

how much damage our strikes had actually done to the Iranian program. In addition to questions about the direct effects, a decision to strike Iran, would have enormous diplomatic consequences for the United States, and would likely lead to Iranian retaliation against our already overextended troops in Iraq, and probably against our ally, Israel.

So without a viable military option, we are left with making multi-lateral diplomacy effective. This is the right course, but it is one that the Bush administration has been extremely loathe to pursue, and one at which they have shown little proficiency.

If a nuclear-armed Iran is “very de-stabilizing,” as the President has said it is—and I do believe it is—then we need to make that view, and the implications of that view, clear to Russia and China and even to our partners in Europe. Fortunately, this legislation provides the administration with new and useful tools that can be applied to help make that case. Our message must be that this urgent problem can be addressed if the will is there to do so.

In short, Iran needs to become urgent for the administration before it will become urgent for anyone else. Only concerted, sustained multilateral pressure has any chance of convincing Iran to change course. And if Iran chooses not to change course, then the international community must be prepared to pursue effective multilateral sanctions against the regime. Unfortunately, while the EU-3 shares our view that an Iran with nuclear weapons is not an acceptable outcome, it seems that Russia and China do not. If the administration can't convince those nations that it is in their interest for Iran not to have nuclear weapons, then we need to start considering what options remain to us unilaterally, what the cost of the options would be and how we could go about containing a nuclear-armed Iran.

One last point Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the bill we are considering today does not contain the language regarding pension plans and mutual funds that would require the managers of such funds to notify investors if any of the assets of a particular fund are invested in an entity which has invested in Iran and may be subject to sanctions under ILSA. I think such notifications are consistent with the fiduciary responsibilities of fund managers and would have prevented Americans from unwittingly fueling Iran's drive to acquire nuclear weapons, simply by contributing to their 401(k)'s. Nevertheless, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the march to war with Iran. I am as concerned as the authors and supporters of this bill about Iran's nuclear weapons program. But I do not believe that levying additional sanctions and encouraging regime change is the correct course. Instead, we should work with our allies to negotiate a diplomatic solution.

The “Iran Freedom Support Act”, H.R. 6198, will antagonize Iran's government. Provisions calling for democracy promotion and “the exercise of self-determination” will be interpreted as a direct assault on Iran's sovereignty and may prompt Iran to discontinue ongoing negotiations. Unilateral sanctions may also discourage France, Germany, Italy, and Spain from working to broker an international agreement. Our allies do not appreciate it when we “go it alone.”

Dissidents will also be hurt by our offer of financial and political assistance. As in Iraq, in-

dividuals and groups that ally with America will see their integrity questioned and their reputations for independence undermined.

Iranian families will be hurt by sanctions that prohibit foreign investment in the country's petroleum industries. Sanctions already in place have not impacted Iran's behavior. Why would new prohibitions on investment succeed where old sanctions have failed?

Finally, the American people will be less secure. Antagonizing Iran will not stop or even slow nuclear weapons development. Instead, sanctions will prompt Iran to redouble its efforts as a means of saving domestic and international face.

The Bush administration and Republicans in Congress have already made a mess of Iraq and allowed warlords to gain control of much of Afghanistan's countryside. This legislation takes us a step closer to similar results in Iran. I urge my colleagues to vote “no”.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6198, introduced by my colleagues on the House International Relations Committee.

The international community continues to look the other way as Iran claims they will move forward in the process of enriching uranium.

The leaders of Iran decided the IAEA deadline did not apply to them and I strongly believe have no interest in negotiating with the West.

The President of Iran was clear about his intentions to enrich uranium at the United Nations General Assembly a few weeks ago.

His performance in New York and at the Council of Foreign Relations was a display of insanity.

He continues to proudly defend his comments about the Holocaust being a myth and how Iran is not trying to acquire nuclear weapons even as more and more information comes out about their covert nuclear program that was helped along by AQ Khan's black market nuclear network

This is a man who was basically appointed by the Mullahs in Tehran.

