points of order against provisions in H.R. 4939 be waived.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO OFFER CERTAIN AMENDMENTS AT ANY POINT DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4939, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND HURRICANE RECOVERY, 2006

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during further consideration of H.R. 4939 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 725, that the following amendments may be offered at any point in the reading:

An amendment by Mr. GILCHREST regarding section 3011; and an amendment by Mr. SABO, regarding the Defense Production Act; and that each such amendment may be offered only by the Member named in this request or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of debate; and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole; and that each amendment shall be debatable for 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

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

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND HURRICANE RECOVERY, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 725 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. 4939.

□ 1646

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. 4939) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with Mr. BOOZMAN (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, 28½ minutes remained in general debate. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) has 19 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 9½ minutes remaining.

Who yields time?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the Chairman of the committee, for his work in bringing this supplemental appropriations bill to the floor. He has really done an outstanding job of, I think, balancing the different interests that are involved here.

I want to take my time, Mr. Chairman, Members, to speak a bit about that part of the bill that deals with the foreign assistance funds. That is Chapter 3 of H.R. 4939.

The Foreign Operations portion of the fiscal year 2006 supplemental is $2.08 billion. That amount is $140 million, or 6.7 percent less than the request of the administration of $2.2 billion.

Now, here is how we arrived at this lesser figure.

First, we eliminated funding requested by the President that is not for the current fiscal year. That is $74 million. We eliminated funding that was requested for non-emergency costs. That is $99 million. And we reduced costs by rescinding previously appropriated funds of $17 million that are not needed because of changed circumstances.

Let me talk for a minute about specific regions and countries. First, Iraq. The bill provides new budget authority of $1.67 billion for Iraq, or two-thirds of the amount in foreign assistance is going to Iraq. But that is a reduction of $58 million from what the President requested. This reduction represents the amount requested for fiscal year 2007 costs for the U.S. Agency for International Development. As I said a moment ago, we concluded that this 2006 supplemental bill should not be used to pre-fund expenses of the next fiscal year.

In addition, the supplemental transfers $185 million from the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund appropriation to augment the new funds provided in this supplemental. These are still unobligated funds that are appropriately applied to the purposes of this legislation. And that brings the total available to Iraq of $1.85 billion.

Many Members are greatly concerned about Darfur and our efforts to stave off genocidal warfare in that region of Africa. Though a fraction of the amount requested for Iraq, our bill attempts to accomplish this. It contains $201 million, fully funding the President's request for Darfur programs. This includes $123 million for the African Union Mission in Sudan, or called AMIS, for peacekeeping activities. The administration has assured us that this $123 million will finance the entire U.S. fiscal year 2006 contribution.

Also included in this amount is $11.7 million for refugee assistance and $66.3 million in nonfood assistance in the International Disaster and Famine Assistance Account. The plight of displaced persons in Darfur remains critical and is pathetic.

The supplemental bill provides new budget authority of only $8.4 million for Afghanistan. This is a reduction of $54 million from the request but does not constitute a lessening of our commitment to this emerging democracy. Rather, it represents, first, the amount requested, $16 million, for fiscal year 2007 funds for USAID. It reduces that amount. Second, it eliminates the amount requested for non-emergency requirements of $38 million. The $8.4 million fully funds the request for emergency replacement of an electric turbine generator and assistance for migration and refugee requirements.

My colleagues should know that the Secretary of State has not yet met the requirements of the fiscal year 2006 Appropriations Act which requires a certification that the Government of Afghanistan is fully cooperating with U.S.-financed efforts to eradicate poppy cultivation. It did not seem prudent at this juncture to appropriate any non-emergency funds for Afghanistan until that certification can be made.

The legislation includes $10 million in the Democracy Fund appropriation for the promotion of democracy, governance, human rights, independent media and the rule of law programs in Iran. This is a reduction of $55 million from the requested amount. However, $50 million of that is for broadcasting efforts and is addressed in Chapter 6 of this bill, the jurisdiction of Mr. WOLF's subcommittee.

For Liberia, the bill includes a total of $63.8 million. $13.8 million of that amount would be used to cover the extraordinary costs of refugees returning to Liberia, and $50 million will provide assistance for economic and project support.

Now let me turn to the issues that are not specific dollar amounts. One of these is a general provision, Section 3012, not in Chapter 3 of the bill. It deals with assistance to the Palestinian Authority.

I want to be clear. This bill includes no new, no additional funding for the Palestinian territories, and the President's supplemental request included no such funding. However, the fiscal year 2006 Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill did include $150 million to support the Palestinian people and build the capacity of the Abbas-led government. Since the fiscal year 2006 bill was passed, as my colleagues know, Hamas won a majority of the Palestinian legislature in the recent elections.

The provision included in this bill before us today reconfirms and reemphasizes congressional oversight of our foreign assistance programs to this troubled region. It directs that no fiscal year 2006 or prior year funding can be used to support the Palestinian Authority or a successor entity until the

government fulfills the requirements of the so-called Quartet Statement. It also suspends U.S. assistance to the Palestinian Authority until the administration completes its review of the entire assistance program.

To be clear, this provision will not halt, nor should it halt, humanitarian assistance to the Palestinian people. We can and we must hold the elected leadership in the Palestinian territories to account for their messages of violence. But we should not punish the people of the territories for asserting themselves peacefully and democratically against corruption in their quest for a better life.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this supplemental. The foreign operations funding contained in Chapter 3 has been scrubbed so that only emergency requirements remain, and that is $140 million reduction from the President's request.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, last year Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma dealt a triple blow to the residents of my district. Florida's commercial fishermen were among the hardest hit, yet these small business owners did not receive any special disaster assistance from last year's Hurricane Supplemental Appropriations Bill and minimal aid from other Federal agencies. Both their livelihoods and the future of this important industry are threatened. That is why I am requesting the gentleman's help in securing the necessary resources to assist these hard-working men and women.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am certainly aware of the devastating impact of last year's hurricane season, and you have my assurances that I will work with you and do everything I can to address this issue when we go to conference with the Senate on this bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your bringing this important legislation to the floor. I will include for the RECORD a letter I recently received from several elected officials from my district which explains in great detail the devastation Hurricane Rita inflicted on Southwest Louisiana and the need for Federal support in its aftermath.

The Nation suffers from Rita amnesia, because the residents of Southwest Louisiana did everything right. We heeded the Federal warnings, evacuated before the storm, saving thousand of lives in the process. In fact, there were no deaths after Rita.

We returned after the storm and immediately got to work to begin the long process of rebuilding our communities and restoring our way of life. The FEMA Long Term Community Recovery Team has said that Southwest Louisiana is leading the State in the recovery effort.

Southwest Louisiana is not looking for a Federal handout, but we need the Nation's help to recover from this unprecedented storm. Debris removal has been slow. 5.73 million cubic yards so far has been collected, enough to cover a football field with a pile of debris 1 mile high. Homes are now destroyed or uninhabitable. And, in fact, in Cameron Parish, 90 percent of the homes were reduced to slabs of concrete. Industries are hurting. The Lake Area Industry Alliance, home to a vast petrochemical complex which serves the entire U.S., reports damages to its facilities of nearly $50 million; and that is just one example.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot ignore the plight of Southwest Louisiana, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. Remember Rita. I yield back.

