffering that Tibetans continue to endure.

News reports have captured violent scenes that are difficult to understand: Buddhist monks juxtaposed alongside armed riot police; protestors with fear and disbelief in their eyes standing across from stoic guards.

The Chinese Government's crackdown in Tibet is a sad example of the state of human rights in China, and its overall lack of respect for freedom of expression. We are witnessing the struggle of a people that seek to preserve their traditions and their religion, so that their children may inherit a rich, peace-loving culture. And we must do what we can to promote peaceful dialogue that produces a resolution that underscores the fundamental freedoms of all Tibetians.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 1077.

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA TO END ITS CRACKDOWN IN TIBET

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN W. OLVER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2008

Mr. OLVER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1077 calling on the Peoples' Republic of China to end its crackdown in Tibet and engage in substantive dialogue with His Holiness, the Dalai Lama. For nearly six decades, China has pursued a deliberate policy of cultural, religious, linguistic, and economic repression against the people of Tibet. Last month on the 49th anniversary of a historic uprising against Chinese rule, Tibetan monks began a series of protests which widened into large-scale and often violent clashes between protesters and Chinese authorities. These protests were the largest since 1989, when Chinese authorities imposed martial law in Lhasa, the Tibetan capital, following mass antigovernment protests.

Since 1950, the history of Tibet—then an autonomous region inhabited by fewer than 3 million overwhelmingly ethnic Tibetans—has been characterized by harsh religious persecution and political repression. The Chinese government has been systematically eradicating the unique cultural and religious heritage of Tibet. In 2006, the Department of State Human Rights Report named China as one of ''the most systematic violators of human rights'' in part due to its repressive actions in Tibet.

In 2007, that same report documented discriminatory Chinese government policies that provide economic benefits to Han Chinese migrants willing to relocate to Tibet. While Tibetans maintain their majority in rural areas, cities such as Lhasa have seen hundreds of thousands of migrant workers lured by economic incentives and the construction of a new railroad, This influx of ethnically Han Chinese has spurred fears among many Tibetans, who have almost no political voice, that the government is engaging in a deliberate campaign to bludgeon their cultural and religious heritage. By suppressing the religious and political rights of Tibetans and by repeatedly denying access to journalists and human rights observers, China has demonstrated a negligent disregard for the rights of Tibetans and has unnecessarily repressed a society which embraces nonviolence and seeks political reconciliation rather than armed resistance.

It is my belief that President Bush should revoke his decision to attend the 2008 Olympic Games in Beijing to protest China's abysmal human rights record in Tibet in addition to its key support for the genocidal government in Sudan. Hosting the Olympic Games is a unique privilege and China's repression of Tibet stands in stark contrast to the ideals behind that august international competition. I join my colleagues today in condemning China's crackdown on nonviolent protesters in Tibet and urge the Chinese government to immediately commence negotiations with the Dalai Lama with the goal of forging a long-term solution that safeguards the unique cultural and religious heritage of the Tibetan people.

HONORING SHARON COOK FOR WINNING THE WISE AWARD

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, for the past 7 years, the greater Mesquite area has honored many exceptional women in the community through the Women in Service and Enterprise, WISE, Award Luncheon and Style Show. Today. I rise to honor this year's award recipient, Mrs. Sharon Cook, who is a shining example of strong, capable, and dedicated leadership. I would also like to recognize honorees Tamara Akens, Rachel Lopez, and Jeann Wisenbaker, for their valuable service and commitment to their community.

Sharon has been employed with Eastfield College for 26 years, where she currently

serves as director of marketing and communications. She is an active member and ambassador of the Mesquite Chamber of Commerce. Sharon is also a member of the American Heart Association Board, among a myriad of other civic and community involvement.

Past WISE Award winners have served in a variety of ways, but they are united by the long-lasting impact they have made on their community. Their service and community involvement continues to inspire younger generations.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Fifth District of Texas, I am honored to recognize all of the WISE honorees for their outstanding service and congratulate them on their awards. Thank you, ladies, for helping make our community and country a better place.

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA TO END ITS CRACKDOWN IN TIBET

SPEECH OF

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2008

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this important resolution. On Monday, activists spread a huge banner across the Golden Gate Bridge reading ''One World. One Dream. Free Tibet.'' I think we can all learn from these powerful words. China's crackdown on the Tibetan people has reminded us that human rights violations are an all too common part of life under Chinese rule.

As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I believe China must engage in an open dialogue with the Dalai Lama that respects the independent national identity of the Tibetan people. However, China's violent oppression of these peaceful protestors only shows their refusal to reach a solution to this crisis. Additionally, China has refused to end its support for the Government of Sudan, continuing to invest in its corrupt leaders. Unfortunately, China's support has helped prolong the humanitarian crisis in Darfur.

We cannot expect China to lead the international community by hosting the Olympic games when it continues to show a lack of respect for fundamental human rights. Our President and all American travelers must seriously reflect on whether to support the Beijing Olympic games in any way because our country must never support those who stand in the way of peace and freedom.

KC–135 AIR REFUELING TANKERS

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise to address the Air Force's recent decision to award Northrop Grumman and its partner, European Aeronautic Defense and Space, EADS, the $40 billion contract to replace the KC–135 air refueling tankers. The Air Force chose against a Boeing team that included Connecticut-based Pratt & Whitney as the engine supplier.

After the contract was awarded, the Connecticut congressional delegation requested a briefing from the Air Force on the source selection process and learned that the two competitors were essentially on par in their bid to win the contract. By all objective measures there was no clear winner, and so the contract award and all the American jobs associated with it were ultimately given to Northrop-EADS for seemingly subjective reason by unidentified personnel within the Air Force. That begs the question: why did the tie not go to the home team?

The Air Force was unable or unwilling to delve into extensive detail as to why Boeing lost the award. Boeing filed a protest with the General Accountability Office shortly after it lost the bid.

What I find particularly troubling in this case is that the Air Force—despite the $40 billion price tag—is not required and does not consider U.S. jobs or the economy in its decision-making. Even more disconcerting is the fact that the Air Force does not seem to be concerned with the security risks of having foreign companies and their employees work on such a major defense project.

Our national economy and our national security are significantly affected by this decision. We have a responsibility to take all the potential consequences into account and in addition, examine the international context in which this decision is being made. The fact is that the impact of this contract will not occur in a vacuum.

For example, the Office of the United States Trade Representative is aggressively challenging in the World Trade Organization, WTO, the millions of dollars in European government subsidies that Airbus—EADS is its parent company—is receiving. The United States accuses Airbus of taking advantage of ''launch aid''—grants and loans at unfairly favorable rates. And so, during a recent hearing, U.S. Trade Representative Susan Schwab told the Senate Finance Committee that the USTR had briefed the Air Force some time ago about the pending U.S. trade case against Airbus at the WTO. Nevertheless, Air Force officials told the Connecticut delegation there is nothing in their rules that call for them to consider the dispute. They ignored it, just as they ignored concerns over their decision's effect on the economy and the likely off-shoring of good paying jobs and our defense industrial base.

Madam Speaker, I believe that this decision will have a deep, long-term negative impact on the aerospace industry and supporting industries in this county, which are so critical to both our national security and our economy. At a time when our Nation faces a recession and a rising unemployment rate, it is wrongheaded to award such a major contract to another nation rather than utilize our own skilled workers and keep scarce resources here at home. The decision will not only continue but also accelerate the erosion of our industrial base and skilled workforce—jeopardizing both our national security and economic prosperity.

Indeed, Connecticut alone stands to lose thousands of jobs at Pratt & Whitney, along with many more from small vendors and suppliers who would have benefited from the award. For Pratt & Whitney's Middletown operations, this news is especially hard to bear, for the company had been planning to use the tanker award to transition away from the old C–17 engine systems.

Labor leaders, businesses, policy experts and others agree that the Air Force made the wrong decision. Organizations such as the Center for Security Policy argue that awarding the contract to an international consortium threatens U.S. national security. And they are joined by organizations like the AFL–CIO and International Association of Machinists in opposing the award.

Finally, I would like to point out that this contract has no contingency plan for dealing with potential cost overruns and schedule delays—problems currently facing the Marine One presidential helicopter program. Defense projects that have been outsourced to foreign countries have experienced significant delays and excessive cost overruns. The Pentagon recently acknowledged that the current helicopter contract awarded to Lockheed Martin and its British-Italian Partner, AgustaWestland-Finmeccanica, is significantly over budget—$11.2 billion, up from an initial estimate of $6.1 billion—and will breach the cost threshold set by Congress.

I am deeply concerned by the fact that, like the Marine One contract, the Air Force has given almost no consideration to the myriad security and economic implications underlying the award of a multi-billion dollar contract to a foreign company. It is déjà vu all over again with the American worker, taxpayer and military likely to come out on the losing end.

IN HONOR OF THE 2007 SACRAMENTO RIVER CATS

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, as the Sacramento River Cats 2008 home opener approaches, I rise in tribute of their 2007 season in which they won the Pacific Coast League and the Triple-A Championship. The River Cats capped their season off in impressive fashion winning 7 straight playoff games to clinch the title. Upon sweeping the New Orleans Zephyrs to win the Pacific Coast League championship, Sacramento laid their claim as outright Triple-A champions by defeating the Richmond Braves in the second annual Bricktown Showdown, a one game playoff between tbe Pacific Coast Champion and the International League Champion. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in saluting the triumphant 2007 Sacramento River Cats.

The River Cats remarkable playoff run began when they clinched the Pacific Coast League Southern Division by finishing the regular season with a record of 84–60. Despite falling behind two games to none against Salt Lake City in the playoff's first round, the River Cats came back to win the next three games. Using that positive momentum, the River Cats quickly beat the New Orleans Zephyrs in three games, winning the Pacific Coast League title for the third time in 5 years. The series final game was seen before a spirited and sellout crowd of 14,414 fans at Sacramento's Raley Field.

The 2007 Sacramento River Cats exuded resilience in the face of adversity. Despite being a revolving door that allowed their parent affiliate, Major League Baseball's Oakland A's, to replenish their injured roster, the River

Cats overcame more then 180 roster changes to win the championship. This meant that they accomplished the feat by receiving contributions from numerous and sometimes unlikely sources. No one epitomized this more than Nick Blasi, who spent much of the season with Class-A Stockton before becoming a playoff catalyst and the Pacitic Coast League's Series MVP. Blasi hit a remarkable .457 in the playoff.

Throughout this roster shuffle, every member of the 2007 River Cats demonstrated outstanding commitment to team play and hard work. Manager Tony DeFrancesco once again was the steady mentor for his young and ever changing roster that featured some of baseball's brightest prospects who are destined to become the stars of tomorrow. The roster was anchored by contributions from now major leaguers: Daric Barton, Kurt Suzuki and Santiago Casilla, as well as prospects Jason Perry, J.J. Furmaniak and Brad Knox.