I say this because any reform minded candidate was removed from the ballots. Iran is not a democracy; the government of Iran is run by zealots using terrorism to meet their goals.

We need to support the people of Iran as they continue to be repressed by the Mullahs.

The people of Iran deserve freedom and democracy.

I strongly support this bill and I urge all of my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6198, the Iran Freedom Support Act, because this bill could very well derail the diplomatic efforts currently underway that are our best hope for ending the possibility of an Iranian nuclear weapon.

Let me be clear that I agree with the great majority of which this bill would do. I believe that we should extend the Iran Libya Sanctions Act. I believe that we should support human rights in Iran.

But as with so many things in life, Mr. Speaker, timing is everything. And this is the wrong time to pass this bill.

Crucial negotiations between Iran and the European Union in Berlin are reportedly closing in on a deal that would suspend Iran's uranium enrichment program while multilateral

talks commence. The Bush administration has so botched the issue of containing Iran's nuclear ambitions that we have few choices left. These negotiations were just suspended for a week, and it would surprise no one if Iran did not return to the table. But make no mistake: as bad as the negotiation option may turn out to be, it remains our best chance of stopping Iran from ever building a nuclear weapon.

We need to support these negotiations, not undermine them. For the Congress to pass language which essentially makes regime change in Iran the official policy of the United States would be counterproductive while these negotiations in Berlin remain promising.

I could support this bill at another time, but not now, not when its passage could kill the ongoing negotiations.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6198, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SECURE BORDER INITIATIVE FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2006

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6162) to require financial accountability with respect to certain contract actions related to the Secure Border Initiative of the Department of Homeland Security.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 6162

*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 “Secure Border Initiative Financial Accountability Act of 2006”.

#### SEC. 2. SECURE BORDER INITIATIVE FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security shall review each contract action related to the Department's Secure Border Initiative having a value greater than \$20,000,000, to determine whether each such action fully complies with applicable cost requirements, performance objectives, program milestones, inclusion of small, minority, and women-owned business, and timelines. The Inspector General shall complete a review under this subsection with respect to a contract action—

(1) not later than 60 days after the date of the initiation of the action; and

(2) upon the conclusion of the performance of the contract.

(b) REPORT BY INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Upon completion of each review described in subsection (a), the Inspector General shall submit to the Secretary of Homeland Security a report containing the findings of the review, including findings regarding any cost overruns, significant delays in contract execution, lack of rigorous departmental contract management, insufficient departmental financial oversight, bundling that limits the

ability of small business to compete, or other high risk business practices.

(c) **REPORT BY SECRETARY.**—Not later than 30 days after the receipt of each report required under subsection (b), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the findings of the report by the Inspector General and the steps the Secretary has taken, or plans to take, to address the problems identified in such report.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—In addition to amounts that are otherwise authorized to be appropriated to the Office of the Inspector General, an additional amount equal to at least five percent for fiscal year 2007, at least six percent for fiscal year 2008, and at least seven percent for fiscal year 2009 of the overall budget of the Office for each such fiscal year is authorized to be appropriated to the Office to enable the Office to carry out this section.

(e) **ACTION BY INSPECTOR GENERAL.**—In the event the Inspector General becomes aware of any improper conduct or wrongdoing in accordance with the contract review required under subsection (a), the Inspector General shall, as expeditiously as practicable, refer information related to such improper conduct or wrongdoing to the Secretary of Homeland Security or other appropriate official in the Department of Homeland Security for purposes of evaluating whether to suspend or debar the contractor.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this bill, and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6162, the Secure Border Initiative Financial Accountability Act of 2006.

This bipartisan legislation will help to ensure that taxpayer funds dedicated to technologies to secure our Nation's borders are spent efficiently and effectively.

The ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security, Mr. THOMPSON, and I have worked for almost a year on this important bill.