CITY OF LAKE CHARLES,
March 11, 2006.

Re Hurricane Rita Recovery in Southwest Louisiana.

Hon. CHARLES BOUSTANY,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOUSTANY: First and foremost, we from Southwest Louisiana want to thank you for your support in our efforts to recover from Hurricane Rita. You have been very vocal in your effort to help us and we sincerely appreciate it. This letter is intended to give you information to support your efforts and to remind you that we stand ready to work with you in this effort. However, it has become very evident that others in our nation's capitol have forgotten about the destruction that occurred as a result of that storm.

We are not asking them to take our word for it. Just this week Governor Rick Perry testified in Washington D.C. and according to AP wire reports he requested that Texas be given $2 billion dollars, because ''states slammed by Katrina are getting more generous help than his state, *which bore the brunt of Hurricane Rita.*'' Governor Perry's significant funding request indicates his belief that Hurricane Rita was a destructive storm.

We do not intend to compete with our Texas neighbors for recovery money. We acknowledge that Hurricane Rita inflicted serious damage on Southeast Texas. But Southwest Louisiana also suffered significant devastation from this storm as well. The eye of the storm made landfall in Cameron Parish on September 24. The highly destructive northeast quadrant of the storm (with its winds and storm surge) was most destructive in Cameron Parish and in Calcasieu Parish in Louisiana. Cameron Parish as we knew it no longer exists. We, as Governor Perry, are concerned that we run the risk of being overshadowed by Hurricane Katrina when it comes time to allocate limited resources to the recovery effort.

Southwest Louisiana's elected officials, emergency responders and citizens worked hard to take the initiative to comply with evacuation orders, maintain discipline after the storm and truly prioritize our needs in a professional manner. Included below for your review is an overview of what happened in Calcasieu and Cameron Parishes during the Katrina and Rita storms. Hopefully this information will help you and your staff in your efforts to prevent Congress and the federal agencies responsible for hurricane relief from forgetting the devastation that occurred across the coastal parishes of Louisiana and in Southwest Louisiana in particular.

Hurricane Katrina also impacted Southwest Louisiana. Calcasieu Parish alone welcomed approximately 20,000 evacuees from Hurricane Katrina by opening shelters at a cost of nearly $1 million. The support of our community for the evacuees was overwhelming. Food, clothing, money and time were donated. Businesses and residents offered shelter, entertainment and support. The Lake Charles American Press described the effort as our community's finest hour. When Hurricane Rita approached our area, the first concern was to evacuate these people to safety.

When Hurricane Rita passed through Southwest Louisiana, our citizens listened to officials and heeded warnings to evacuate. Residents of Cameron and Calcasieu Parishes left the area on heavily congested roadways to the north along with residents of Texas who had already been given an order to evacuate. Gas supplies were limited and hotels to the north were full with evacuees from Hurricane Katrina, many who had evacuated a second time to escape Hurricane Rita.

Residents of Calcasieu Parish began returning to the area after the storm starting September 30, to ''look and leave''. They returned to find over 19,000 homes or approximately 25 percent of the housing stock was destroyed. Another 35 percent of the housing was damaged. Power was out throughout most of the area for one to three weeks causing widespread loss of water and sewer systems and shuttering industry and retail businesses. Gasoline was a rare commodity. Approximately half of the trees in Calcasieu Parish were destroyed or damaged.

Industries and public facilities were also heavily damaged. Lake Charles Regional Airport suffered over $20 million in damage including the passenger terminal, which was damaged beyond repair. The facility was closed approximately fifteen days after the storm. Chennault International Airport, home to Northrop Grumman, suffered approximately $40 million in damages and was closed for four weeks after the storm. Damages to other aviation industry businesses brought the estimated damage to our aviation industry to approximately $90 million.

The Lake Area Industry Alliance, home of a vast petrochemical complex important to the entire United States, reported damages of approximately $50 million to their members' facilities. Damage to off-shore rigs and the closure of the Port of Lake Charles (the nation's 12th largest port) caused supply disruptions to production facilities. Supply disruptions and power outages resulted in loss of production, worker layoffs and additional startup costs. Lyondell Chemical Company closed its facility, costing the community 295 well paying jobs with benefits; it will be impossible to replace this facility.

The six casinos of our gaming industry were shut down during the power outage. Harrah's two riverboat casinos and hotel were damaged beyond repair. Harrah's facility is currently closed; our community has lost 2,000 jobs as a result.

McNeese State University and Sowela Technical College sustained extensive damage. The Calcasieu Parish School System experienced heavy damage to school facilities and closure of all public schools for approximately four weeks. Damage to education facilities is estimated at $57 million.

The Calcasieu Parish Police Jury and area municipalities suffered damages to facilities of approximately $30 million. The parish

wide highway system, including three movable bridges in Calcasieu Parish, required extensive debris removal and repairs to make them safe for traffic. The I–10 bridge over Lake Charles, the main east-west traffic artery through southwest Louisiana and across the southern U.S. was closed following the storm for structural inspection after a barge ran into a supporting structure. An early estimate of parish-wide highway damage is $20 million.

Cameron Parish, our sister parish to the south was totally devastated. Although there was no loss of life, Cameron suffered the loss of a way of life. Approximately 90 percent of the homes in Cameron, the Parish seat were destroyed. Other communities suffered similar or worse fates. The major industries—oil, agriculture, seafood and tourism—were destroyed. It will take years for the residents to recover. And Southwest Louisiana will never be fully recovered until Cameron is rebuilt and back ''in business'' again.

Cameron Parish contains four wildlife refuges, all of which sustained significant damage. The Sabine National Wildlife Refuge of 125,000 acres was officially closed after Hurricane Rita. Facilities were destroyed and the landscape was littered with debris from damaged structures, vehicles, dead animals and hazardous chemical containers. The refuge cannot reopen until the hazardous debris is removed and there is no safety risk to the public. In 2004 the economic effect of the refuge and its visitation was $9 million, supporting 108 jobs and $1 million in tax revenue. This is an average return of $10.18 for every federal dollar spent operating the refuge. Annually 300,000 people tour the Creole Nature Trail, which is designated an All-American Road. Nature trail brochures are being pulled out of circulation by bureau officials.

The Southwest Louisiana community immediately began cleaning up and repairing damages in order to begin recovery from this storm. Temporary ''blue'' roofs were installed on 17,104 houses and apartments. An estimated 5.73 million cubic yards of storm debris was collected, enough to cover a football field with a pile more than one half-mile high.

In addition to residents who were displaced from their homes due to damage, approximately 10,000 evacuees from other places are now residing in Calcasieu Parish. Hotel vacancy is essentially zero and there is a shortage of affordable housing for residents. Because of this housing shortage, many residents have not been able to return to the Parish. Many businesses are still unable to operate for normal business hours because of a shortage of workers. Although many minimum wage jobs are advertised and unfilled for long periods of time, unemployment in the Parish has more than tripled from 5.3 percent in 2004 to 16.2 percent in November 2005, an increase of 10.9 percent due to a number of complex reasons.