Under the leadership of President and CEO Art Savage the River Cats players reaffirmed the front offices commitment to the people of Sacramento. On the Opening Day of the season, the River Cats unveiled their Mario Encarnacion Humanitarian Award which will annually honor a young student athlete who shows a commitment to his or her teammates and classmates. Furthermore, the River Cats Foundation has been providing support to Sacramento nonprofits that assist with youth and family activities. The River Cats commitment to the community was reciprocated by the Sacramento fans, as the River Cats led the Pacific Coast League in attendance for an astounding 8th year in a row. Around 710,000 fans attended River Cats 71 home contests this year, and since beginning play at Raley Field in 2000, the River Cats have drawn over 6,000,000 fans.

Madam Speaker, as the River Cats prepare for another successful season, I am honored to pay tribute to the many hard-working men and women of the River Cats organization who brought so much joy and pride to the people of Sacramento. Their successes are highly commendable. I ask all my colleagues to join one in celebrating the River Cats 2007 championship season.

PAYING THE PRICE FOR CLIMATE CHANGE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, the time has come to recognize the effects of climate change on the Caribbean community; I want to enter into the RECORD editorials from the New York CaribNews for March 4, 2008 and March 11, 2008, respectively, ''Paying the Price for Climate Change'' and ''Deal with Climate Change.''

The Caribbean community countries (CARICOM), Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and other Least Developed Countries (LCD's) are experiencing the serious effect of climate change even though they contribute the least to the problem and have the least capacity to adapt to the new conditions created.

CARICOM Member States are being forced to divert resources from important development initiatives such as health, food, education and critical infrastructure issues to adapt to the damages being caused by the climate change. Some of the major effects being experienced include sea-level rise, increasingly severe hurricanes, drought and water scarcity, coral bleaching and declining fish stocks.

CARICOM is asking developed countries to take immediate action to help counteract the effects of climate change and to increase funding over and above traditional official development assistance. The United Nations has been requested to assist specifically with disaster preparedness.

I encourage the International Community to mobilize to help the Caribbean protect its precious beautiful environment as a legacy for all mankind.

DEAL WITH CLIMATE CHANGE

REGION OUTLINES WISHES TO U.N.—HOW INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY CAN HELP CARICOM STATES

(By Tony Best)

Citing their own high vulnerability CARICOM nations have called on the international community to help them deal with the costly impact of climate change.

What the countries, which include Antigua, the Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica Grenada, Haiti, Guyana, Jamaica. St. Lucia, St. Kitts-Nevis, St. Vincent, Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago want the United Nations system to do is to help them cope with disaster preparedness.

This means high-priced insurance to aid in recovering losses due to the fall-out from climate change while aiding in risk management and climate monitoring, among other things.

CARICOM's shopping list of needs, will, was presented to the U.N. General Assembly by Dr. Christopher Hackett, Barbados' U.N. Ambassador, who in an address on behalf of the entire region complained that although an ''unfortunate reality'' was that Caribbean nations and other Small Island Developing States, (SIDS), as well as the world's least developed countries, (LDCs), contributed ''the least to the problem'' they were ''confronted with the most serious challenges'' associated with climate change.

Just as important, Dr. Hackett told a special session in New York that was devoted to the issue that the smaller and poorer nations ''possess the least capacity to adapt'' and meet the challenges.

''CARICOM member-states are highly vulnerable to climate change impacts including sea-level rise, increasingly severe hurricanes and other extreme weather events, such as drought and water scarcity, coral bleaching, and declining fish stocks;'' he explained.

That is why Caribbean states wanted U.N. agencies, funds and programs to ''ensure that their activities in the area of climate change in our region are fully supportive of national and regional efforts to address these specific challenges.''

Specifically, they appealed to the U.N. to:

* Assist CARICOM in ''incorporating climate change adaptation concerns in national development plans and strategies''

* Provide technical and other forms of assistance to CARICOM so they can ''strengthen'' the Caribbean Community Climate Change Center and other ''cc-ordination mechanisms.''

* Back plans designed to promote information sharing ''on adaptation technologies, development and transfer between exchange developing countries;' including the exchange of ideas on ''best practices.''

* Help CARICOM undertake the monitoring of climate while expanding the ability to assess the region's vulnerability and to carry out impact studies.

* Give both ''technical and financial'' support in such areas as disaster preparedness, early warning, risk management, disaster mitigation and disaster recovery and rehabilitation.

* Develop new financial arrangements to support ''adaptation measures'' while providing insurance coverage to small island states so they ''recoup losses due to the impacts of climate change and sea level rise.''

As Dr. Hackett explained it, ''climate change of very damaging proportions and which poses a very serious danger to the very existence of our countries is already occurring and the longer the international community postpones the implementation of the necessary greenhouse gas emissions cuts, the more adaptation will be required by SIDS and at much greater costs.'' The region complained that the island-nations and coastal states in the region had ''been forced to diver scarce resources'' from key development initiatives'' such as health, education, food and the provision of critical infrastructures to meet the demands of climate change adaptation.

''Surely,'' he added, ''this has major implications for achieving sustainable development goals.''

PAYING THE PRICE FOR CLIMATE CHANGE

HOW CARIBBEAN NATIONS ARE FACING SERIOUS CHALLENGES

It is an unfortunate reality that CARICOM countries and other Small Island Developing States (SIDS) as well as the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), all of whom contribute the least to the problem, are confronted with the most serious challenges associated with climate change; yet we possess the least capacity to adapt. Climate change of very damaging proportions and which poses a very serious danger to the very existence of our countries is already occurring and the longer the international community postpones the implementation of the necessary greenhouse gas emission cuts, the more adaptation will be required by SIDS and at much greater costs.

Negotiations around the four themes agreed to at Bali—Mitigation, Adaptation, Finance and Technology—should not prevent advancement of, or immediate action under any theme. For CARICOM adaptation, finance and technology are not only required in 2009 or post-2012, they are urgently needed now.

CARICOM Member States have been forced to divert scarce resources from key developmental initiatives (e.g. health, education, food, provision of critical infrastructure etc) to climate change adaptation activities. Surely this has major implications for achieving sustainable development goals.

The inadequacy of financing for adaptation activities in developing countries is a major failing of the entire international system. As stated in the 2007 UNDP Human Development Report ''the current framework provides the equivalent of an aid sponge for mopping up during a flood''. That report estimates that new additional adaptation finance of at least US$86 billion a year will be required by 2015 to meet the most basic and pressing adaptation needs of developing countries. Expressed in other terms this figure represents a mere one tenth of what developed countries currently mobilize for military expenditure.

While increasing emphasis is being paid to private-public partnerships the role of international cooperation remains essential and must be enhanced. CARICOM urges developed countries to take immediate action to significantly scale-up the level of financing devoted to adaptation through the provision

of new and additional resources, over and above traditional official development assistance (ODA). This would serve as a major confidence building measure and demonstration of good faith, as we enter a period of great uncertainty.

The General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and other intergovernmental bodies of the UN System by the very nature of their respective mandates are important for a dialogue, awareness raising and the exchange of information on issues of global concern. CARICOM believes that the General Assembly and ECOSOC must continue to ensure that addressing climate change remains a global priority, while fully respecting and not duplicating the ongoing negotiating process with the Convention. In this context, future actions or initiatives by the GA or the ECOSOC should add value to the ongoing negotiations, and be guided by the needs of Member States, particularly those most vulnerable to the adverse impacts of climate change. While we are convinced that a parallel negotiating theatre should not be established within the GA, we are equally convinced that the issue of climate change should not be held in abeyance in New York until our work is completed within the Convention.

CARICOM has some concerns over the orientation of the SG's report and in particular the rationale given for what he terms ''a more inclusive and coherent approach to climate change''. We believe that the first and overriding priority of the U.N. System's work in climate change should be addressing the needs of those most vulnerable and most adversely impacted by climate change—SIDS, LDCs, countries in Africa and disaster prone developing countries, rather than, as the report states providing support for negotiations. The effectiveness of the U.N. System should be assessed by its capacity to deliver the required assistance to, and build capacity in, these vulnerable countries and other developing countries.

CARICOM Member States are highly vulnerable to climate change impacts including sea-level rise, increasingly severe hurricanes and other extreme weather events, drought and water scarcity, coral bleaching, and declining fish stocks. In this regard we call on relevant U.N. agencies, funds and programs to ensure that their activities in the area of climate change in our region are fully supportive of national and regional efforts to address these specific challenges. This demand driven approach with strong national and regional ownership must be embedded in the U.N.'s work at the national and regional levels. Areas, sectors, projects and program identified as priority in our national communications to the Convention, national and regional adaptation plans and sustainable development plans and strategies should receive the full support of the relevant parts of the U.N. System.

IN HONOR OF AMERICAN LEGION POST 738

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of American Legion Post 738, on its sixtieth anniversary; and in honor of its members' outstanding service to their country and community.

American Legion Post 738 is comprised of over one hundred people, each of whom has served our country during a time of war. Recognized by Mayor Eileen Patton of Fairview Park as a ''dedicated group of true Americans that are proud to serve our country'', the members of American Legion Post 738 have played a significant role in the community for sixty years.

Every year, Post 738 organizes Fairview Park's spectacular Memorial Day Parade. Located on Lorain Road, Post 738 has served as a beacon of hospitality. After every Memorial Day Parade, they welcome all members of the community back to their post and host them for a bountiful cookout. Members of the Post also host bi-monthly dinners there.

Every year before Christmas, Post and auxiliary members of Post 738 put together care packages for fellow veterans at the Louis Stokes Veterans Administration Medical Center in Brecksville, Ohio and nurturing local children whose parents are veterans at their annual Christmas party. Always willing to participate in City events, six times a year, Post and ladies auxiliary members deliver refreshments and play bingo with veterans at the VA medical center.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in recognizing the members of American Legion Post 738 for their outstanding and tireless efforts on behalf of veterans of this country, as well as for their extensive and diverse service to many individuals and families who call the Greater Cleveland area home.

[From the WestLife Newspaper, Apr. 2, 2008]

AMERICAN LEGION POST 738 MARKING 60TH ANNIVERSARY

(By Kevin Kelley)

The ladies auxiliary of American Legion Post 738 is putting on a dinner marking the organization's 60th anniversary April 12.

Despite the celebratory nature of the event, Joanne Hulec, president of the ladies auxiliary, has a sense of trepidation.

''I hope this is not the last birthday dinner we have,'' she said.

Property taxes and utility costs have combined with declining membership to put American Legion Post 738 in a financial pinch in recent months.

Three months ago, some leaders associated with the post put out a public appeal to help with the organization's cash flow problems.