Last November, I introduced H.R. 4284, the Secure Border Financial Accountability Act of 2005. I was pleased that Chairman KING and Ranking Member THOMPSON were original co-sponsors of that bill.

We also worked to include the language in the border security bill which the Committee on Homeland Security marked up on November 11, 2005. At that time, Mr. THOMPSON added a key

funding trigger to ensure that the Inspector General had the necessary resources to respond quickly to major disasters.

This language ultimately was included in H.R. 4437, the Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005, which passed the House on December 16 of that same year. We again worked in a bipartisan manner to include this provision in H.R. 5814, the Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act for 2007, which the Committee on Homeland Security reported favorably in July of this year.

But, why is this bill so important? The Homeland Security Subcommittee on Management, Integration, and Oversight, which I chair, has held three hearings over the past year and a half on the existing border technology program.

We found the Integrated Surveillance Intelligence System, ISIS, and its remote video surveillance program, was plagued by mismanagement, operational problems and financial waste. On June 16, 2005, our committee heard from the GSA deputy inspector general that electronic surveillance equipment covered only 2 to 4 percent of the border and that over \$200 million was paid by the Federal Government for poor, incomplete and never-delivered goods and services.

At our second hearing on December 16, 2005, the Department of Homeland Security Inspector General testified that cameras and sensors were not integrated, oversight of contractor performance was ineffective, numerous poles and cameras were never installed along the border, and millions of program dollars remained unspent at the GSA.

Our third hearing on February 16, 2006, examined the disciplinary actions taken by the Department against employees responsible for these problems at ISIS to ensure that those employees would not be involved in any future border technology contracts.

Last Thursday, Secretary Chertoff announced the contract for the technology component of the Secure Border Initiative, known as SBInet. This is a 6-year, multi-billion dollar contract, and it is designed to establish a virtual fence across 6,000 miles of our borders through a mix of poles, cameras, ground-based radar, aircraft and other aerial platforms.

My subcommittee intends to hold a fourth hearing on November 15 to review the SBInet contract. The purpose of this bill is to prevent the same type of financial mismanagement of ISIS from taking place in SBInet.

Specifically, this bill directs the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security to review each contract action related to the Department's Secure Border Initiative that is a contracting amount of \$20 million or more. This contract review will determine whether each contract action fully complies with cost requirements, performance objectives, and timelines.

The bill further requires that the Homeland Security Inspector General report to the Secretary of Homeland Security on cost overruns, significant delays in contract execution, lack of rigorous contract management, insufficient financial oversight, and other high-risk business practices.

The Secretary of Homeland Security is then required to notify the Congress and take immediate steps to rectify the problems within 30 days.

To carry out this vigorous oversight, the bill includes a provision by Mr. THOMPSON that would authorize additional funds. SBInet will involve numerous large and small Federal contractors to implement the technology required to successfully secure our Nation's borders.

We look forward to working with the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, Mr. TOM DAVIS, in the coming months to ensure that we have the best oversight process in place to ensure SBInet is cost effective.

A "yes" vote on this legislation will send a strong message to the contractor and to the Department that Congress intends to "hold their feet to the fire" in fulfilling these contract requirements.

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

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, the ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the subcommittee for allowing me to speak on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. ROGERS for his commitment to stemming waste, fraud and abuse in the Department of Homeland Security.

This bill, H.R. 6162, would require the Department of Homeland Security Inspector General to immediately review any Secure Border Initiative contract valued at \$20 million or more. By requiring a review once this amount has been triggered, the Inspector General can immediately review the cost requirement, performance objectives and timelines for the SBI project.

This trigger builds accountability into every contract made for the Secure Border Initiative and will provide the American public with some certainty about where their money is going. This bill also will allow the Inspector General to express its concerns if they find unsatisfactory practices early on.

□ 1400

They will not have to wait until all the money is out the door and excuses are being made before they get involved in the oversight of this multi-billion dollar project.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to emphasize that this review would include the assessment of the inclusion of small, minority, and women-owned businesses in any subcontracting plans, an area of constant challenge for the Department.