We understand the scale of the storm in Hurricane Katrina. And we understand that Southeast Texas was affected by the Hurricane Rita, but please do not penalize us for being aggressive in our efforts to help ourselves recover. It has been said by the FEMA Long Term Community Recovery Team that Southwest Louisiana is leading the state in the recovery effort. But true recovery requires more than just debris removal and new roofs. Because of the devastation caused by Hurricane Rita, we need to retool and rebuild the economy of Southwest Louisiana. We cannot depend on the existing businesses and industry to rebuild the economy of our area. We must be creative and aggressive in our efforts to both diversify and expand our economy if we are to accomplish the long term recovery goals FEMA and others have set for our area.

Hurricanes Rita and Katrina have impacted 30–40 percent of the economy of our state. It will take years to truly recover from this disaster in terms of real economic recovery. Please help us remind your colleagues that no state in the history of our great nation has ever suffered the extent of economic and social disruption that Louisiana has as a result of these two storms.

Some would say that it is this ''can do'' attitude that has prevented us in Southwest Louisiana from getting national media attention. We don't want media attention, but we do need your attention. Please assist us in getting our ''fair share'' of federal funding for our recovery effort. And please consider extending the GO Zone Legislation for parishes hardest hit by these storms. We need at least an additional two years to take advantage of the economic recovery offered by this bill. And when it comes to the allocation of Community Development Block Grant monies to the individual states, please include an allocation for Hurricane Rita parishes/counties as well.

Thank you again for all you have done in the recent months to focus attention on the recovery of Southwest Louisiana. If you need additional information or we can assist you in any way, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely yours,

RANDY ROACH,
Mayor, City of Lake Charles

WILLIE MOUNT,
Louisiana State Senate

GERALD THEUNISSEN,
Louisiana State Senate

CHUCK KLECKLEY,
Louisiana House of Representatives

ELCIE GUILLORY,
Louisiana House of Representatives

RONNIE JOHNS,
Louisiana House of Representatives

DAN MORRISH,
Louisiana House of Representatives

BRETT GEYEMAN,
Louisiana House of Representatives.

[From American Press Editorial, Mar. 10, 2006.]

HEY, CONGRESS, HOW ABOUT US?

On Wednesday, President Bush once again toured New Orleans' areas damaged by Hurricane Katrina.

The President's visit, his 10th, comes on the heels of another visit by a large congressional delegation to New Orleans and parts of Mississippi hit by Hurricane Katrina.

There were about 100 people in the delegation, including Speaker of the House Dennis Hastert and Minority Leader, Nancy Pelosi.

The trip was organized by Hastert's office and the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Meanwhile, residents of Calcasieu, Cameron, and Vermilion parishes who are picking up the pieces from the devastating Hurricane Rita wonder if they are being forgotten or if anybody in Washington, D.C., cares.

We understand that the areas in New Orleans and the Mississippi Coast are hurting, but so are Southwest Louisiana and Southeast Texas.

It's an insult to Southwest Louisiana residents that more than five months after Hurricane Rita struck here they are still waiting for members of Congress to come and see the devastation Rita wrought.

Members of Congress need to talk to Cameron Parish residents who have seen their entire way of life blown away by Rita.

Why do Louisiana Gov. Kathleen Blanco and Texas Gov. Rick Perry have to go to Washington to beg Congress to send more funds for Hurricane Rita relief?

All of this is a stark reminder about how Congress is out-of-touch with what needs to be done to help Southwest Louisiana and Southeast Texas get back on track.

Louisiana Seventh District U.S. Rep. Charles Boustany Jr. is aware of the problem with Rita amnesia in Washington. He sent a letter to Hastert and Pelosi when he learned about the congressional visit to New Orleans and Mississippi, urging them to include Southwest, Louisiana in their fact-finding tour.

Hastert responded in a March 1 letter that he considered including a tour of Southwest Louisiana in their recent visit, but it was not possible.

''Unfortunately, logistics and time constraints made it impractical to tour the parts of Louisiana impacted by Hurricane Rita during this trip,'' Hastert wrote.

He added that he wants to arrange a ''future visit'' so he can ''personally come down to Southwest Louisiana.''

Time's a-wastin', Mr. Speaker.

A number of congressional delegations have visited Louisiana and Mississippi in months past. Why didn't any come to this part of the state? Why does Boustany have to beg members of Congress to come here? Why haven't U.S. Sens. Mary Landrieu and David Vitter come here with a delegation of their Capitol Hill colleagues in tow to see Southwest Louisiana?

Landrieu of New Orleans and Vitter of Metairie have been on the forefront in getting assistance for Katrina-ravaged areas.

They represent this part of the state, too.

Vitter recently asked Don Powell, the federal recovery and rebuilding coordinator, to tour storm-damaged areas in Southwest Louisiana.

It's the members of Congress, not Powell, who will approve the relief funds this area so desperately needs.

Landrieu and Vitter need to help bring a large congressional delegation here to Southwest Louisiana. The sooner the better.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I fully support the funding for our troops in this Emergency Supplemental; the men and women serving our country in Iraq and Afghanistan must have equipment to effectively fight insurgents, and the harsh environment has taken its toll on everything from helicopters to tanks to armored vehicles.

I am concerned however that we are not addressing the impact of lost equipment and vehicles when our National Guard and Reserve units are forced to leave their equipment in Iraq.

Some reports state that Guard and Reserve units in the U.S. are only equipped at 30 percent of pre-war levels. The FY06 Defense Appropriations bill included $1 billion for reequipping units here at home, but the Guard needs $20 billion to address the shortage.

Money is tight in times of war, but national security is hollow if we leave our homeland unprotected to fight wars overseas. If we are going to increase the federal debt limit yet again—by nearly $800 billion this time—and extend tax cuts, we should also equip the men and women who protect the homeland from terrorist attacks and natural disasters.

This is extremely important for constituents in the district I represent. In 2001, Tropical

Storm Allison, just weeks into the hurricane season, flooded tens of thousands of homes and businesses in Southeast Texas. The Guard was a critical part of the rescue and recovery effort, using its large trucks and equipment to reach individuals stranded by the high water. During Katrina and Rita, the Guard again played a major role in rescue and recovery efforts after a natural disaster.

With the start of hurricane season on June 1st—less than three months away—we must ensure Guard units along the Gulf coast have the equipment they need to save lives.

I also want to talk about housing for Katrina and Rita evacuees. We have 100,000 evacuees in the City of Houston's emergency housing program, but frankly FEMA and HUD have been very difficult to work with.

FEMA told the City to sign 1-year leases for evacuees and promised in writing to reimburse Houston. First, these reimbursements have been extremely slow, and the our cities and apartments are becoming the bank for FEMA.

I met with Houston apartment owners that have not been paid rent for 90 days—I could not get away with that in my apartment in D.C., but FEMA gets away with it.