Ron Hulec, Joanne's husband and a former post commander and member of its executive board, said while the organization is currently solvent, its finances are still tight.

Hulec said that when he joined about 14 years ago, the post had about 240 members. Today it has around 140.

There has been some discussion in recent months among post leaders, Hulec said, of selling its property, located at 19311 Lorain Road. In the event of such a sale, the post would seek to share facilities with another area post, possibly American Legion Clifton Post 421, headquartered at 22001 Brookpark Road. However, members have held off on making any decision to sell the post's hall, said Hulec, who served in the Army in the 1950s.

''We're doing everything we can to keep functioning the way we have been,'' he said.

The post's current commander, Jim Babitsky, noted that most community organizations have been having financial problems lately.

''We're hoping to stabilize the finances and keep the post alive and keep it going,'' said Babitsky, a Marine veteran who was stationed in Vietnam in 1968–69. ''The economic times are just rough on everybody.''

Meanwhile, the post's members, who already served their country during wartime, continue to serve the community and their fellow veterans in various ways.

The post raises the American flag at Fairview High School home football games and provides color guards at local civil events.

''If City Hall needs the colors posted, we usually do that,'' Babitsky said.

Mayor Eileen Patton said she appreciated their service.

''Legion Post 738 has always played an important role in our community,'' Patton told WestLife. ''They participate in our Summerfest every year as well as every We Do Care ceremony each November at the high school. They also organize our Memorial Day parade and invite the community back to the post for a ceremony and a great cookout at no cost.

''I also have the honor of attending all the Legion ceremonies installing their new boards and the women's auxiliary boards as well. They are a wonderful dedicated group of true Americans that are so proud of serving our country. They are always willing to participate in our city events, and I am so glad that I have gotten to know each and every one of them.''

Post and ladies auxiliary members travel about six times a year to the U.S. Veterans Administration Medical Center in Brecksville to visit, deliver refreshments, and play bingo with the veterans. ''They seem to appreciate that a lot,'' said Sue Carson, treasurer of the ladies auxiliary. Before Christmas each year, post and auxiliary members put together care packages containing toiletries, cards and books for the veterans at the Brecksville hospital, she added.

The post also hosts an annual Christmas party for local children whose fathers and grandfathers are veterans, said Carson, whose husband, Don, is a Korean Conflict-era Army veteran.

About two dinners are held each month at the post's hall, Carson said. In recent weeks, the ladies auxiliary has been focusing on the anniversary dinner.

''We have a birthday dinner every year,'' Carson said, ''but this year we're trying to make it more special because of the 60th anniversary.''

Joanne Hulec said it's shaping up to be one of the post's highlights of the year. ''I like to think of it as one of our 'white table cloth' dinners,'' she joked. Because the dinner will be catered, the ladies will be relieved of kitchen duty, except for those making the hor'dourves, she said.

Several certificates of appreciation will be awarded to a number of post and auxiliary members, Carson said. Just who will be recognized is a secret; however, Carson said recognition will be given to ''people who have put forth a concerted effort to be active in the post.''

The post's 60th anniversary dinner April 12 is open to the public. Cocktails and appetizers will be served from 5:45 until 6:45 p.m., with dinner following at 7 p.m. Tickets are $12 per person. To make reservations, call Sue Carson at (440) 331-2730 by April 7.

PRO OF THE YEAR: For nearly five decades, Post 738 hosted its ''Pro Of the Year'' dinner honoring a member of the Cleveland Browns. This year, quarterback Derek Anderson will be honored at the April 22 event, which Hulec said is the organization's biggest annual fund-raiser.

TRIBUTE TO KIRKLAND CALVET ANDERSON, SR.

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Kirkland ''Kirk''

Calvet Anderson, Sr., of Minnesota, a beloved member of the South Minneapolis community. While I regret the recent passing of Kirkland Anderson on March 14, 2008 at the age of 79, I am grateful for his lifelong service to his family, friends and his dedication and love for our community.

A native of Bolton, Mississippi, Kirkland attended the University of Minnesota from 1946–49. He served in the U.S. Army during the Korean war from 1950–1953, and returned to Minneapolis, where in 1954 he married Alice A. Gaskins. After starting his career at the VA Hospital and the U.S. Postal Service, Kirk then went on to operate Kirk's Mobil from 1961–2007.

Most importantly, Kirk will be remembered for his ever willingness to lend a hand to his friends and neighbors. Steadfast dedication to his community was evident through his participation on the board of the Blaisdell YMCA, his support for area schools and parks and the local Scouts.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I wish to express my condolences to those surviving Mr. Anderson: his wife, children, grandchildren, great-grandchild, sister, sisters-in-law, nieces, nephews, great nieces, great nephews, cousins, friends, and community. It is an honor to stand in recognition of the memory and life of a man who gave so much. Mr. Anderson, today we thank you.

HONORING MELVIN AND MINNIE LOU SCOTT FOR CELEBRATING THEIR 80TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize two outstanding citizens of Frankston, Texas, Melvin Scott and Minnie Lou Scott.

On November 8, 2007 the Scotts celebrated their 80th wedding anniversary, an accomplishment that very few achieve. The Scotts' long-lasting marriage is one that exemplifies dedication and healthy values. In fact, Frankston citizens often ask the Scotts' advice on how they too can have a successful, long lasting marriage.

On February 21, 2008 Melvin celebrated his 101st birthday. Minnie Lou is 99-years-old. They have one son, three grandchildren and four great grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Fifth District of Texas, I am honored to recognize Melvin and Minnie Lou Scott for their longstanding dedication to each other and their family.

A TRIBUTE TO THE GAUDET FAMILY OF MOBILE, ALABAMA

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. BONNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Gaudet Family of Mobile, AL. For years, Steve and Lydia Gaudet, along with their eight children, have given back to the community by donating their time and services to improve the lives of others.

At the encouragement of their friends, colleagues, and those grateful to have received their assistance. the Gaudet family was chosen for some very special recognition of their own. Earlier this year, the family was chosen by the popular ABC television show, ''Extreme Makeover: Home Edition'' for a new home.

Six of the eight Gaudet children: Joseph, Chris, Todd, Patrick, Michael, and Peter, live at home with their parents, Steve and Lydia. Steve had recently been laid off from his job with a tire manufacturer, and Lydia works for Goodwill Easter Seals. Despite their own hardships, the entire family volunteers with United Cerebral Palsy, Down Syndrome Society of Mobile, and Camp Smile-A-Mile. a camp for disabled children and adults.

In February, the crew of ''Extreme Makeover: Home Edition'' arrived at the family's home to surprise them with the announcement they had been selected for the show. Steve and Lydia, along with six of their children, lived in an 1,100 square-foot, three-bedroom, one-bathroom home that was 50 years old and still under a bright blue roof tarp due to damage sustained by Hurricane Katrina over 2 years ago.

In ''Extreme Makeover'' style, the family was sent on a well-deserved, week-long, all-expense paid vacation to a resort in Arizona and given tickets to the Super Bowl. While the Gaudets were away, the family's old home was torn down and replaced with a new 3,500 square-foot home in just 106 hours.

Father and son builders, Frank Lott, Jr., and Frank Lott III, of Heritage Homes of Mobile, worked day and night alongside as many as 1,500 volunteer workers to finish the Gaudet home. In addition to the volunteers, numerous local firms contributed materials to the project and members of the community made monetary donations to the family. CVS Pharmacy donated $100,000 to Camp Smile-A-Mile and an additional $50,000 to be used to pay for medical bills related to the special needs of their son, Peter.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting the Gaudet family for their selfless contributions to the City of Mobile. Despite their own needs, the entire family is devoted to making south Alabama a better place to live. I would also like to commend ABC network, the entire crew of ''Extreme Makeover: Home Edition,'' Frank Lott, Jr., Frank Lott, III, as well as all of the staff at Heritage Homes, and the volunteers who contributed to providing a beautiful new home for a truly deserving family.

SUNSET MEMORIAL

HON. TRENT FRANKS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I stand once again before this body with yet another Sunset Memorial.

It is April 9, 2008, in the land of the free and the home of the brave, and before the sun set today in America, almost 4,000 more defenseless unborn children were killed by abortion on demand—just today. That is more than the number of innocent American lives that were lost on September 11, only it happens every day.

It has now been exactly 12,861 days since the travesty called Roe v. Wade was handed down. Since then, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 50 million of our own children.

Some of them, Madam Speaker, cried and screamed as they died, but because it was amniotic fluid passing over their vocal cords instead of air, we couldn't hear them.

All of them had at least four things in common.

They were each just little babies who had done nothing wrong to anyone. Each one of them died a nameless and lonely death. And each of their mothers, whether she realizes it immediately or not, will never be the same. And all the gifts that these children might have brought to humanity are now lost forever.

Yet even in the full glare of such tragedy, this generation clings to a blind, invincible ignorance while history repeats itself and our own silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victims to date, those yet unborn.

Madam Speaker, perhaps it is important for those of us in this Chamber to remind ourselves again of why we are really all here.

Thomas Jefferson said, ''The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government.''

The phrase in the 14th amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution. It says: ''No state shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law.'' Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of our innocent citizens and their constitutional rights is why we are all here. It is our sworn oath.

The bedrock foundation of this Republic is that clarion declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Every conflict and battle our Nation has ever faced can be traced to our commitment to this core self-evident truth. It has made us the beacon of hope for the entire world. It is who we are.

And yet Madam Speaker, another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that foundational commitment. We failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibility as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent American babies who died today without the protection that we should have given them.

It seems so sad to me, Madam Speaker, that this Sunset Memorial may be the only acknowledgement or remembrance these children who died today will ever have in this chamber.

And so—as small a gesture as it might be—I would ask those in this Chamber who are inclined to join me in a moment of silent memorial to these lost little Americans.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude, in the hope that perhaps someone new who heard this sunset memorial tonight will finally embrace the truth that abortion really does kill little babies, that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express, and that 12,801 days spent killing nearly 50 million unborn children in America is enough; and that the America that rejected human slavery and marched into Europe to arrest the Nazi Holocaust, is still courageous and compassionate enough to find a better way for mothers and their babies than abortion on demand.

So tonight, Madam Speaker, may we each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are also numbered and that all too soon each of us will walk from these Chambers for the very last time.

And if it should be that this Congress is allowed to convene on yet another day to come, may that be the day when we finally hear the cries of the innocent unborn. May that be the day we find the humanity, the courage, and the will to embrace together our human and our constitutional duty to protect the least of these, our tiny American brothers and sisters, from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

It is April 9, 2008—12,861 days since Roe v. Wade first stained the foundation of this Nation with the blood of its own children—this, in the land of free and the home of the brave.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SHARK CONSERVATION ACT OF 2008

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to improve the conservation of sharks.