I guess some people would wonder why this kind of oversight is necessary or whether we are being fair. Let me tell you why this kind of oversight is necessary for a project of this size.

First of all, SBInet is expected to cost around \$2.5 billion. Under the predecessors to Secure Border, ISIS and American Shield, we have spent over \$429 million and protected only 4 percent of the border. That is about \$100 million for every 1 percent of the border. It is not an understatement to say that this has not been a cost-effective use of funds.

The Inspector General has found that the Department's failure in these past programs has been due to poor planning, bad equipment purchases, and spotty implementation. We are told once again that this program will solve the problems of our porous border through the use of integrated and coordinated technology and manpower. It seems like I have heard this before, Mr. Speaker.

We have not seen a detailed rendering of the Department's overall strategy. And in fact, this procurement allows the industry to pitch solutions based not on the Department's objectives. As I have said many times, I support the use of technology as a force-multiplier in the effort to secure our borders. However, I also support the effective use of our taxpayers' money. We all want to see this initiative fare better than its failed predecessors, but that will only happen with effective oversight and management of this program.

I commend Mr. ROGERS again and I commend my ranking member, Mr. MEEK, for their support of this legislation. I look forward not only to the passage of this legislation, but I look forward to working with both these gentlemen to make sure that with any other large contracts we provide similar oversight to make sure that the taxpayers' dollars are well spent.

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

I think folks can take from the dialogue here today that this committee, this full committee, and particularly this Management Subcommittee that the gentleman from Florida and I are the ranking member and Chair of, are going to be vigorous in our oversight of these contracts going forward to ensure that we do not have future problems like we saw with ISIS and American Shield.

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

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the great State of Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the distinguished gentlemen, the ranking member and the chairman of the Management Subcommittee on Homeland Security, that deal with these crucial issues.

I rise to support the Secure Border Initiative Financial Accountability Act and offer that there is an overall vision that this is a very important component of, and I hope that as we move this legislation along we still may have a window of opportunity to ensure that the Secure Border Initiative that Secretary Chertoff speaks of, that this is a major component of, is in place.

And I just want to thank both gentlemen for your leadership and acknowledge that, even with this Financial Accountability Act, we are still missing and need to move forward on: More agents to patrol our borders, secure our ports of entry and enforce immigration laws; expanded detention and removal capabilities to eliminate "catch and release" once and for all; a comprehensive and systematic upgrading of the technology used in controlling the border, including increased manned aerial assets, expanded use of UAVs, and next-generation detection technology; increased investment in infrastructure improvements at the border, providing additional physical security to sharply reduce illegal border crossings; and greatly increased interior enforcement of our immigration laws, including more robust work site enforcement; and, of course, an earned access to legalization.

We must not frighten America. Let them know that we are doing the job. But we can do both. We can account for everyone that is inside our borders, and we can work to protect and secure our northern and southern border. This initiative, the Financial Accountability, is crucial because it gives the Inspector General oversight and we, as the Management Subcommittee of the Homeland Security Committee, have seen the fractures in the oversight of spending money. This is an important way to provide the Department of Homeland Security's Inspector General to immediately review any Secure Border Initiative contract valued at \$20 million or more.

Let me thank the two gentlemen, Mr. ROGERS and Mr. MEEK, who spent hours and hours reviewing some of the mishaps that have occurred with contracts that have not fulfilled the responsibility of securing America, contracts that have violated our trust. They have not had the right equipment, the technology. It hasn't worked. They haven't had the right staff.

This way, the Inspector General can make findings, including cost overruns, delays in contract execution, lack of rigorous contract management, insufficient Department oversight, and limitations on small business participation, which now will be able to be reported under this particular bill. Within 30 days of receiving the Inspector General's report, the Secretary must submit a corrective action plan to Congress, and as well we must ensure open opportunity.