Second, these commitments are not being honored. Instead, they are going to pull the rug out from under probably 30,000 of these evacuees that FEMA says won't qualify for housing help after March 31.

In the coming weeks, 30,000 evacuees in Houston are going to get a letter giving them 30 days notice before eviction, even if they have a 1-year lease that FEMA promised to reimburse back in September. Many of these evacuees are schoolchildren.

FEMA has no plan for where the folks that they decide no longer qualify for housing assistance are going to find housing or where they are going to go. Rental rates are going to go up due to the influx of evacuees. Houston's section 8 housing program is full.

30,000 Americans should not end up on the streets of Houston and America should not stand for it. FEMA made commitments to 1-year leases and they are not abiding by their written commitments.

Mr. Chairman, I fully support the hurricane relief funding in this bill and the funding for the men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan, but I believe that there is a tremendous amount of work yet to be done.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendments by my colleagues in Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. DOGGETT; our levee system in South Texas has long passed the point of insufficient—we are in an emergency situation.

The Lower Rio Grande Flood Control Project has several components, including the levee system along the Rio Grande, which is in a state of disrepair. This amendment provides $10 million for IBWC; it has no effect on budget authority; and it reduces outlays by $2 million for FY 2006.

The integrity of the 500 mile levee system is the responsibility of the Army Corp of Engineers and the International Boundary and Water Commission. The IBWC has not received any consistent federal funding necessary to rehabilitate this critical levee system.

An indirect impact from Hurricane Emily last September brought water levels along the South border to critical levels that we have not seen in decades.

It was Hurricane Katrina that gave each American a tutorial on the utter importance of levees when it comes to protecting U.S. lives and property.

In the 2 major storms that blew ashore last fall, Katrina gave us a glimpse of the damage possible if these levees are not repaired . . . and Emily that made us hold our collective breath as the waters rose near the top of the levee system.

Like New Orleans, the population protected by these levees is enormous. South Texas is a densely populated area, and is the front door of international trade. Millions of lives and the nation's economy could hang in the balance when these levees fail. Evaluations of the present condition of these levees conclude the system is deficient in both hydraulic capacity and structural integrity.

The investment we ask to include today as part of this emergency supplemental is a small price to pay to ensure the integrity of these levees when we have the next major hurricane. Hurricane season is rapidly approaching, and this is the last opportunity to fix the levee system before hurricanes start blowing into the Gulf. Let us not be penny wise and pound foolish about the dangers that await us, as we were with the New Orleans levees.

We know the damage that can happen . . . and we know it will only come at a profoundly bad time, as millions of residents are trying to flee the coast . . . and the U.S. economy takes a multi billion dollar hit.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation, which makes ''emergencies'' out of non-emergencies and fails to provide assistance to my home State of Texas, which did suffer an emergency in the form of Hurricane Rita last summer.

First, I should note to my colleagues and the American taxpayer that, at almost $92 billion, this is the largest supplemental appropriations request in the history of the U.S. Congress.

Is it really an emergency to send $1.2 billion to pay off our allies for their help in Afghanistan? Won't these countries in close proximity presumably benefit more than even we will from the stability that we are told U.S. troops will provide? Perhaps these countries should be paying us for stabilizing their neighborhood. But no, it is always the U.S. taxpayer who ends up paying.

Is $36 million more for taxpayer-funded broadcasting programs overseas really an emergency?

Is $30 million to build roads in Liberia an emergency, when roads in Texas are still unrepaired after Hurricane Rita?

Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to this ''emergency'' supplemental that reduces some of the non-emergency ''emergencies'' by $500 million and allocates that money for the recovery of the State of Texas from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Additionally, my amendment will take another half-billion dollars from the non-emergency portions of this bill and apply it toward the Federal deficit.

The real emergency is the rate that this government is spending money we do not have on policies that we cannot afford while ignoring what should be our real priorities.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOOZMAN). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. When the reading for amendment reaches title II, that title shall be considered read.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the following amendments may be offered at any point in the reading:

An amendment by Mr. GILCHREST, regarding section 3011;

An amendment by Mr. SABO, regarding the Defense Production Act.

Each amendment may be offered only by the Member named in the request or a designee, shall be considered read, shall not be subject to amendment except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of debate; shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and shall be debatable for 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4939

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

CHAPTER 1

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

PUBLIC LAW 480 TITLE II GRANTS

For an additional expenses for ''Public Law 480 Title II Grants'', during the current fiscal year, not otherwise recoverable, and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon, under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad under title II of said Act, $350,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GILCHREST

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILCHREST.

Strike section 3011.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

□ 1700

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of dialogue in the last few weeks about this issue of Dubai Ports World controlling U.S. ports. What I would like to do with this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is to explain what the Dubai Ports World issue is, and in the process, hope my colleagues will vote in favor of this amendment which strikes the section of the supplemental appropriations bill, the section 3011.

I would at first like to give some frame of reference as to what it means to be the Dubai Ports World, which basically has purchased P&O, a British firm, that works with scheduling for the loading and unloading of cargo at our Nation's ports.

The Baltimore Sun, which is a newspaper in Maryland that represents the Port of Baltimore, one of the largest ports in the United States, says the following: ''Potentially lost in this uproar is a clear understanding of what a stevedore company does.'' Stevedore, that is what the Dubai Ports World is going to do. They are going to employ stevedores.

For the record, its employees, of Dubai Ports World, do not touch any cargo. No employee of the Dubai Ports World touches cargo. They are not in charge of port security. They do not oversee shipping manifests. That means they don't know what is in the containers. Stevedores, which is what the Dubai Ports World is going to be, are the middle managers who tell longshoremen, who are Americans, who are employed by the ports, who are employed by the State and local governments that control the ports, the longshoremen are the ones that load and unload the cargo.

Dubai Ports World will be able to tell them when that ship is going to dock and how to unload it. USA Today, many foreign companies, including one from Singapore, China and Taiwan, are doing business today at U.S. ports, leasing some terminals, to schedule the loading and unloading.

General Tommy Franks, this is what General Tommy Franks says about this particular issue: I personally believe that we have no greater ally in seeking a resolution of problems in the Middle East, the Palestinian issue, the Israeli issue, than we have found in the United Arab Emirates.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this quote, and there are quotes from every major newspaper in this country, this is a quote from The New York Times: ''Dubai is not a democracy, and it is not without its warts. But Dubai is a bridge of decency that leads away from the failing civilization to a much more optimistic, open and self-confident society. Dubaians are building a future based on butter, not guns; private property, not caprice; services more than oil and globally competitive companies, not terror networks. Dubai is about nurturing Arab dignity through success, not suicide. As a result, its people want to embrace the future, not blow it up.

Dubai, the United Arab Emirates. We have a difficult, nearly impossible situation in Iraq, difficulties in the Arab world. Who do we need most to bridge the gap of the lack of knowledge? Who do we need most in the Arab world to connect and bridge that gap between the United States and that culture? It is the United Arab Emirates.