Sharks are long-lived apex predators with comparatively small populations, making it difficult for them to breed rapidly enough to maintain populations under fishing pressure. Sharks have been increasingly exploited in recent decades, both as bycatch in the pelagic longline fisheries from the 1960s onward, and as targets in direct fisheries that expanded rapidly in the 1980s. The rising demand for shark fins over past decades has also led to increases in the particularly exploitive practice of shark finning, where fins of sharks are removed and the carcass is discarded at sea.

According to scientists, scalloped hammerhead, white, and thresher shark populations are each estimated to have declined by over 75 percent in the past 15 years due in large part to these fishing pressures. Removing these top predators drastically changes the food web structure, and marine diversity and ecosystem health. Addressing the practice of shark finning is an imperative step toward the conservation of sharks and marine ecosystems.

Congress recognized shark finning as an inherently wasteful practice in enacting the Shark Finning Prohibition Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–557). This Act prohibits U.S. fishermen from removing the fins of sharks and discarding the carcass at sea, and from landing or transporting shark fins without the corresponding carcass.

The Shark Conservation Act of 2008, which I have introduced today, includes several measures to strengthen the implementation and enforcement of that prohibition and would ensure that the intent of Congress is achieved. First, the bill eliminates an unexpected enforcement loophole related to the transport of shark fins by prohibiting vessels from having custody, control, or possession of shark fins without the corresponding carcass. This is intended to ensure that U.S.-flagged vessels are not traveling to the high seas and purchasing fins from fishermen engaged in shark finning and bringing them into U.S. waters in an attempt to skirt the finning prohibition.

Second, the Shark Conservation Act of 2008 addresses the difficulty apparent in enforcing the statute's percentage-based standard. Existing law contains a rebuttable presumption that any shark fins landed were taken, held, or landed in violation of the Shark Finning Prohibition Act if the total weight of shark fins landed or found on board exceeds five percent of the total weight of shark carcasses landed or found on board. This ''fin to carcass'' ratio was intended to provide a mechanism for enforcing the finning prohibition by ensuring that the amount of fins landed is proportional to the amount of carcasses landed. It has proven virtually impossible, however, to determine whether a given set of fins belong to a particular dressed carcass. As a result, there are reports of fishermen mixing fins and carcasses for maximum profit, continuing to discard less desirable, finned sharks at sea. Therefore, the Shark Conservation Act of 2008 strikes the rebuttable presumption to improve enforcement of the prohibition on finning that has existed in statute now for nearly eight years.

Finally, the Shark Conservation Act of 2008 amends the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act to allow the Secretary of Commerce to identify and list nations that have not adopted a regulatory program for the conservation of sharks comparable to the United States. This amendment promotes the conservation of sharks internationally and in a manner that is consistent with the expectations placed on U.S. fishermen.

The Shark Conservation Act of 2008 reestablishes the intended protections for sharks under U.S. law. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to advance this timely and important bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Madam Speaker, on April 8, 2008, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to be present for rollcall vote No. 162.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

EXTENDING THE NEW MARKETS TAX CREDIT TO THE TERRITORIES

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend eligibility under the new markets tax credit for community development entities created or organized in American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. This bill would make a technical correction to existing law governing the new markets tax credit program and specifically authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to certify corporations or partnerships organized in one of the five U.S. territories as entities qualified to participate in the new markets tax credit program.

The Community Renewal Tax Relief Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–554) authorizes the new markets tax credit program for the purpose of increasing incentives for investment in low-income communities across the country. Under the program, qualified community development entities (CDEs) are eligible to be allocated credits from the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund at the Department of the Treasury. Taxpayers who then invest in the CDE are allocated some of those credits in return for their investment. The CDE must invest those funds in low-income communities, and the taxpayers are able to claim, over a 7-year period, credits equal to 39 percent of their investment. CDEs act as intermediaries for the provision of loans, investment funding, or financial counseling in low-income communities and are able to legally operate anywhere in the United States, including in the territories.

Despite the ability of a CDE under current law to legally and practically operate in a U.S. territory, a corporation or partnership that is created or organized in a U.S. territory applying for CDE certification cannot qualify for such certification under the current law. This ineligibility stems from such organizations being deemed ''foreign'' and not ''domestic'' under other provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. This nuance in law effectively prevents local CDEs in the territories, that is entities who would otherwise be recognized as such by the Department of the Treasury, from investing in their own communities.

The bill I have introduced today would rectify this situation which I believe is an oversight in the Community Renewal Tax Relief Act of 2000. The bill would allow for the certification of CDEs created or organized in a U.S. territory thereby enabling them, to operate and invest in their own communities. CDEs organized and operating in any one of the several States or the District of Columbia could continue to invest in low-income communities in the territories under this arrangement.

I am joined by Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA of American Samoa, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN of the Virgin Islands, and Mr. FORTUÑO of Puerto Rico, in introducing this bill. We look forward to working with the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Ways and Means to advance this bill and to support increased investment opportunities for our own communities. Ultimately, this bill is about making the new markets tax credit program work for the territories and ensuring Congressional intent behind the new markets tax credit is fully realized and fulfilled in our communities.

HONORING RYAN T. DION

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay great honor to United States Marine Corps Cpl. Ryan T. Dion, a true American hero from Manchester, CT. On April 25, 2007, while serving in Unit

216 Echo Company at Camp LeJeune in Fallujah, Iraq, Ryan was injured in an IED explosion. On December 11, he was awarded the Purple Heart, recognizing his great sacrifice for the defense of our country. The story of Ryan's bravery inspired the following poem, written by United States Capitol Guide, Albert Carey Caswell:

A PATRIOT

A Patriot...
A young man who goes off to war....
But, for his country his burden bore!
Lock and Load,
A man who so lives by a code....
Is that not but what heaven is for?
A fine Marine!
Who on battle fields of honor, with but his courage seen!
When, heartache would so intervene!
When, his new battle would begin
To rebuild where none lies left, all in courage's quest... as he so intervenes!
Without a leg as seen, when so comes within his inter being.
The Proof!
The Truth! Of what his heart and soul has willed. The Truth!
As all around him, he brings people to tears to so instill...
As we watch him rebuild...and fight the fears!
With his patriotic heart so filled, to our children to so instill...so dear!
Of All The Best, yes nothing less! As this patriot climbs this hill with no fear!
To Teach Us,
To Reach Us....To So Beseech Us....
As has Ryan so been seen, as where patriotism so stands....for all of us to understand!
The real Neon Dion!
Shining far . . . Patriotism's Star . . . Shining way beyond! Shining far!
Ooh Rah . . . you've come so far . . . so fast . . . Marines Do, They do no ask!
For in this, Our Country Tis A Thee!
Has come throughout her very history, such fine men and women as he!
Who are but her very soul, her very fabric of gold so indeed! As why we are free!
Ryan, March On You Patriot. We see!

Dedicated to Ryan Dion . . . all the fine men . . . and women just like him!

PAYING TRIBUTE TO MARIE SOLDO

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 2008

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to rise today to honor my good friend Marie Soldo by entering her name in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the official record of the proceedings and debates of the United States Congress since 1873. I rise today to honor my good friend Marie H. Soldo, for her many years of dedicated service at Sierra Health Services and the southern Nevada community and to wish her the best in her retirement.

Before joining Sierra, Marie served for 7 years as a Regional HMO Program Consultant for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. In this position she was responsible for promoting HMO development, monitoring operations, and funding developing HMOs in her assigned region.

After becoming a part of the Sierra Health team Marie was appointed Vice President of Government Affairs and Special Projects on January 1, 1988, and promoted to Executive Vice President of Government Affairs and Special Projects in 1997.

Ms. Soldo is a member of several professional organizations, including Chairwoman of the Sierra Community Healthcare Foundation Board of Trustees. She served as President of the Nevada Association of Health Plans and serves as a Director for Health Plan of Nevada, Inc., Med One Health Plan, COU, Inc., Northern Nevada Health Network, Prime Health, Inc., Prime Holdings, Inc., and Sierra Military Health Services, Inc.

In addition to her service to the southern Nevada community, Maria has dedicated herself to improving the lives of those in Africa and Latin America. Maria has participated in medical missions to Belize to provide health care services to the local people and assisted in establishing a scholarship program for African women seeking a bachelor's degree in theology in Nairobi, Kenya. Additionally, Maria helped raise funds for the International Health Partners, Tanzania.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to honor my good friend Marie Soldo. Her commitment to the people of southern Nevada is truly commendable, as is her efforts on behalf of the local populations in developing nations. I congratulate her on service and wish her the best of luck in her much deserved retirement.

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 Thursday, April 10, 2008 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 15

10 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine U.S. credit markets, focusing on the impact on the cost and availability of student loans.

SD–538

Finance

To hold hearings to examine tax reform, focusing on fundamentals for advancement.

SD–215

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine ending abuses and improving working conditions for tomato workers.

SD–430

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine nuclear terrorism, focusing on confronting the challenges of the day after.

SD–342

Appropriations

Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2009 for the Department of the Interior.

SD–124

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine challenges to providing and paying for long-term care.

SD–138

2:30 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Adoption of an Additional Distinctive Emblem (the ''Geneva Protocol III''), adopted at Geneva on December 8, 2005, and signed by the United States on that date; the Amendment to Article 1 of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects (the ''CCW Amendment''); and the CCW Protocol on Explosive Remnants of War (the ''CCW Protocol V'') (Treaty Doc. 109–10), the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (the Convention) and, for accession, The Hague Protocol, concluded on May 14, 1954, and entered into force on August 7, 1956 with accompanying report from the Department of State (Treaty Doc. 106–01), and protocols to the 1980 Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects: the amended Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices (Protocol II orthe Amended Mines Protocol); the Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Incendiary Weapons (Protocol III or the Incendiary Weapons Protocol); and the Protocol on Blinding Laser Weapons (Protocol IV) (Treaty Doc. 105–01).

SD–419

Energy and Natural Resources

Public Lands and Forests Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine S. 570 and H.R. 1011, bills to designate additional National Forest System lands in the State of Virginia as wilderness or a wilderness study area, to designate the Kimberling Creek Potential Wilderness Area for eventual incorporation in the Kimberling Creek Wilderness, to establish the Seng Mountain and Bear Creek Scenic Areas, to provide for the development of trail plans for the wilderness areas and scenic areas, S. 758 and H.R. 1311, bills to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Alta-Hualapai Site to the city of Las Vegas, Nevada, for the development of a cancer treatment facility, S. 1680, to provide for the inclusion of certain non-Federal land in the Izembek National Wildlife Refuge and the Alaska Peninsula National Wildlife Refuge in the State of Alaska, S. 2109, to designate certain Federal lands in Riverside County, California, as wilderness, to designate certain river segments in Riverside County as a wild, scenic, or recreational river, to adjust the boundary of the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument, S. 2124, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land in the Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest, Montana, to Jefferson County, Montana, for use as a cemetery, and S. 2581, to designate as wilderness additional National Forest System lands in the Monongahela National Forest in the State of West Virginia.