Let me congratulate the ranking member, Mr. THOMPSON, and I joined

him on these amendments that will highlight small businesses, automatically triggers oversight based on the award of contracts once a certain monetary amount has been reached, requires that the Inspector General conduct a review during the pendency of the project and requires that the Inspector General assess the inclusion of small, minority, and women-owned businesses in the SBI subcontracting plans as a factor in its review.

If that is not one of the larger pieces, everywhere we go, as this Department grows larger and larger and larger, Homeland Security spends more and more money, the question is, why can't the homegrown people do the job, the small businesses, the women-owned businesses, the minority-owned businesses? And the answer is a blank. We don't have an answer.

This committee has been in the leadership realm, this subcommittee with Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member MEEK. You have been in the driver's seat on pushing the Homeland Security Department and our subcommittee in ensuring that the little guys get the work.

We are now suffering in Louisiana and the Gulf Region because the little guys have been ignored, and the jurisdictions down there say we have got the little guys willing to work but the big guys have thrown us out the door and not allowed us to be able to do an efficient, cost-efficient, good job. It has been the layered contracts with multinationals, and it never gets down to small business persons.

So I rise to support this initiative, the Secure Border Initiative Financial Accountability Act, and I want to thank Cherri Branson and Rosaline Cohen for their leadership of staff.

I thank the ranking member for yielding to me, and I ask my colleagues to support it. But our work is yet undone until we finish comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6162, requiring financial accountability with respect to certain contract actions related to the Secure Border Initiative (SBI) of the Department of Homeland Security.

The Secure Border Initiative, SBI, is a comprehensive multi-year plan to secure America's borders and reduce illegal migration.

Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff has announced an overall vision for the SBI which includes: more agents to patrol our borders, secure our ports of entry and enforce immigration laws; expanded detention and removal capabilities to eliminate "catch and release" once and for all; a comprehensive and systemic upgrading of the technology used in controlling the border, including increased manned aerial assets, expanded use of UAVs, and next-generation detection technology; increased investment in infrastructure improvements at the border—providing additional physical security to sharply reduce illegal border crossings; and greatly increased interior enforcement of our immigration laws—including more robust work site enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, an earlier version of this important bill passed the House as part of a border security measure in December 2005. Furthermore, the language of this bill also appears in fiscal year 2007 DHS authorization measure that passed the Committee on Homeland Security in July 2006.

This bill requires the DHS's Inspector General to immediately and automatically review any Secure Border Initiative contract valued at more than \$20 million. This review necessarily entails examining the cost requirements, performance objectives, and program timelines set by the Department for the SBI project and requires an assessment of the inclusion of small, minority and women-owned businesses in any subcontracting plans.

The Inspector General's review must be completed within 60 days after its initiation and reported to the Secretary of DHS. Within 30 days of receiving the Inspector General's report, the Secretary of DHS must submit to the Committee on Homeland Security a report on the Inspector General's findings and the corrective action plan the Secretary has taken and plans to take.

This automatic triggering of oversight by the Inspector General for contracts greater than \$20 million is critical to minimize the waste, abuse, and fraud, which unfortunately has plagued many of DHS's contracts. In addition, this review will occur during the pendency of the project rather than at its termination to minimize waste and ensure redemptive steps are taken expeditiously. The Inspector General's findings will include cost overruns, delays in contract execution, lack of rigorous Department contract management, insufficient Department financial oversight, limitations on small business participation, and other high risk business practices.

Moreover, this bill requires that the Inspector General assess the inclusion of small, minority and women-owned businesses in the SBI subcontracting plans as a factor in its review. Historically, small, minority and women-owned businesses have been disadvantaged in seeking and winning these types of contracts. There may be inherent disadvantages for these businesses, but it is clear their potential is tremendous. It is critical that DHS ensures that these businesses have the ability to compete fairly for these lucrative opportunities.