It is time for us to recognize that this is an ally that we need to integrate with the United States as far as global issues and global terror issues are concerned.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOOZMAN). The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield half that time to my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin will control 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a very frustrating day. I can remember when this place used to be a legislative body. Now it has unfortunately become 99 percent a political institution, and even the politics of the institution doesn't seem to be working out too well on either side of the aisle.

What we have before us now is a holy picture debate. This is a Potemkin amendment. It is a Potemkin debate, and it is another example of how Congress has been reduced to dealing in symbols rather than dealing with substance.

We have had this country in a frenzy about the Dubai involvement in American ports over the past couple of weeks. The Appropriations Committee had a vote, and by vote of 62 to 2, the committee adopted an amendment by the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. LEWIS, which shut off the ability of the Dubai company to make their purchase of American port facilities.

We tried, in the committee, to make that action more rational by also establishing a process under which we would have a regularized notice to our government every time such a transaction is being proposed. The committee saw fit to turn that down.

We are now out on the floor. What is going on now is that there is such a frenzy to have every single member of the House also on record on this issue, that we now have a faux debate going on. As I read this, the only purpose of this debate today is to allow every Member of the House to cast a vote. It is what I call a holy picture vote, and it means that when the votes come, this amendment is going to be overwhelmingly defeated.

The only purposes I see that will have been accomplished by taking this time, is that Members will then have a vote in their pocket that they can take home and brag to people about. I admire the gentleman from Maryland and his willingness to be a sacrificial lamb on the amendment. I know that one or two people on this side of the aisle, such as Mr. MORAN, share his view, and I admire them for their courage.

I have to say that I really am frustrated to see on this, and a number of other amendments today and tomorrow, this House is going to deal with these issues in a symbolic manner rather than discussing it in a thorough, systematic way that might bring some additional credit to the House.

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

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I don't feel like I am a sacrificial lamb, and I am not doing this for any other purpose other than to give our strongest ally in the Middle East, the United Arab Emirates, the dignity that they deserve. There are Americans that feel they can do this in a most positive fashion.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Maryland.

Mr. Chairman, I have no illusions about the results of this vote. It is going to be pretty much proportionate to the 62–2 vote that we took in the full Appropriations Committee, Mr. KOLBE and I being in the minority. But I want to share with my colleagues why this is the wrong thing to be doing.

The fact is that Dubai is our natural bridge to the modern, peaceful and progressive Arab world, and, with this amendment, instead of crossing that bridge, we blow it up.

The fact is that we currently have over 600 ships that are using Dubai, U.S. naval vessels. We have more than 77,000 military personnel who take leave in Dubai, and we have never had a security incident. In fact, more U.S. military personnel take liberty, port leave, in other words, in the United Arab Emirates today than in any other place in the entire world.

The UAE wants to be our friend. They want to invest some of those petro-dollars back in the United States. They want to modernize. They want, in fact, to trade with Israel. They want to trade with Europe. They want to trade with the United States. They are under a lot of political pressure, but, in fact, the emirs are standing up to that pressure.

Couldn't we be expected to do the same? Are we going to yield to the fear

and the prejudice that I think motivates this amendment? Because it is not reasoned judgment. In fact, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States was to be conducting a 45-day thorough investigation. Then we would be able to make an informed decision. At the end of that investigation they were going to make recommendations.

But the reality is there aren't a whole lot of things that need to be changed with this transaction. It is a financial transaction. U.S. longshoremen still handle the cargo. The U.S. Coast Guard provides physical security. The Customs Service inspects the cargo.

In fact, it was the UAE who was first, right away, to sign the U.S. Container Security Initiative. We asked them to. They are doing everything. And, my friends, the Director of the Department of Homeland Security, Secretary Chertoff, said if this deal goes through, it will make our ports more secure, not less.

Listen to the experts.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am doing this in no small part because I have been looking for an accurate description of ''holy pictures'' for some time now since I have been dealing with my friend from Wisconsin, and in this process we are going through today, I think I may have found at least one snapshot.

What we have done in this bill is attempt to respond to a very serious concern on the part of the American public regarding having a country or an organization that is related to a country in the Middle East having authority or control over any of our ports in this country. It is viewed by many as a serious national security issue, and this is a national security bill.

Our goal is to make certain that we have thought through this Dubai Ports World deal very carefully before moving forward. The language is to stop that deal. It is rather straightforward. The 62–2 vote in the committee indicates the broad cross-section of public reaction reflected in the membership to going forward without some action on the part of the committee, and thus this language in the bill. It is rather straightforward.

I welcome this discussion today, and intend to be as helpful as I can to those opposing our language.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me paraphrase the words that Mr. OBEY said a few minutes ago. Rather than holy pictures, I would say this provision of the bill is a little bit like sprinkling holy water over the issue. It has no effect.

Dubai has already announced that they are going to sell their interests. The deal already went through. There is no effect of this provision in actually blocking the sale. This is making everybody feel good, that they can thump their chest and say we are doing something really tough here.

There are three good arguments, Mr. Chairman, as to why we should not be doing this.

First, it diverts our attention from the real issue. The real issue, is we don't have good port security.

□ 1715

In fact, our port security is terrible. It is very poor. This diverts us from really dealing with the issue that we do not inspect more than 2 percent of all containers. We do not really have a system for tracking containers and we do not know the origin of these containers. Containers start in one place in Malaysia and go to Singapore and then go to Vancouver, and then by train to Chicago. We have no idea where it originated and what might have been put into the container.

We do not have the information. We have bad port security. And Congress has a responsibility for the oversight and to make sure that the Department of Homeland Security is doing the job it should be doing.

This diverts our attention from this issue and, allows everybody to feel good about what they are doing. It has no effect, none, on port security, or on the security of the United States.

The second reason why this is bad, it is damaging, as has been indicated by the gentleman from Virginia, it is damaging to our relationship with the United Arab Emirates.

The United Arab Emirates, Dubai, is the largest port in the world outside of the United States for U.S. warships. This last year 56 warships docked in the United Arab Emirates, Dubai, the same port that is managed by this company, and 590 supply vessels. All supplies that go to Iraq go through this port.

Now we are inviting trouble. If Dubai decides that they want to retaliate against the United States, we will be up a creek without a paddle when it comes to getting our supplies into Iraq.

And then, the third reason, it sends the wrong signal to investors around the world. It says to investors around the world that we are not really a reliable trading partner or a reliable investment partner. It says to them, that, the United States has rules that they are supposed to follow, and then they throw them overboard.

This has been confirmed to me in at least one email that I have received from somebody who is an investor in Singapore. It said that many of his clients are reconsidering some of their investments in the United States, investments that create jobs for American workers in this country, because we do not have a reliable policy.

This is good politics but bad policy, and this provision should be removed from the bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 4939. I will be supporting the Supplemental Appropriations Act so our Armed Forces who are so bravely working to rebuild Iraq and fight the global war on terror have all of the tools and equipment they need to be successful.

My support comes, however, with a great deal of consternation. Because in this voting for this legislation I will also be forced to support unrelated spending for the rebuilding of the gulf coast.

Let me be clear. I believe that we need to help those devastated by Katrina. I have been there twice. But we must do it in a responsible manner with a clear understanding of where and how the money is spent.