SD–366

3 p.m.

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine pharmaceuticals in the nation's water, focusing on assessing potential risks and actions to address this issue.

SD–406

3:15 p.m.

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To contiune hearings to examine the 2010 Decennial Census, focusing on automation and information technology in order to improve census coverage, accuracy, and efficiency.

SD–342

APRIL 16

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the Department of Defense medical programs.

SD–192

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 2009 for the Department of Education, focusing on teacher quality.

SD–138

10 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine U.S. credit markets, focusing on proposals to mitigate foreclosures and restore liquidity to the mortgage markets.

SD–538

Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine National Security Letters, focusing on the need for greater accountability and oversight.

SD–226

Environment and Public Works

Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine surface transportation and the global economy.

SD–406

2 p.m.

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget request for fiscal year 2009 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

SD–124

Judiciary

Crime and Drugs Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine violence and exploitation in the 21st century, focusing on solutions for protecting our children.

SD–226

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2009 for the Department of Energy.

SD–138

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Housing, Transportation and Community Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine affordable housing opportunities, focusing on reforming the housing voucher program.

SD–538

2:30 p.m.

Armed Services

Personnel Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2009 on military beneficiary organizations regarding the quality of life of Active, Reserve, and retired military personnel and their members, and the future years defense program.

SR–232A

Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine the impact of the credit market on small businesses.

SR–428A

3 p.m.
Appropriations
Financial Services and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2009 for the Internal Revenue Service.
SD–192
Aging
To hold hearings to examine caring for the elderly, focusing on how to support those on the frontline.
SD–562

APRIL 17

10 a.m.
Appropriations
Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2009 for Military Construction.
SD–124
10:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the National Indian Gaming Commission.
SD–562
2 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the United States Bureau of Reclamation, focusing on issues associated with aging water resource infrastructure.
SD–366

APRIL 23

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine an update on the Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense cooperation and collaboration.
SR–418
2:30 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine phantom traffic.
SR–253

APRIL 24

10:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting to consider S. 2688, to improve the protections afforded under Federal law to consumers from contaminated seafood by directing the Secretary of Commerce to establish a program, in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies, to strengthen activities for ensuring that seafood sold or offered for sale to the public in or affecting interstate commerce is fit for human consumption, S.J. Res. 28, disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to broadcast media ownership, S. 2607, to make a technical correction to section 3009 of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005, H.R. 3985, to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to register a person providing transportation by an over-the-road bus as a motor carrier of passengers only if the person is willing and able to comply with certain accessibility requirements in addition to other existing requirements, H.R. 802, to amend the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships to implement MARPOL Annex VI, and the nomination of Robert A. Sturgell, of Maryland, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.
SR–253

APRIL 30

10 a.m.
Rules and Administration
To hold hearings to examine electronic voting systems, focusing on top-to-bottom inquiries by Secretaries of State.
SR–301

MAY 7

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine pending benefits legislation.
SR–418

MAY 21

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine pending health care legislation.
SR–418

POSTPONEMENTS

APRIL 15

10 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine S. 2438, to repeal certain provisions of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act.
SD–366

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2767–S2828

Measures Introduced: Seven bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2832–2838, S.J. Res. 31, and S. Res. 507–509. **Page S2817**

Measures Reported:

S. 1418, to provide assistance to improve the health of newborns, children, and mothers in developing countries, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 110–282) **Page S2817**

Measures Passed:

National 9–1–1 Education Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 468, designating April 2008 as ''National 9–1–1 Education Month''. **Pages S2825–26**

Violence in Tibet and the Government of the People's Republic of China: Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 504, condemning the violence in Tibet and calling for restraint by the Government of the People's Republic of China and the people of Tibet, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Pages S2826–27**

Congratulating the University of Tennessee Women's Basketball Team: Senate agreed to S. Res. 508, congratulating the University of Tennessee women's basketball team for winning the 2008 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Women's Basketball Championship. **Pages S2827–28**

Measures Considered:

New Direction for Energy Independence, National Security, and Consumer Protection Act and the Renewable Energy and Energy Conservation Tax Act: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 3221, moving the United States toward greater energy independence and security, developing innovative new technologies, reducing carbon emissions, creating green jobs, protecting consumers, increasing clean renewable energy production, and modernizing our energy infrastructure, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the production of renewable energy and energy conservation, and taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S2780–S2811**

Adopted:

Dodd (for Salazar) Modified Amendment No. 4398 (to Amendment No. 4387), to address the availability of foreclosure prevention hotlines. **Page S2806**

Dodd (for Boxer) Amendment No. 4444 (to Amendment No. 4387), to provide the sense of the Senate regarding non-interference with local government requirements that the holder of a foreclosed property maintain that property. **Page S2806**

Dodd (for Leahy/Sanders) Modified Amendment No. 4446 (to Amendment No. 4387), to assure national distribution of certain redevelopment and housing counseling resources. **Page S2806**

Dodd (for Ensign) Modified Amendment No. 4449 (to Amendment No. 4387), to sunset the ability of States to reinvest profits generated under title III. **Pages S2806–07**

Dodd (for Brownback) Amendment No. 4454 (to Amendment No. 4387), to require enhanced reporting regarding certain loans guaranteed by the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund. **Page S2807**

Dodd (for Gregg) Modified Amendment No. 4458 (to Amendment No. 4387), to ensure that no funds appropriated under title III may be used to fund any project that involves, includes, or is associated with the use of eminent domain. **Page S2807**

Dodd (for Crapo/Johnson) Modified Amendment No. 4464 (to Amendment No. 4387), to restore investment authority of certain banks and savings associations to the types of public welfare activities previously permitted by law and regulation. **Page S2807**

Dodd (for DeMint) Modified Amendment No. 4473 (to Amendment No. 4387), to provide a limitation on the distribution of funds made available under titles II and III to organizations which have been indicted, or the employees of which have been indicted, for election fraud. **Page S2807**

Dodd (for Carper) Amendment No. 4480 (to Amendment No. 4387), to require the Federal Housing Finance Board to permit the Federal home loan banks to use affordable housing program funds to refinance certain single-family first mortgages. **Page S2807**

Dodd (for McCaskill) Modified Amendment No. 4489 (to Amendment No. 4387), to prohibit authorized lenders of home equity conversion mortgages from requiring seniors to purchase an annuity with the proceeds of a reverse mortgage, and to provide other consumer protections to reverse mortgage borrowers. **Pages S2807–08**

Mikulski Modified Amendment No. 4494 (to Amendment No. 4478), to make additional funds available to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation to increase legal assistance available to homeowners at risk of foreclosure and assistance to community organizations working to preserve homeownership and prevent foreclosure, with an offset. **Page S2780, S2811**

Dodd/Shelby Amendment No. 4518 (to Amendment No. 4387), to improve housing benefits for veterans. **Page S2808**

Dodd (for Hatch) Modified Amendment No. 4390 (to Amendment No. 4387), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify certain provisions applicable to real estate investments trusts. **Page S2808**

Lincoln (for Snowe) Amendment No. 4433 (to Amendment No. 4387), to modify the increase in volume cap for housing bonds in 2008. **Pages S2780, S2808–09**

Murray Amendment No. 4478 (to Amendment No. 4387), to increase funding for housing counseling with an offset. **Pages S2780, S2811**

Withdrawn:

Sanders Modified Amendment No. 4401 (to Amendment No. 4387), to establish a maximum rate of interest for loans insured under title II of the National Housing Act. **Pages S2780, S2806**

Cardin/Ensign Amendment No. 4421 (to Amendment No. 4387), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of a principal residence by a first-time homebuyer. **Pages S2780, S2806**

Nelson (FL)/Coleman Amendment No. 4423 (to Amendment No. 4387), to provide for the penalty-free use of retirement funds to provide foreclosure recovery relief for individuals with mortgages on their principal residences. **Pages S2780, S2806**

Lincoln Amendment No. 4382 (to Amendment No. 4387), to provide an incentive to employers to offer group legal plans that provide a benefit for real estate and foreclosure review. **Pages S2780, S2806**

Landrieu Amendment No. 4404 (to Amendment No. 4387), to amend the provisions relating to qualified mortgage bonds to include relief for persons in areas affected by Hurricane Katrina, Rita, and Wilma. **Pages S2780, S2806**

Sanders Amendment No. 4384 (to Amendment No. 4387), to provide an increase in specially adapted housing benefits for disabled veterans. **Pages S2780, S2806**

Pending:

Dodd/Shelby Amendment No. 4387, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S2780**

Ensign Amendment No. 4419 (to Amendment No. 4387), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the limited continuation of clean energy production incentives and incentives to improve energy efficiency in order to prevent a downturn in these sectors that would result from a lapse in the tax law. **Pages S2780, S2800**

Alexander Amendment No. 4429 (to Amendment No. 4419), to provide a longer extension of the renewable energy production tax credit and to encourage all emerging renewable sources of electricity. **Pages S2780, S2797–S2800**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding its adoption on April 4, 2008, Landrieu Modified Amendment No. 4389, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow use of amended income tax returns to take into account receipt of certain hurricane-related casualty loss grants by disallowing previously taken casualty loss deductions, and to waive the deadline on the construction of GO Zone property which is eligible for bonus depreciation, be further modified. **Pages S2810–11**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 10:30 a.m., on Thursday, April 10, 2008, and vote on or in relation to the following amendments, in the order listed, and that if a point of order is raised against an amendment, then there be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the motion to waive the point of order, equally divided and controlled in the usual form: Alexander Amendment No. 4429 (to Amendment No. 4419) (listed above), Ensign Amendment No. 4419 (to Amendment No. 4387), as amended, if amended (listed above), and that Senators Alexander and Ensign be recognized for 5 minutes each for consideration of the amendments; provided further, that upon disposition of listed amendments, Dodd/Shelby Amendment No. 4387 (listed above), as amended, be agreed to, and that upon disposition of this amendment, Senate vote on passage of the bill, and that upon passage the title amendment, which is at the desk be agreed to; provided further, the cloture motion on the bill be withdrawn. **Page S2806**

CONSOLIDATED NATURAL RESOURCES ACT—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that on Thursday, April 10, 2008, following disposition of H.R. 3221, New

Direction for Energy Independence, National Security, and Consumer Protection Act, Senate begin consideration of S. 2739, Consolidated Natural Resources Act, and that when the bill is considered the only first-degree amendments in order be the 4 amendments at the desk by Senator Coburn, with no other amendments in order; that there be a total of 2 hours for debate with respect to the amendments, equally divided and controlled in the usual form; that upon disposition of the amendments, the bill be read a third time, and without further intervening action or debate, Senate vote on passage of S. 2739, as amended, if amended; provided further, that the amendments be printed in the Record once this agreement is entered; and that the cloture motion on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2739 be withdrawn; and that the order with respect to S. 2483, National Forests, Parks, Public Land, and Reclamation Projects Authorization Act, be vitiated. **Page S2809**

Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that on Thursday, April 10, 2008, upon disposition of S. 2739, Consolidated Natural Resources Act, following consultation by the Majority Leader with the Republican Leader, Senate begin Executive Session to consider the following nominations: Brian Stacy Miller, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas, James Randal Hall, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Georgia, John A. Mendez, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California, Stanley Thomas Anderson, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee, and Catharina Haynes, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit; that there be a total of 4 hours of debate on the nominations, with two hours each under the control of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order listed above; provided further, that after the first vote in the sequence the vote time be limited to 10 minutes. **Page S2810**

Messages from the House: **Pages S2815–16**

Measures Referred: **Page S2816**

Executive Communications: **Pages S2816–17**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2817–19**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S2819–21**

Additional Statements: **Pages S2814–15**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S2821–25**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S2825**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S2825**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:40 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, April 10, 2008. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2828.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2009 for the Department of Energy, after receiving testimony from James A. Rispoli, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, and Edward F. Sproat, III, Director, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, both of the Department of Energy.

CYBER WARFARE PROGRAMS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense concluded a closed hearing to examine cyber warfare programs, after receiving testimony from General Kevin Chilton, Commander, Strategic Command, Department of Defense; and Chris Inglis, Deputy Director, National Security Agency.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2009 for the Department of State and foreign operations, after receiving testimony from Condoleezza Rice, Secretary of State.

IRAQ

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the situation in Iraq, focusing on progress made by the government of Iraq in meeting benchmarks and achieving reconciliation, after receiving testimony from Andrew J. Bacevich, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts; and General John M. Keane, USA (Ret.), Keane Advisors, LLC, and Robert Malley, International Crisis Group, both of Washington, D.C.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Airland concluded a hearing to examine the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2009 for Air Force and Navy aviation programs, and the future years defense program, after receiving testimony from William M.

Balderson, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Air Programs, and Rear Admiral Allen G. Myers, USN, Director, Air Warfare, both of the Department of the Navy, Lieutenant General Daniel J. Darnell, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Air, Space and Information Operations, Plans, and Requirements, and Lieutenant General Donald J. Hoffman, USAF, Military Deputy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, both of the Department of the Air Force, and Lieutenant General George J. Trautman, III, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Aviation, United States Marine Corps, all of the Department of Defense.

COAL GASIFICATION TECHNOLOGIES

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Innovation concluded a hearing to examine coal gasification technologies, focusing on the need for large scale projects, after receiving testimony from John Marburger, III, Director, Office of Science and Technology Policy, Executive Office of the President; Joseph P. Strakey, Chief Technology Officer, National Energy Technology Laboratory, Department of Energy; James M. Childress, Gasification Technologies Council, Arlington, Virginia; and Michael J. Mudd, FutureGen Alliance, David G. Hawkins, Natural Resources Defense Council Climate Center, and John Novak, Electric Power Research Institute, all of Washington, D.C.

HISTORICAL LAND BILLS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks concluded a hearing to examine S. 1633, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of including the battlefield and related sites of the Battle of Shepherdstown in Shepherdstown, West Virginia, as part of Harpers Ferry National Historical Park or Antietam National Battlefield, S. 1993 and H.R. 2197, bills to modify the boundary of the Hopewell Culture National Historical Park in the State of Ohio, S. 2207, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating Green McAdoo School in Clinton, Tennessee, as a unit of the National Park System, S. 2254, to establish the Mississippi Hills National Heritage Area in the State of Mississippi, S. 2262, to authorize the Preserve America Program and Save America's Treasures Program, S. 2329 and H.R. 2627, bills to establish the Thomas Edison National Historical Park in the State of New Jersey as the successor to the Edison National Historic Site, S. 2502 and H.R. 3332, bills to provide for the establishment of a memorial within Kalaupapa National Historical Park located on the island of Molokai, in the State of Hawaii, to honor and perpetuate the memory of those individuals who were forcibly relocated to the Kalaupapa Peninsula from 1866 to 1969, S. 2512, to establish the Mississippi Delta National Heritage Area in the State of Mississippi, and H.R. 3998, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct special resources studies of certain lands and structures to determine the appropriate means for preservation, use, and management of the resources associated with such lands and structures, after receiving testimony from Senator Alexander; P. Lynn Scarlett, Deputy Secretary, and Katherine H. Stevenson, Acting Assistant Director, Business Services, National Park Service, both of the Department of the Interior; James T. Surkamp, Jefferson County Commission, Charles Town, West Virginia; and Richard Moe, National Trust for Historic Preservation, Washington, D.C.

CLEAN WATER RESTORATION ACT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 1870, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify the jurisdiction of the United States over waters of the United States, after receiving testimony from Alexander B. Grannis, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Albany; Joan Card, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Phoenix; David Brand, Madison County, London, Ohio, on behalf of the National Association of Counties (NACo) and the National Association of County Engineers (NACE); Carol M. Browner, Albright Group, LLC, Washington, D.C.; and Randall Smith, Glen, Montana, on behalf of the National Cattlemen's Beef Association (NCBA) and the Montana Stock Growers Associations (MSGA).

CHIP DIRECTIVE

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on Healthcare concluded a hearing to examine covering uninsured children, focusing on the provisions and regulations in the current Children's Healthcare Insurance Program (CHIP) directive, after receiving testimony from Dennis G. Smith, Director, Center for Medicaid and State Operations, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services; Peter Orszag, Director, Congressional Budget Office; Chris L. Peterson, Specialist, Health Care Financing, Domestic Social Policy Division, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Alan Weil, National Academy for State Health Policy (NASHP), Nina Owcharenko, Heritage Foundation, and Cindy Mann, Georgetown University Center for Children and Families Health and Policy Institute, all of Washington, D.C.; and Paula Novak, Lebanon, Ohio.

U.S. CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS OF VIOLENT CRIMES OVERSEAS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on International Operations and Organizations, Democracy and Human Rights concluded a hearing to examine closing legal loopholes, focusing on prosecuting sexual assaults and other violent crimes committed overseas by American civilians in a combat environment, after receiving testimony from Sigal P. Mandelker, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, Department of Justice; Gregory B. Starr, Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Diplomatic Security, and J. Bradford Wiegmann, Assistant Legal Adviser for Management, both of the Department of State; and Robert E. Reed, Associate Deputy General Counsel for Military Justice and Personnel Policy, Department of Defense; Eugene R. Fidell, Feldesman, Tucker, Leifer, Fidell, LLP, Washington, D.C.; and Mary Beth Kineston, Olmsted Falls, Ohio, and Dawn Leamon, Lena, Illinois, both of KBR, Inc.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Patricia M. Haslach, of Oregon, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as United States Senior Coordinator for the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Forum, Scot A. Marciel, of California, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Affairs, D. Kathleen Stephens, of Montana, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Korea, who was introduced by Senator Kennedy, and William E. Todd, to be Ambassador to the State of Brunei Darussalam, all of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS AT THE VA

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine efforts to make the Department of Veterans Affairs the workplace of choice for health care providers, after receiving testimony from Marisa Palkuti, Director, Health Care Retention and Recruitment Office, Veterans Health Administration, Shelia M. Cullen, Director, San Francisco Veterans Affairs Medical Center, San Francisco, California, Steven P. Kleinglass, Director, Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Minneapolis, Minnesota, and Jennifer L. Strauss, Health Scientist, Center for Health Services Research in Primary Care, Durham Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina, on behalf of the Friends of VA Medical Care and Health Research, all of the Department of Veterans Affairs; Marjorie Kanof, Managing Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office; John A. McDonald, University of Nevada School of Medicine, Reno, on behalf of the Association of American Medical Colleges; Valerie O'Meara, Veterans Affairs Puget Sound Health Care System, Seattle, Washington, on behalf of the American Federation of Government Employees (AFL–CIO); and Randy Phelps, American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 21 public bills, H.R. 5734–5754; and 6 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 325–326; H. Res. 1093–1096, were introduced. **Pages H2149–51**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2151–52**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 1092, relating to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5724) to implement the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement (H. Rept. 110–574). **Page H2149**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, Dr. Carey D. Froelich, First Baptist Church, Baytown, Texas. **Page H2073**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Welcoming His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI on his first apostolic visit to the United States: H. Res. 838, amended, to welcome His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI on his first apostolic visit to the United States; **Pages H2076–78**

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the March 2007 report of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development makes an important contribution to the understanding of the high levels of crime and violence in the Caribbean, and that the United States should work with Caribbean countries to address

crime and violence in the region: H. Res. 865, amended, to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the March 2007 report of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development makes an important contribution to the understanding of the high levels of crime and violence in the Caribbean, and that the United States should work with Caribbean countries to address crime and violence in the region; **Pages H2078–81**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the March 2007 report of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development makes an important contribution to the understanding of the high levels of crime and violence in the Caribbean, and that the United States should work with the current member states of Caribbean Community and the Dominican Republic to address crime and violence in the region.". **Page H2081**

Congresswoman Jo Ann S. Davis Post Office Designation Act: H.R. 5489, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6892 Main Street in Gloucester, Virginia, as the "Congresswoman Jo Ann S. Davis Post Office", by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 397 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 176; **Pages H2081–83, H2121**

Julia M. Carson Post Office Building Designation Act: H.R. 5472, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2650 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, as the "Julia M. Carson Post Office Building", by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 401 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 177; **Pages H2083–86, H2121–22**

William "Bill" Clay Post Office Building Designation Act: H.R. 5395, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11001 Dunklin Drive in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "William 'Bill' Clay Post Office Building"; and **Pages H2086–88**

Recognizing the plumbing industry and supporting the goals and ideals of "National Plumbing Industry Week": H. Res. 1082, to recognize the plumbing industry and supporting the goals and ideals of "National Plumbing Industry Week". **Pages H2092–93**

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed until Thursday, April 10th:

Recognizing the fifth anniversary of the Department of Homeland Security and honoring the Department's employees for their extraordinary efforts and contributions to protect and secure our Nation: H. Res. 1038, to recognize the fifth anniversary of the Department of Homeland Security and honoring the Department's employees for their extraordinary efforts and contributions to protect and secure our Nation. **Pages H2088–92**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure which was debated on Tuesday, April 8th:

Calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to end its crackdown in Tibet and enter into a substantive dialogue with His Holiness the Dalai Lama to find a negotiated solution that respects the distinctive language, culture, religious identity, and fundamental freedoms of all Tibetans: H. Res. 1077, to call on the Government of the People's Republic of China to end its crackdown in Tibet and enter into a substantive dialogue with His Holiness the Dalai Lama to find a negotiated solution that respects the distinctive language, culture, religious identity, and fundamental freedoms of all Tibetans, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 413 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 166. **Pages H2098–99**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:07 p.m. and reconvened at 4:25 p.m. **Page H2112**

National Landscape Conservation System Act: The House passed H.R. 2016, to establish the National Landscape Conservation System, by a recorded vote of 278 ayes to 140 noes, Roll No. 174. **Pages H2093–96, H2099–H2119**

Rejected the Cannon motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report back to the House promptly with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 208 ayes to 212 noes, Roll No. 173. **Pages H2117–18**

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. **Page H2105**

Accepted:

Cannon amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 110–573) that provides that the National Landscape Conservation System Act does not create an independent federal legal cause of action based on inclusion in the System; **Pages H2106–07**

Grijalva amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 110–573) that reiterates that nothing in the bill shall impede efforts by the Department of Homeland Security to secure the borders of the United States (by a recorded vote of 414 ayes with none voting "no", Roll No. 167); **Pages H2105–06, H2113**

Bishop (UT) amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 110–573) that provides that inclusion in the National Landscape Conservation System does not

additionally restrict or hinder energy development within the System (by a recorded vote of 333 ayes to 89 noes, Roll No. 170); **Pages H2109, H2115**

Altmire amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 110–573) that provides that the bill does not in any way limit access for hunting, fishing, trapping or recreational shooting on the 27 million acres administered by the Bureau of Land Management and also provides that H.R. 2016 does not in any way infringe on a state's right to manage, control or regulate its hunting, fishing, trapping and recreational shooting activities on these lands (by a recorded vote of 416 ayes to 5 noes, Roll No. 171); and

Pages H2109–10, H2115–16

Pearce amendment (No. 7 printed in H. Rept. 110–573) that provides that inclusion in the National Landscape Conservation System does not affect existing grazing rights or operations on those Bureau of Land Management lands (by a recorded vote of 214 ayes to 207 noes, Roll No. 172).

Pages H2110–11, H2116–17

Rejected:

Bishop (UT) amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 110–573) that sought to strike the preamble to the establishment of the National Landscape Conservation System (by a recorded vote of 175 ayes to 246 noes, Roll No. 168) and **Pages H2107–08, H2113–14**

Bishop (UT) amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 110–573) that sought to strike Section 3(c)(2) and insert language directing the Interior Secretary to manage the system in accordance with each applicable law (including regulations) relating to each component of the system included under subsection (b) (by a recorded vote of 172 ayes to 245 noes, Roll No. 169). **Pages H2108–09, H2114–15**

Withdrawn:

Walden amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 110–573) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have struck the Steens Mountain Cooperative Management and Protection Act of 2000 (P.L. 106–399) from the bill. **Pages H2111–12**

H. Res. 1084, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 188 nays, Roll No. 165, after agreeing to order the previous question by a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 190 nays, Roll No. 164.

Pages H2096–98

Food and Energy Security Act of 2007—Motion to go to Conference: The House disagreed to the Senate amendment and agreed to a conference on H.R. 2419, to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2012.

Pages H2119–21

Agreed to the Goodlatte motion to instruct conferees by a yea-and-nay vote of 400 yeas to 11 nays, Roll No. 175. **Pages H2120–21**

Later, the Chair appointed the following Members of the House to the conference committee on the bill: from the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of the House bill (except title XII) and the Senate amendment (except secs. 12001, 12201–12601, and 12701–12808), and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Peterson (MN), Holden, McIntyre, Etheridge, Boswell, Baca, Cardoza, Scott (GA), Goodlatte, Lucas, Moran (KS), Hayes, Musgrave, and Neugebauer. **Page H2123**

From the Committee on Education and Labor, for consideration of secs. 4303 and 4304 of the House bill, and secs. 4901–4905, 4911, and 4912 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives George Miller (CA), McCarthy (NY), and Platts. **Page H2123**

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of secs. 6012, 6023, 6024, 6028, 6029, 9004, 9005, and 9017 of the House bill, and secs. 6006, 6012, 6110–6112, 6202, 6302, 7044, 7049, 7307, 7507, 9001, 11060, 11072, 11087, and 11101–11103 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Dingell, Pallone, and Barton (TX). **Page H2123**

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of sec. 11310 of the House bill, and secs. 6501–6505, 11068, and 13107 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Kanjorski, Waters, and Bachus. **Page H2123**

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of secs. 3001–3008, 3010–3014, and 3016 of the House bill, and secs. 3001–3022, 3101–3107, and 3201–3204 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Berman, Sherman, and Ros-Lehtinen. **Page H2123**

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of secs. 11102, 11312, and 11314 of the House bill, and secs. 5402, 10103, 10201, 10203, 10205, 11017, 11069, 11076, 13102, and 13104 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Conyers, Scott (VA), and Smith (TX). **Page H2123**

From the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of secs. 2313, 2331, 2341, 2405, 2607, 2607A, 2611, 5401, 6020, 7033, 7311, 8101, 8112, 8121–8127, 8204, 8205, 11063, and 11075 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Rahall, Bordallo, and McMorris Rodgers. **Page H2123**

From the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of secs. 1501 and 7109 of the House bill, and secs. 7020, 7313, 7314, 7316, 7502, 8126, 8205, and 10201 of the Senate

amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Waxman, Towns, and Jordan (OH). Page H2123

From the Committee on Science and Technology, for consideration of secs. 4403, 9003, 9006, 9010, 9015, 9019, and 9020 of the House bill, and secs. 7039, 7051, 7315, 7501, and 9001 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Gordon (TN), Lampson, and McCaul (TX). Page H2123

From the Committee on Small Business, for consideration of subtitle D of title XI of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Velázquez, Shuler, and Chabot. Page H2123

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of secs. 2203, 2301, 6019, and 6020 of the House bill, and secs. 2604, 6029, 6030, 6034, and 11087 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Oberstar, Norton, and Graves. Page H2123

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of sec. 1303 and title XII of the House bill, and secs. 12001–12601, and 12701–12808 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Representatives Rangel, Pomeroy, and McCrery. Page H2123

For consideration of the House bill (except title XII) and the Senate amendment (except secs. 12001, 12201–12601, and 12701–12808), and modifications committed to conference: Representatives DeLauro and Putnam. Page H2123

Amendments: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages H2152–65.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Six yea-and-nay votes and eight recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2907, H2097–98, H2098–99, H2113, H2113–14, H2114–15, H2115, H2116, H2116–17, H2118, H2118–19, H2120–21, H2121 and H2122. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10:00 a.m. and adjourned at 10:50 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies held a hearing on Marketing and Regulatory Programs. Testimony was heard from Bruce I. Knight, Under Secretary, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, USDA.

U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE; INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION; BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO AND FIREARMS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies held a hearing on the USTR. Testimony was heard from Ambassador Susan C. Schwab, United States Trade Representative.

The Subcommittee also held a hearing on the International Trade Administration. Testimony was heard from Christopher A. Padilla, Under Secretary, International Trade, Department of Commerce.

The Subcommittee also held a hearing on the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. Testimony was heard from Michael J. Sullivan, Director, ATF, Department of Justice.

FCC

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a hearing on the Federal Communications Commission. Testimony was heard from Kevin J. Martin, Chairman, FCC.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies held a hearing on the Smithsonian Institution. Testimony was heard from Cristian Samper, Acting Secretary, Smithsonian Institution.

U.S. CAPITOL POLICE BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a hearing on the U.S. Capitol Police Budget. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the U.S. Capitol Police: Phillip Morse, Chief; and Daniel Nichols, Assistant Chief.

ARMY BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans' Affairs and Related Agencies held a hearing on the Army Budget. Testimony was heard from Gen. George W. Casey, Jr., USA, Chief of Staff, Department of the Army.

STATUS—IRAQ WAR AND POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS; STATUS OF U.S. GROUND FORCES

Committee on Armed Services: Held a hearing on the status of the war and political developments in Iraq. Testimony was heard from GEN David H. Petraeus, USA, Commanding General, Multi-National Force—Iraq, Department of Defense; and Ryan C. Crocker, U.S. Ambassador to Iraq, Department of State.

The Committee also held a hearing and on the current status of U.S. ground forces. Testimony was

heard from GEN Richard A. Cody, USA, Vice Chief of Staff; and GEN Robert A. Magnus, USMC, Assistant Commandant, Marine Corps.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Education and Labor: Ordered reported the following bills: H.R. 5522, amended, Combustible Dust Explosion and Fire Prevention Act of 2008; and H.R. 5715, To ensure continued availability of access to the Federal student loan program for students and families.

PROTECTING THE MEDICAID SAFETY NET ACT OF 2008

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 5613, Protecting the Medicaid Safety Net Act of 2008.

HOUSING STABILIZATION AND HOMEOWNERSHIP RETENTION

Committee on Financial Services: Held a hearing entitled " Using FHA for Housing Stabilization and Homeownership Retention." Testimony was heard from Sheila C. Bair, Chairman, FDIC; the following officials of the Department of the Treasury: John C. Dugan, Comptroller of the Currency; and John M. Reich, Director, Office of Thrift Supervision; Randall Kroszner, member, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System; Brian Montgomery, Assistant Secretary, Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development; and public witnesses.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

IRAQ REPORT

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Held a hearing on Report on Iraq. Testimony was heard from David H. Petraeus, USA, Commanding General, Multi-National Force—Iraq, Department of Defense; and Ryan C. Crocker, Ambassador to Iraq, Department of Defense.

FEMA RESPONSE/RECOVERY CAPABILITIES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Emergency Communications, Preparedness, and Response held a hearing entitled "Moving Beyond the First Five Years: Ensuring FEMA's Ability to Respond and Recover in the Wake of a National Catastrophe." Testimony was heard from Harvey E. Johnson, Jr., Acting Deputy Administrator and Chief Operating Officer, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security.

HOMELAND SECURITY'S MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Management, Investigations, and Oversight held a hearing entitled "Moving Beyond the First Five Years: Solving the Department of Homeland Security's Management Challenges." Testimony was heard from Elaine Duke, Deputy Under Secretary, Management, Department of Homeland Security; Norman J. Rabkin, Managing Director, Homeland Security and Justice Team, GAO; and public witnesses.

2008 PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES AND CAUCUSES

Committee on House Administration: Held a hearing on the 2008 Presidential Primaries and Caucuses: "What we've learned so far." Testimony was heard from April E. Pye, Interim Director, Registration and Elections, Fulton County, Georgia; Alisha Alexander, Elections Administrator, County Board of Elections, Prince George's County, Maryland; Linda Weedon, Deputy Director, Elections, Maricopa County, Arizona; and public witnesses

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 5608, Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments Act, H.R. 3522, To ratify a conveyance of a portion of the Jicarilla Apache Reservation to Rio Arriba County, State of New Mexico, pursuant to the settlement of litigation between the Jicarilla Apache Nation and Rio Arriba County, State of New Mexico, to authorize issuance of a patent for said lands, and to change the exterior boundary of the Jicarilla Apache Reservation accordingly, H.R. 3490, Tuolumne Me-Wuk Land Transfer Act of 2007, S. 2457, to provide for extensions of leases of certain land by Mashantucket Pequot (Western) Tribe, and H.R. 5680, To amend certain laws relating to Native Americans, and for other purposes. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Interior: James Cason, Associate Deputy Secretary; and Jerry Gidner, Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs; Robert McSwain, Acting Director, Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services; Philip N. Hogen, Chairman, National Indian Gaming Commission; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Ordered reported the following measures: H.R. 5687, as amended, To amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to increase the transparency and accountability of Federal advisory committees; H.R. 752, amended, Federal Electronic Equipment Donation Act of 2007; H.R. 1734, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 630

Northeast Killingsworth Avenue in Portland, Oregon, as the "Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Post Office;" H. Res. 1026, Recognizing the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Congressional Club; H.R. 5601, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7925 West Russell Road in Las Vegas, Nevada, as the "Sergeant Irving Joseph Schwartz Post Office Building;" and H.R. 5631, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1155 Seminole Trail in Charlottesville, Virginia, as the "Corporal Bradley T. Arms Post Office Building."

2010 CENSUS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Subcommittee on Information Policy, Census, and National Archives held a joint hearing on 2010 Census, Progress on the Development of the Field Data Collection Automation Program. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Bureau of the Census: Department of Commerce: Steven H. Murdock, Director; and Preston Jay Waite, Deputy Director; the following officials of the GAO: Mathew Scire, Director, Strategic Issues; and David Powner, Director, Information Technology Management Issues; and public witnesses.

FEDERAL SECURITY ID CARDS; BACKGROUND CHECKS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Management, Organization, and Procurement held a hearing on Federal Security: ID Cards and Background Checks. Testimony was heard from Karen Evans, Administrator, Electronic Government and Information Technology, OMB; Kathy Dillaman, Associate Director, Investigations, OPM; Linda Koontz, Director, Information Management Issues, GAO; Michael Sade, Acting Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Office of Integrated Technology Service, Federal Acquisition Service, GSA; Thomas Wisner, Deputy Chief Information Officer for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor; and public witnesses.

COLUMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT RELATING TO CONSIDERATION

Committee on Rules: Committee granted, by a vote of 9 to 3, a rule providing that section 151(e)(1) and section 151(f)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 shall not apply in the case of H.R. 5724, to implement the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement.

GAS PRICES' IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESS

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight held a hearing entitled "The Impact of Increasing Gas Prices on Small Businesses." Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

AVIATION DELAYS AND CONSUMER ISSUES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing on Aviation Delays and Consumer Issues. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Transportation: Calvin L. Scovel, III, Inspector General; and D. J. Gribbin, General Counsel, Office of the Secretary; and public witnesses.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION CHALLENGES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Highways and Transit held a hearing on Transportation Challenges of Metropolitan Areas. Testimony was heard from Jolene Molitoris, Assistant Director, Department of Transportation, State of Ohio; and public witnesses.

ENDING VETERANS HOMELESSNESS

Committee on Veterans Affairs: Held a hearing on Ending Homelessness for our Nation's Veterans. Testimony was heard from Peter H. Dougherty, Director, Homeless Veterans Programs, Department of Veterans Affairs; Libby Perl, Analyst in Housing, CRS; a representative of a veterans organization; and public witnesses.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE TAX ACT; TAXPAYER ASSISTANCE AND SIMPLIFICATION ACT

Committee on Ways and Means: Ordered reported, as amended, the following bills: H.R. 5720, Housing Assistance Tax Act of 2008; and H.R. 5719, Taxpayer Assistance and Simplification Act of 2008.

ASSESSING THE FIGHT AGAINST AL-QAEDA

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Held a hearing on Assessing the Fight Against Al-Qaeda. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

GLOBAL WARMING AND PUBLIC HEALTH

Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming: Held a hearing entitled "Healthy Planet, Healthy People: Global Warming and Public Health." Testimony was heard from Howard Frumkin, M.D., Director, National Center for Environmental Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2008

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2009 for the Department of the Army, Army Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of the Interior, 9:30 a.m., SD–124.

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine the Federal Housing Administration's role in addressing the housing crisis, 10 a.m., SD–138.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2009 for the Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–192.

Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2009 for the Department of Veterans Affairs, 2 p.m., SD–124.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the situation in Iraq, focusing on the progress made by the Government in Iraq meeting benchmarks and achieving reconciliation, the future U.S. military presence in Iraq, and the situation in Afghanistan, 2 p.m., SH–216.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine U.S. credit markets, focusing on proposals to mitigate foreclosures and restore liquidity to the mortgage markets, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security, to hold hearings to examine aviation safety oversight, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine challenges facing Hawaii's Air Service Market, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of David R. Hill, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, 9 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine identity theft, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine negotiating a long-term relationship with Iraq, 9:30 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine climate change, focusing on a challenge for public health, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: business meeting to consider pending legislation, and the nomination of Harvey E. Johnson, Jr., of Virginia, to be Deputy Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Andrew Saul, of New York, Alejandro Modesto Sanchez, of Florida, and Gordon James Whiting, of New York, all to be Members of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, 2 p.m., SD–342.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies, on Farm and Foreign Agriculture Services, 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies, on NOAA, 10 a.m., 2358–A Rayburn, and on EEOC, 3 p.m., H–309 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, on Department of Energy—Nuclear Energy and Nuclear Waste, 9 a.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, on Small Business Administration, 10 a.m., 2220 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Homeland Security, on Secretary of DHS, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, on Government Accountability Office, 1 p.m., H–144 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans' Affairs and Related Agencies, on European Command, 1:30 p.m., H–143 Capitol.

Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, on U.S. Policy and Program in Iraq, 11 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn, and on U.S. Treasury International Assistance Programs and U.S. Contributions to International Financial Institutions, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services: hearing on Contingency Contracting: Implementing a Call for Urgent Reform, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces, hearing on Army acquisition programs, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Workplace Protections, hearing on the 15th Anniversary of the Family Medical Leave Act: Achievements and Next Steps, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, hearing entitled "Strengths and Weaknesses of Regulating Greenhouse Gas Emissions Using Existing Clean Air Act Authorities," 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn .

Committee on Financial Services, to continue hearings entitled " Using FHA for Housing Stabilization and Homeownership Retention," 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight, hearing on War Power for the 21st Century: The Constitutional Perspective, 3 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, hearing and briefing on the Crisis in the Andes: The Border Dispute Between Columbia and Ecuador, and Implications for the Region, 11 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, hearing on the Reauthorization and Improvement of DNA Initiatives of the Justice For All Act of 2004, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 5541, Federal Land Assistance, Management and Enhancement Act; and H.R. 5648, Emergency Wildland Fire Response Act of 2008, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs, hearing on Investigation into the Sale of Sensitive, In-Demand Military Equipment and Supplies on the Internet, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, hearing entitled ''Modernizing the Tax Code: Updating the Internal Revenue Code to Help Small Businesses Stimulate the Economy,'' 10 a.m., 1539 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, hearing on Cosco Busan and Marine Casualty Investigation, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, hearing on the Old Post Office Building: The General Services Administration's Plans for Future Use, 2. p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans Affairs, Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, hearing on Veterans Disability Benefits Claims Modernization Act of 2008, and H.R. 5509, Noble Warrior Act, 2 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Committe on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support, hearing on extending unemployment insurance, 10 a.m., B–318 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, briefing on Colombia, 8:30 a.m., and, executive, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2009 Budget—Cyber Initiative, 10 a.m., H–405 Capitol.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to hold hearings to examine the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), focusing on the displacement of Iraqi citizens on Jordan, Syria, Egypt, Turkey, and other surrounding countries in the region, 2:30 p.m., 1100, Longworth Building.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

9:30 a.m., Thursday, April 10

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 60 minutes), Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 3221, New Direction for Energy Independence, National Security, and Consumer Protection Act, and vote on or in relation to certain amendments; also, Senate will consider S. 2739, Consolidated Natural Resources Act. Additionally, Senate will vote on certain pending judicial nominations.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

10 a.m., Thursday, April 10

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 2537—Beach Protection Act of 2007 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Allen, Thomas H., Me., E555
Bonner, Jo, Ala., E565
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E566, E566
Boustany, Charles W., Jr., La., E559
Braley, Bruce L., Iowa, E554
Burton, Dan, Ind., E560
Capps, Lois, Calif., E561
Castle, Michael N., Del., E553
Clay, Wm. Lacy, Mo., E554
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E562
Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E557
Ellison, Kieth, Minn., E564
Franks, Trent, Ariz., E565
Graves, Sam, Mo., E549, E550, E552, E554, E555, E556, E558, E558
Hensarling, Jeb, Tex., E560, E561, E565
Honda, Michael M., Calif., E555
Inslee, Jay, Wash., E552
Issa, Darrell E., Calif., E556
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E556
Johnson, Timothy V., Ill., E558
Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E561
Klein, Ron, Fla., E549, E550
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E558, E564
Langevin, James R., R.I., E560
Larson, John B., Conn., E566
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E560
McCarthy, Carolyn, N.Y., E551
McCotter, Thaddeus G., Mich., E551
McDermott, Jim, Wash., E552
Mack, Connie, Fla., E553
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E562
Michaud, Michael H., Me., E552
Olver, John W., Mass., E561
Ortiz, Solomon P., Tex., E558
Paul, Ron, Tex., E549, E550
Pearce, Stevan, N.M., E554
Porter, Jon C., Nev., E550, E567
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E563
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana, Fla., E552
Ruppersberger, C.A. Dutch, Md., E559
Schwartz, Allyson Y., Pa., E566
Skelton, Ike, Mo., E559
Space, Zachary T., Ohio, E549, E550, E552, E554, E555, E557, E558, E558, E559
Stearns, Cliff, Fla., E557
Terry, Lee, Nebr., E557
Tiahrt, Todd, Kans., E549, E551
Udall, Tom, N.M., E553
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E559
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E556, E562

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.