I am very proud that my district, Harris County and Houston ranks sixth and Texas ranks fifth in the country for the largest number of African-American owned firms, following New York, California, Florida, and Georgia. Minority and women-owned businesses across the country will appreciate the effort to preserve their opportunity to compete for these contracts. I encourage my colleagues to remember that there are a great many barriers to minority and women business professionals, and provisions such as these preserve equal access and open opportunities.

In the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma, small, minority and disadvantaged businesses from the region were shut out of disaster-related contracts because goals and preferences were not in place. Since the late 1960s, it has been the policy of the Federal Government to assist small businesses owned by minorities and women to become fully competitive, viable business concerns. As a result, the Small Business Administration has set forth government-wide goals to level the playing field for small and minority businesses

seeking Federal Government contracts. Leveling the playing field continues to be a central concern for me and should continue to be a central concern for this Congress.

The oversight required in this bill is integral because SBInet is expected to be a \$2.5 billion procurement and the contracts allocated through SBI will be substantial. For example, last week, DHS awarded a contract valued at \$80 million to a team led by Boeing under the SBInet program. Furthermore, the predecessors to SBI—ISIS and American Shield—fell far short of expectations. The Department spent over \$429 million and protected 4 percent of the border, which is about \$100 million for every 1 percent of the border.

Similarly, the Inspector General has found that the Department's failure in these past programs has been due to poor planning, lax program management, inappropriate equipment purchases and spotty implementation.

This bill is the first step in requiring effective oversight. Realistically, effective oversight cannot be the sole province of Inspectors General. It is Congress's constitutional duty to conduct systematic oversight of the programs and activities of the executive branch. Just as the Department cannot contract out its responsibilities, neither can we.

Consequently, I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think we have identified the true essence of this bill; and I think also that it is very, very important. I want to take from not only Ms. JACKSON-LEE but also Mr. ROGERS and Ranking Member BENNIE THOMPSON in saying in this area, when we look at management and oversight of one of the fastest-growing Departments and the largest Department in the history of the world, that we have to put these parameters in place because we have the responsibility of article I, section 1 of the U.S. Constitution to make sure that we have the level of oversight that is needed.

I think the record reflects for itself that when oversight is not paramount the taxpayers lose; and I hope, like Mr. THOMPSON said, that we can expand this kind of theme throughout other programs in the Department of Homeland Security.

Now, the people that are happy today are members on this committee and, hopefully, the Members when they vote for this piece of legislation. But the Inspector General is very happy because the Inspector General, especially in the Department of Homeland Security, writes these reports, submits them to Congress, and then there is a foot-dragging process at the Department of Homeland Security.

Within this piece of legislation within 30 days they have to respond as it relates to corrective action. And it would hopefully bring about the kind of accountability not only that we look for on the economic side, Mr. Speaker, but also look for as it relates to protecting our borders. Two programs before this program, well over \$400 million, \$429 million, was spent. We are going back

again with a contract with a different company that would take us to \$2.5 billion. We had the Secretary before the full committee just yesterday, or the day before last, and this was the line of my questioning. Because we do not want to be after the fact; we want to be before it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I encourage the Members to vote an affirmative on this very good piece of legislation; and hopefully, just hopefully, Mr. Speaker, we could head further into other contracting matters not only within the Department of Homeland Security but I would also add the Department of Defense and other departments like it so we can do away with waste and having individuals watching over the shoulders of individuals that may not hold the taxpayers' dollars as high as we do as it relates to accountability.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would like to sum up by emphasizing that it is critically important for the Members to recognize that we need to put these kinds of accountability measures in place so that we can ensure that as we go forward with the massive expenditures we are going to make to secure our borders that we don't have a repeat of the waste, fraud, and abuse that we have seen in the past.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote for H.R. 6162.

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 Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6162.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL GME SUPPORT REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2006

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 5574) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Children's Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2006".*

#### SEC. 2. PROGRAM OF PAYMENTS TO CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS THAT OPERATE GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

*(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 340E of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256e) is amended—*