It is clear that we must sustain military operations and reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan, continuing making progress and tracking down and bringing terrorists to justice and procure the necessary equipment for our troops to carry out their mission.

It is unclear to me, however, why we must couple this funding with gulf coast relief funds. Both are worthy causes, but in my view the spending for the latter is in desperate need for further oversight and explanation.

For instance, we should be taking a closer look at the $9.6 billion included for FEMA's problematic Disaster Relief Fund and the $4.2 billion included for community development block grants, which are not even required to go to the gulf coast areas. These funds should not be incorporated into a bill with those for our military force protection needs, including up-armored Humvees, Abram tanks, Bradley fighting vehicles.

Congress has already allocated $62.3 billion to hurricane relief and recovery. I believe that it is Congress' responsibility to demand a strict accounting of how these dollars are spent, and any further funds allocated to the gulf coast for hurricane relief should be offset with other savings.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGREY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. We are on the amendment dealing with the Dubai Ports. Does the gentleman know that?

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I did not know that. I apologize.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thought that is why you were asking to speak. But that is okay. Just go right ahead.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I will go ahead and complete. I do apologize for that. I was not aware of that.

But I think it is important, in conclusion, that we work toward rebuilding and restoring normalcy for those who are affected by Katrina. However,

we should do so in a stand-alone bill to ensure that we have proper oversight.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, this is what I would like to conclude with. Dubai Ports World will have no administrative authority over any ports. They will have no security responsibility over any ports in the United States. That is retained by the Federal and State governments, completely.

All the longshoremen will still be American longshoremen that load and unload these ships. The Dubai Ports World is an organization made up of American investors, and chief executive officers of the United States are officers in this Dubai Ports World organization. They are a strong ally. Let this vote signal dignity and worth to the United Arab Emirates. I urge my colleagues to vote for the motion to strike.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I will use just a few seconds to close.

We oppose this amendment for security purposes. This language should remain in the bill to make certain that Dubai Ports World does not have any management control or authority over any of our major ports.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, while I understand the sentiments and the security concerns of the Members here today on this ports issue, I feel strongly that free trade is a core American value that is worth fighting for. I look forward to making the case for free trade and for economic engagement with our moderate Arab allies here today.

But first, let's consider what we are and are not voting on today. The U.S. Congress cannot stop this sale, as this provision would seek to do. We simply do not have jurisdiction beyond our shores. In fact, the sale has already happened and the shareholders will be paid over the next couple of weeks. While I appreciate the desire of Members to stop the sale, the fact is that this language does nothing of the sort.

I'm not sure what the goal is. The language certainly does not stop the purchase by Dubai Ports World, and—even more important—does nothing to improve the security of our ports. I would argue that this provision does not improve our security but will damage us economically, militarily, and diplomatically.

It seems as if we are operating in a fact-free zone here.

The facts are that companies based in many other countries are already managing most of the Nation's ports. Will we be seeking to overturn these contracts next?

The fact is that no American company chose to bid on Peninsular and Oriental. There is only one American company large enough to take on this kind of contract, and my understanding is that firm is already at capacity. Would we simply wish an American ports management company into creation?

Let's talk a little about port security. We know that no matter who manages port operations, the U.S. Coast Guard, the U.S. Customs Service, and U.S. longshoremen continue to be responsible for port security, the checking of cargo, and the handling of cargo.

Stephen Flynn of the Council on Foreign Relations testified before Congress: "We need to know what's in the box more than we need to know who is moving them around a container yard."

So if our concern truly is port security, why are we not focusing on supporting that overall effort?

The fact is that Dubai Ports World is of course involved with the Jebel Ali port, one of the largest and among the most advanced ports in the world. According to The New York Times, it is the world's 11th largest port and annually handles more than 7.5 million containers, many of them going directly to and from the United States. On a number of issues, they have cooperated with the U.S. government to allow for our inspections.

Robert C. Bonner, formerly with Customs, was quoted in The New York Times: "Dubai has acknowledged the absolute importance of securing cargo against terrorists."

On cargo security, we ought to be concerned about what's being onloaded in foreign ports just as much as we are concerned about what's being offloaded on our shores. Once a dangerous ship arrives, it's far too late for concern.

So if we trust Dubai Ports World on the first crucial half of a cargo transaction—the loading—why would we not trust the company to be involved in U.S. cargo operations in a strictly management capacity?

Nonetheless, the company has moved forward to sell the operations to a U.S. buyer. DPW announced yesterday it has retained credible, well-known legal and financial firms to handle this transaction. The company has agreed to abide by a voluntary commitment to hold U.S. ports separate until the sale is complete.

And still, it seems that it's not enough. I would ask: What more would we have DPW do? When will this be dead enough to satisfy the U.S. Congress?

The action, I am sad to say, sends exactly the wrong message to the world about the climate for international businesses in the United States. It sends the wrong message about our willingness to engage in transactions that create growth and jobs here at home. It tells the world that we are an unreliable trading partner.

While we are sometimes obsessed with the so-called "outsourcing" of American jobs abroad, why are we not similarly concerned about our ability to "insource" jobs through foreign direct investment?

Moving to the military aspect of our relationship with Dubai, today we may blatantly insult a moderate Arab ally that has generously allowed the use of its port and airfield facilities for our military. General Peter Pace, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has called the U.S. military relationship with the UAE "superb." Dubai provides servicing and port security that is good enough for the U.S. Navy.

I worry how that relationship will proceed in the future, and I believe that this entire affair will end up as diplomatic disaster for the United States throughout the moderate Middle East.

Lawrence Lindsey recently wrote in The Wall Street Journal: "The UAE isn't any old Arab country. It sits astride the Strait of Hormuz through which a fifth of world oil passes. Iran sits on the other side. . . . From a global perspective, efforts by the U.S. Congress to alienate the UAE at this time look about as sensible as Russian roulette."

There are many other respected voices who have spoken to the economic, security, and global issues raised in this controversy.

Robert Samuelson, the renowned economist, wrote recently in The Washington Post about how this action will damage American interests. In addition to the damage done to our relationship with the UAE and other allies in the Middle East, Samuelson holds the view that it has weakened worldwide confidence in the dollar.

Samuelson concludes, "Every country has the right to protect its security interests. But those interests must be defined coherently and not simply as the random expression of political expediency."

James Glassman of the American Enterprise Institute testified before a Financial Services subcommittee: "Our ties through trade, in fact, have made us more safe as our trading partners become more prosperous, open and democratic. But our politicians and pundits should know that we can't pick and choose. If we decide to deny firms from developing nations—Arab, Asian or otherwise—from investing in the United States, those firms will go elsewhere. And we will pay the price—in higher interest rates, higher mortgage rates, higher inflation, lower stock prices, less participation in a world [that is] growing more and more creative and exciting."

Since World War II, the United States has enjoyed economic growth and an increase in economic standard of living that has never before been achieved in world history. This has gone hand-in-hand with our values of democracy and freedom of thought. We have watched other nations fail because they were too closed, either economically or politically or both. One of the critical factors in our stunning success has been free trade and the free movement of capital throughout the world.

I can't say it any better than Thomas Friedman, who wrote: "People across the world still look to our example of pluralism, which is like no other. If we go Dark Ages, if we go down the road of pitchfork-wielding xenophobes, then the whole world will go Dark Ages."

"There is a poison loose today, and America—America at its best—is the only antidote. That's why it is critical that we stand by our principles of free trade and welcome the world to do business in our land, as long as there is no security threat."

This is a feel-good vote in the heat of the moment that I think the House will live to regret. It's time for us to decide whether we are going to continually respond to 9/11 with a reactive fear, or whether we're going to move forward and engage the world with confidence. Today, I will vote for the latter.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOOZMAN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOOZMAN). Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SABO

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABO:

Page 83, after line 16, insert the following new section:

SEC. 3011A. (a) Section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 721. INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY IMPLICATIONS.

''(a) INVESTIGATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon receiving written notification, as prescribed by regulations under this section, of any merger, acquisition, or takeover proposed or pending on or after the date of the enactment of this section by or with any foreign person which could result in foreign control of any person engaged in interstate commerce in the United States, the President, acting through the President's designee and the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States shall conduct an investigation to determine the effects, if any, of the proposed or pending merger, acquisition, or takeover on the national security of the United States.

''(2) TIMING.—Any investigation required under paragraph (1) shall be completed before the end of the 75-day period beginning on the date of the receipt by the President or the President's designee of written notification of the proposed or pending merger, acquisition, or takeover.

''(b) CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any information or documentary material filed with the President or the President's designee pursuant to this section shall be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and no such information or documentary material may be made public, except as may be relevant to any administrative or judicial action or proceeding.

''(2) AVAILABILITY TO THE CONGRESS.—No provision of paragraph (1) shall be construed as preventing the disclosure of any information or documentary material to either House of Congress or to any duly authorized committee or subcommittee of the Congress.

''(c) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States established pursuant to Executive Order No. 11858 (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Committee') shall be a multi-agency committee to carry out this section and such other assignments as the President may designate.

''(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be comprised of the following members:

''(A) The Secretary of the Treasury.

''(B) The Secretary of State.

''(C) The Secretary of Defense.

''(D) The Secretary of Homeland Security.

''(E) The Attorney General.

''(F) The Secretary of Commerce.

''(G) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

''(H) The United States Trade Representative.

''(I) The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors.

''(J) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

''(3) CHAIRPERSON.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall be the Chairperson of the Committee.

''(4) OTHER MEMBERS.—The Chairperson of the Committee shall involve the heads of such other Federal agencies, the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, and the Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy in any investigation under subsection (a) as the Chairperson determines to be appropriate on the basis of the facts and circumstances of the transaction under investigation.

''(5) ROLE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—The Director of National Intelligence shall provide appropriate intelligence analysis and intelligence briefings to the Committee.

''(d) ACTION BY THE PRESIDENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No proposed or pending acquisition, merger, or takeover, of a person engaged in interstate commerce in the United States by or with foreign persons may occur unless the President, on the basis of an investigation and report by the Committee, finds that such acquisition, merger or takeover, will not threaten to impair the national security of the United States, as defined by regulations prescribed pursuant to this section, and approves the transaction.

''(2) ENFORCEMENT.—The President shall direct the Attorney General to seek appropriate relief, including divestment relief, in the district courts of the United States in order to implement and enforce—

''(A) any finding, action, or determination under this section of disapproval of an acquisition, merger, or takeover; or

''(B) any conditions imposed on any approval of any acquisition, merger, or takeover.

''(3) FINALITY OF DETERMINATIONS.—All actions and determinations under this section shall be final and not subject to judicial review.

''(e) FINDINGS BY THE PRESIDENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A finding under this section of impairment or threatened impairment to national security shall be based on credible evidence that leads the President to believe that—

''(A) the foreign interest exercising control might take action that threatens to impair the national security; and

''(B) other provisions of law do not provide adequate and appropriate authority for the President to protect the national security.

''(2) FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED.—Any investigation under this section shall take into account the following factors:

''(A) Domestic production needed for projected national defense requirements.

''(B) The capability and capacity of domestic industries to meet national defense requirements, including the availability of human resources, products, technology, materials, and other supplies and services.

''(C) The control of domestic industries and commercial activity by foreign citizens as it affect the capability and capacity of the United States to meet the requirements of national security.

''(D) The potential effects of the proposed or pending transaction on sales of military goods, equipment, or technology to any country—

''(i) identified by the Secretary of State—

''(I) under section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as a country that supports terrorism;

''(II) under section 6(l) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as a country of concern regarding missile proliferation; or

''(III) under section 6(m) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as a country of concern regarding the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons; or

''(ii) listed under section 309(c) of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 on the 'Nuclear Non-Proliferation-Special Country List' (15 C.F.R. Part 778, Supplement No. 4) or any successor list.

''(E) The potential effects on the proposed or pending transaction on United States international technological leadership in areas affecting United States national security.

''(f) REPORT TO THE CONGRESS.—Upon making any determination to approve or disapprove any merger, acquisition, or takeover by or with any foreign person which could result in foreign control of any person engaged in interstate commerce in the United States, the President shall immediately transmit to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives a written report of the President's determination under this section to approve or disapprove such merger, acquisition, or takeover, including a detailed explanation of the finding made and factors considered.

''(g) CONGRESSIONAL ACTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the determination of the President contained in the report transmitted to the Congress under subsection (f) is that the President will approve any merger, acquisition, or takeover under subsection (d) and not later than 30 days after the date on which Congress receives the report, a joint resolution described in paragraph (2) is enacted into law, then the President shall take such action under subsection (d) as is necessary to prohibit the merger, acquisition, or takeover, including, if such acquisition has been completed, directing the Attorney General to seek divestment or other appropriate relief in the district courts of the United States.

''(2) JOINT RESOLUTION DESCRIBED.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'joint resolution' means a joint resolution of the Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That the Congress disapproves the determination of approval of the President contained in the report submitted to Congress pursuant to section 721(f) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 on _____.', with the blank space being filled with the appropriate date.

''(3) COMPUTATION OF REVIEW PERIOD.—In computing the 30-day period referred to in paragraph (1), there shall be excluded any day described in section 154(b) of the Trade Act of 1974.

''(h) REGULATIONS.—The President shall direct the issuance of regulations to carry out this section. Such regulations shall, to the extent possible, minimize paperwork burdens and shall to the extent possible coordinate reporting requirements under this section with reporting requirements under any other provision of Federal law.

''(i) EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.—No provision of this section shall be construed as altering or affecting any existing authority, power, process, regulation, investigation, enforcement measure, or review provided by any other provision of law.

''(j) TECHNOLOGY RISK ASSESSMENTS.—In any case in which an assessment of the risk of diversion of defense critical technology is performed by the Committee or any other designee of the President, a copy of such assessment shall be provided to any other designee of the President responsible for reviewing or investigating a merger, acquisition, or takeover under this section.

''(k) BIENNIAL REPORT ON CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to assist the Congress in its oversight responsibilities with respect to this section, the President and such agencies as the President shall designate shall complete and furnish to the Congress, not later than May 1, 2007, and upon the expiration of every 2 years thereafter, a report, both in classified and unclassified form, which—

''(A) evaluates whether there is credible evidence of a coordinated strategy by 1 or more countries or companies to acquire United States companies involved in research, development, or production of critical technologies for which the United States is a leading producer; and

''(B) evaluates whether there are industrial espionage activities directed or directly assisted by foreign governments against private United States companies aimed at obtaining commercial secrets related to critical technology.

''(2) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'critical technologies' means technologies identified under title VI of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 or other critical technology, critical components, or critical technology items essential to national defense or security identified pursuant to this section.

''(1) BIENNIAL REPORT ON CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE.—In order to assist the Congress in its oversight responsibilities, the President and such agencies as the President shall designate shall complete and furnish to the Congress, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection and upon the expiration of every 2 years thereafter, a report, both in classified and unclassified form, which—

''(1) lists all critical infrastructure, as defined under subtitle B of title II of Public Law 107–296, that is owned, controlled or dominated by an alien, a foreign corporation, or a foreign government;

''(2) evaluates whether there is credible evidence of a coordinated strategy by 1 or more countries or companies to acquire United States critical infrastructure; and

''(3) evaluates whether there are industrial espionage activities directed or directly assisted by foreign governments against private United States companies controlling critical infrastructure.''.

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to the review and investigation of any acquisition, merger, or takeover which is or becomes subject to section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2170) (as in effect immediately before the date of the enactment of this Act or on or after such date) that has not become final before the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed that the Rules Committee has not allowed me to offer my amendment to strengthen the CFIUS foreign investment review process to this bill.

Americans deserve a rigorous review of foreign investments that could affect our national security. We all know now that the Bush administration was sleepwalking through the review of the Dubai Ports World transaction to acquire shipping terminals at six major U.S. ports.

We should fix the process. Never again should we find that the President and the Secretaries of Homeland Security, Treasury and Defense are unaware of a foreign takeover of a critical U.S. asset until after it is approved.

The bill kills the Dubai Ports World deal. It does not, however, deal with the larger problem of an inadequate foreign investment review process. An amendment I offered in committee would have fixed the problem for the future.

My amendment would strengthen the CFIUS process in the following ways: all transactions that result in foreign control of any person engaged in interstate commerce would be required to undergo a full review to determine whether it affects U.S. national security.

Today, foreign firms voluntarily, let me say that again, voluntarily notify us of these transactions. I believe notification must be mandatory to ensure that our government knows about all such transactions.

My amendment would also retain the Secretary of the Treasury as the chairperson of the committee.

Under my amendment, the President would be required to approve or disapprove all transactions. Today, if the President takes no action, the transaction is automatically approved.

My amendment would extend the CFIUS review period to the full 75 days. Current practice allows most transactions to be reviewed within 30 days, with an additional 45 days of review only if flags are raised.

The amendment would also require the Congress to be notified of Presidential decisions. Furthermore, Congress could overturn approvals within 30 days by a joint resolution. Today, Congress is notified of a CFIUS transaction only when the President disapproves one, and we discover about approvals, like we did in the most recent case, through the press.

Under my amendment, the administration would also be required to report to Congress on foreign ownership of all U.S. critical infrastructure within 90 days of enactment of this bill. Today, no one really knows how much of our critical infrastructure is in the hands of foreign companies and foreign governments.

If we fail to fix the deep flaws in the CFIUS process, our Nation will be vulnerable in the future. We should not take that chance. We should act now to strengthen the foreign investment review process.

I would hope the gentleman from California, the distinguished chairman, would not insist on his point of order so the House may have a vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this place is really something else. We just had a debate on an amendment that doesn't do ''nothing'' to or for ''nobody''.

The Dubai deal is already dead, and so it is irrelevant whether this House votes for the Gilchrest amendment or not. Because the Dubai deal is already dead, the Lewis Amendment is eviscerated; it does not do anything. It leaves the country with the same problem that we had before we discovered the Dubai controversy.

What Mr. SABO is doing today is what he usually does, which is to try to bring a bit of objectivity and concern for substance into a political pit. And what Mr. SABO is saying in his amendment is ''Let's fix the process so that we do not have the future spectacle of a President to the United States being clueless when a transaction like Dubai is about to take place.''

So what Mr. SABO is saying is, ''Look, the problem with the process is that, right now, it is voluntary, whether or not the people with an economic interest in such a transaction ever notifies our government or not.''

What the Sabo Amendment would do is to say, ''Let's make sure our government always knows what is happening with these kind of transactions.'' And the second thing the Sabo Amendment does is to make certain that Congress can have a role, if it chooses, in this process. Because right now the only time Congress is ever informed is if the President turns down a transaction. They are not informed if the President goes ahead with it.

So I would suggest it would be quaint indeed if this House uses a technicality in the rules to eliminate the only amendment that does something and then makes a big political production out of voting on the Gilchrest amendment, which is totally irrelevant. It is as irrelevant as the Lewis amendment is, because Dubai is already done, the deal is gone, it is quashed.

What Mr. SABO is trying to do is to create some order for the future.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

□ 1730

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I thank my good friend. I rise in support of this amendment.

As I suggested in addressing the last amendment, we need to be driven by people with expertise, not by fear and prejudice. What Mr. SABO is suggesting is that we get the facts on the table so that we can make the most informed judgment. That is all it is. We are not necessarily going to automatically reject anyone or accept anyone.

Let's have the facts on the table, take the time, let the experts on the Committee for Foreign Investment in the United States do a thorough investigation. I think it will satisfy our constituents' concerns, but it will also enable us to make much more responsible decisions that we have made in the last week. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed that a point of order is

raised on this very good amendment, but I would concede the point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GILCHREST

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) 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 38, noes 377, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

AYES—38

Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Blumenauer
Brady (TX)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Conaway
Davis, Tom
Ehlers
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Hensarling
Hoekstra
Jefferson
Kline
Kolbe
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
McCrery
McDermott
Miller (MI)
Moran (VA)
Neugebauer
Olver
Oxley
Rahall
Reichert
Rohrabacher
Sabo
Schwarz (MI)
Shadegg
Smith (WA)
Thomas
Thornberry
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

NOES—377

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews
Becerra
Boren
Buyer
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Evans
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Lantos
Matsui
McCollum (MN)
Norwood
Peterson (MN)
Sweeney
Westmoreland

□ 1800

Messrs. BOEHNER, SCOTT of Georgia, NUNES, WYNN, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Messrs. SAXTON, MEEK of Florida, TIAHRT, Mrs. MUSGRAVE and Mr. RANGEL changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. FRANKS of Arizona, McDERMOTT, and HENSARLING changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LEWIS of California. 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. GINGREY) having assumed the chair, Mr. BOOZMAN, 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. 4939) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MISCELLANEOUS TRADE AND TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4944.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4944, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 2, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—412

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx