



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2006

No. 127

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 13, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable PHIL GINGREY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Lord God of the universe, we praise You and thank You as the 109th Congress gathers to resume its work in serving this Nation. Grant all the Members of this assembly wisdom, prudence and courage as these words of Moses are taken to heart and You pour forth Your spirit upon two new Members as well:

“If you will only obey the Lord your God by diligently observing all the commandments that I enjoin on you today, the Lord your God will raise you high above all the nations of the Earth. Every blessing shall come upon you and overwhelm you, if only you obey the Lord your God.”

With renewed faith, we place all our trust in You, and give You glory, Lord, by our words and deeds both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. POE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

NO SUBSTITUTE FOR VICTORY

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, as the war wages on in the deserts of Iraq, there is talk of a new direction. There are only three options: one, retreat because the fight is a bit rough-going. Two, stalemate. A Vietnam-type politically correct draw. Three, victory.

Mr. Speaker, there is no substitute for victory. Let the generals finish the job, win and bring our troops home. Abandoning Iraq is not in the best interest of the United States. If we sneak out now, who is to say the Iranians and their rogue dictator will not come in and make Iraq a puppet nation of their radicalism.

Confront the armed militias who murder Iraqis in the name of religion, like al-Sa'dr's Mahdi army. The thugs who roam the streets are not engaged in civil war, but terror and anarchy and murder.

The question I was asked when I was in Iraq by Iraqi citizens was, is America going to leave like in 1991 before the war is won? While American politicians are debating that question, turn the U.S. military loose on the enemy and let our troops decide that question with total victory.

And that's just the way it is.

AMERICA'S NEED FOR FUEL INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, at one time the United States of America overwhelmingly was an agrarian country, but today only 2 percent of the population are farmers. Yet those 2 percent feed all 100 percent of us and a great portion of the rest of the world as well.

Now, when it comes to energy, however, we import 60 percent; yet America consumes 25 percent of the world's oil. We need, for the sake of national security, fuel independence. In 2004, we bought over \$100 billion of oil from non-democratic countries, countries like Saudi Arabia, Iran, Iraq, Russia, Venezuela, countries that are not always with the United States on a lot of matters and particularly on their votes in the U.N.

When we do this, we are funding both sides in the war on terrorism. We need to move towards alternatives: biofuel, ethanol, hydrogen. These technologies are already out there; we just need to have a national commitment to have fuel independence.

I have proposed a bill, H.R. 4409, which is cosponsored by Mr. ENGEL of New York, that moves us in that direction in 20 years. I urge my colleagues to join us and take a good serious look at fuel independence.

CONGRATULATING THE HOUSTON DYNAMO

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, soccer anyone? Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Houston Dynamo, located in the 18th Congressional District, who are now the 2006

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H8581

Major League Soccer Cup champions, as they won it just yesterday in front of thousands of soccer fans at Pizza Hut Park. The Houston Dynamo emerged victorious against the New England Revolution.

A bet was made with the mayor of the City of Houston and the mayor of Boston now has to pay up, legally. The win was with a score of 4-3 on penalty kicks after the team played to a 1-1 draw through regulation and extra time.

This is a young team that moved from San Jose, and we in Houston are enthusiastic and absolutely dynamic about the Dynamo. Congratulations to Kelly Gray, Stuart Holden, Dwayne De Rosario and Brian Ching who successfully converted from the penalty spot in the shoot-out. Brian Ching was recognized as the match's most valuable player.

This is the Dynamo's first season in Houston. They have surely made a warm welcome for themselves. The team is led by 2005 Major League Soccer Coach of the Year, Dominic Kinnear. Let me acknowledge Dynamo investor-operator Philip Anschutz for the time and commitment he has given to U.S. soccer and the City of Houston.

Let me also thank Oliver Luck and all of the management team family. I also congratulate the players and their families for making the transition from their other city to Houston, Texas. Let me also say that the Dynamo are great civic leaders and participants. I am delighted that they are going to be involved with our school districts in Houston, the North Forest Independent School District to be able to uplift those students and let them know that staying in school is the right thing to do.

Soccer, anyone? The Houston Dynamo, they are the Major League Soccer Cup winners of 2006. We are proud of them. I yield back knowing that we can play soccer in Houston, Texas.

HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning hour debate, thereafter to resume its session at 11 a.m.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:20 p.m. today.

SIERRA NATIONAL FOREST LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 2006

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 409) to provide for the exchange of land within the Sierra National Forest, California, and for other purposes. 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 "Sierra National Forest Land Exchange Act of 2006".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COUNCIL.—The term "Council" means the Sequoia Council of the Boy Scouts of America.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term "Federal land" means the parcel of land comprising 160 acres and located in E½SW¼ and W½SE¼, sec. 30, T. 9 S., R. 25 E., Mt. Diablo Meridian, California.

(3) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term "non-Federal land" means a parcel of land comprising approximately 80 acres and located in N½NW¼, sec. 29, T. 8 S., R. 26 E., Mt. Diablo Meridian, California.

(4) PROJECT NO. 67.—The term "Project No. 67" means the hydroelectric project licensed pursuant to the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.) as Project No. 67.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. LAND EXCHANGE, SIERRA NATIONAL FOREST, CALIFORNIA.

(a) EXCHANGE AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If, during the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the owner of the non-Federal land offers to convey to the United States title to the non-Federal land and to make a cash equalization payment of \$50,000 to the United States, the Secretary shall convey to the owner of the non-Federal land, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land, except as provided in subsection (d), subject to valid existing rights, and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(2) CORRECTION AND MODIFICATION OF LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the owner of the non-Federal land, may agree to make corrections to the legal descriptions of the Federal land and non-Federal land.

(B) MODIFICATIONS.—The Secretary and the owner of the non-Federal land may agree to make minor modifications to the legal descriptions if the modifications do not affect the overall value of the exchange by more than 5 percent.

(b) VALUATION OF LAND TO BE CONVEYED.—For purposes of this section, during the period referred to in subsection (a)(1)—

(1) the value of the non-Federal land shall be considered to be \$200,000; and

(2) the value of the Federal land shall be considered to be \$250,000.

(c) ADMINISTRATION OF LAND ACQUIRED BY UNITED STATES.—On acquisition by the Secretary, the Secretary shall manage the non-Federal land in accordance with—

(1) the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the "Weeks Act") (16 U.S.C. 480 et seq.); and

(2) any other laws (including regulations) applicable to the National Forest System.

(d) CONDITIONS ON CONVEYANCE OF FEDERAL LAND.—The conveyance by the Secretary under subsection (a) shall be subject to the conditions that—

(1) the recipient of the Federal land convey all 160 acres of the Federal land to the Council not later than 120 days after the date on which the recipient receives title to the Federal land;

(2) in accordance with section 4(a), the Secretary grant to the owner of Project No. 67 an easement; and

(3) in accordance with section 4(b), the owner of Project No. 67 has the right of first refusal regarding any reconveyance of the Federal land by the Council.

(e) DISPOSITION AND USE OF CASH EQUALIZATION FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall deposit the cash equalization payment received under subsection (a)(1) in the fund established by Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the "Sisk Act") (16 U.S.C. 484a).

(2) USE.—Amounts deposited under paragraph (1) shall be available to the Secretary until expended, without further appropriation, for the acquisition of land and any interests in land for the National Forest System in the State of California.

(f) COST COLLECTION FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The owner of the non-Federal land shall pay to the Secretary all direct costs associated with processing the land exchange under this section.

(2) COST COLLECTION ACCOUNT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any amounts received by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in a cost collection account.

(B) USE.—Amounts deposited under subparagraph (A) shall be available to the Secretary until expended, without further appropriation, for the costs associated with the land exchange.

(C) REFUND.—The Secretary shall provide to the owner of the non-Federal land a refund of any amounts remaining in the cost collection account after completion of the land exchange that are not needed to cover expenses of the land exchange.

(g) LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.—For purposes of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-9), the boundaries of the Sierra National Forest shall be considered to be the boundaries of the Sierra National Forest as of January 1, 1965.

SEC. 4. GRANT OF EASEMENT AND RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL.

In accordance with the agreement entered into by the Forest Service, the Council, and the owner of Project No. 67 entitled the "Agreement to Convey Grant of Easement and Right of First Refusal" and executed on April 17, 2006—

(1) the Secretary shall grant an easement to the owner of Project No. 67; and

(2) the Council shall grant a right of first refusal to the owner of Project No. 67.

SEC. 5. EXERCISE OF DISCRETION.

In exercising any discretion necessary to carry out this Act, the Secretary shall ensure that the public interest is well served.

SEC. 6. GRANTS TO IMPROVE THE COMMERCIAL VALUE OF FOREST BIOMASS FOR ELECTRIC ENERGY, USEFUL HEAT, TRANSPORTATION FUELS, AND OTHER COMMERCIAL PURPOSES.

Section 210(d) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15855(d)) is amended by striking "\$50,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2006 through 2016" and inserting "\$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2006 and \$35,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2016".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) each will control 20 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 409 provides for the exchange of land within the Sierra National Forest in California. This bill originally passed the House of Representatives on September 20, 2005, but was recently amended by the Senate.

The land exchange portion of the bill remains unchanged and would exchange 160 acres of Forest Service property, of which only 15 acres is above water, for 80 acres of private land surrounded by national forest. The land owner has agreed to pay the difference of \$50,000 to the Forest Service to finalize the land transfer.

After the completion of the exchange, the land owner will then convey the property to the Sequoia Council Boy Scouts who have run a camp on the land under a special use permit for the last 30 years.

The Senate amendment reduces funding for a biomass grant program authorized by the Energy Policy Act of 1995 to pay, in part, for the funding authorized by the unrelated package of other energy and natural resource-related bills.

This biomass grant program was originally authorized at \$50 million per year, but only received \$4 million in funding this year. The Resources Committee has been very supportive of biomass funding to help reduce hazardous fuels and create valuable byproducts for otherwise unmerchantable woody debris.

And while the Senate's reduction in authorization funding is somewhat distressing, the Resources Committee agrees to pass this bill with the understanding that both the House and the Senate work together to increase the amount appropriated for biomass grants in the future. This would, in turn, reduce the cost of removing hazardous fuels from the forest and save taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill.

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

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

(Ms. HERSETH asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, as Mr. RADANOVICH explained, H.R. 409 directs the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange 160 acres of Federal land in the Sierra National Forest at Shaver Lake for an 80-acre inholding also in the Sierra National Forest.

H.R. 409 also requires that the owners of the non-Federal land make a \$50,000 cash equalization payment and convey the Federal land to the Sequoia Council of the Boy Scouts of America within 120 days of receiving it.

Furthermore, an amendment to H.R. 409 made by the other body makes

changes to the biomass grants under the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

Mr. Speaker, we have no objections to H.R. 409.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 409.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRAIL OF TEARS STUDY ACT

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3085) to amend the National Trails System Act to update the feasibility and suitability study originally prepared for the Trail of Tears National Historic Trail and provide for the inclusion of new trail segments, land components, and campgrounds associated with that trail, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

On page 3, strike lines 1 through 3 and insert the following:

"(iv) The related campgrounds located along the routes and land components described in clauses (i) through (iii).

"(D) No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out subparagraph (C). The Secretary may accept donations for the Trail from private, nonprofit, or tribal organizations."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3085, introduced by Congressman ZACH WAMP of Tennessee and amended by the Senate, would amend the National Trails System Act to update a feasibility study originally prepared for the Trail of Tears in 1987.

This new study would examine new trail segments, land components and

campgrounds associated with the trail, particularly Bell and Bengé Segments.

As my colleagues are aware, the Trail of Tears National Historic Trail encompasses the primary water route and northern land route used during the forced removal of the Cherokee Nation from its homelands in the southeast United States to Indian Territory, which is present-day Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill.

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

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

(Ms. HERSETH asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, the majority has already explained the purpose of H.R. 3085, which was introduced by our colleague from Tennessee, Representative ZACH WAMP. H.R. 3085 passed the Senate this past July and has been returned to us with an amendment from the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, while the amendment made to H.R. 3085 is, in our view, unnecessary, the overall bill is a good one and we have no objection to the adoption of the legislation by the House today.

□ 1415

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank Chairman POMBO, Chairman RADANOVICH, Ranking Member HERSETH, all of the staffs involved for their work through the Resources Committee and subcommittees on this bill. I would also like to thank my Senate cosponsors, Senator COBURN, Senator FRIST, and majority leader Senator ALEXANDER for their involvement as well. I am very proud to be the lead sponsor of H.R. 3085. Completing the story of the Cherokee removal is an important issue for Congress to address. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for it.

I understand we are going to have a recorded vote on this. We are under suspensions, and I am going to need the votes. I am going to ask everyone to come and vote for this.

It has been cosponsored by 20 of my colleagues, all from districts and States in which the additional components are located. I would also like to add that S. 1970, the Senate companion bill, was sponsored by COBURN, FRIST, and ALEXANDER.

As a consequence of the Indian Removal Act of 1830, a detachment led by John Bengé traveled 734 miles starting at Fort Payne, Alabama, continuing through Tennessee, Kentucky, Missouri, Arkansas, and Oklahoma.

The treaty party group led by John A. Bell traveled 765 miles starting at Charleston, Tennessee, traveling through Arkansas, collectively passing through 10 counties in Tennessee eventually.

Also included are 29 forts and the emigration depots located near Fort Payne, Alabama; Ross' Landing, present-day Chattanooga, Tennessee; and Fort Cass, present-day Charleston, Tennessee, where the Cherokee initially were taken after being rounded up from their homes.

Consequently, the intent of H.R. 3085 is to study an expansion of the current Trail of Tears National Historic Trail, which Congress designated in 1987, to include these additional documented components in the National Trails System Act. The proposed additions have been documented by National Park Service historians, military journals, and newspaper accounts.

The bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to complete within 6 months the remaining criteria necessary to determine the designation of additional routes to the Trail of Tears National Historic Trail.

Even today, many interpretation activities along the Trail of Tears seek to remember the historic routes taken by the Benge detachment and the Bell Treaty Party as we are considering inclusion in the National Trails System.

I want to be very clear that it is my intent that this legislation respect private property rights absolutely. I believe the National Park Service has demonstrated strong partnerships geared towards respecting the private property of citizens in its administering of the current Trail of Tears National Historic Trail and will continue to do so upon the addition of the routes.

The designation and interpretation of the sites and trails associated with the Cherokee removal will enhance public understanding of American history. Our greatness as a Nation is our ability to look at our own history objectively and in proper perspective, being mindful of the errors of the past in order to not repeat them. Through this legislation we will honor the historic footsteps taken by the Cherokee and celebrate our future as we remember the past.

Finally, because of historical significance, H.R. 3085 enjoys broad support not only within Congress but also within the Cherokee Nation, Eastern Band of Cherokee and associated trail organizations such as the Trail of Tears Association. The legislation is a wonderful example of how we can better understand a national event through commemoration of the Cherokees' story.

I want to thank principle chief of the Cherokee Nation, Chad Smith; principle chief of the Eastern Band of the Cherokee Nation, Michell Hicks; and everyone at the National and State Trail of Tears Associations, especially Dr. Duane King and Jack Baker.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me say that basically in the last 20 years, we have been missing a big piece of the Trail of Tears. It was enacted by statute 20 years ago, but it was very incomplete. Two major trails were never

added, and now that we have that documentation, it is important for history, it is important for the Cherokee Nation, it is important for the future of our country to understand what happened and where this happened, where we forcibly removed thousands upon thousands of Cherokee and forced them to their new land in Oklahoma, many dying along the way.

It is a tragic story, but it is one that cannot be swept under the rug. The Cherokee are a proud people, and I am very proud of the Cherokee blood in my veins, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me today in honoring the Cherokee Nation in this great story of Native Americans who were forced from their homeland but have survived and are even stronger today because of the challenges they have been through and to make this wrong right in the history of America.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to congratulate the gentleman from Tennessee for his hard work on this important legislation and for his statement on the floor today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3085.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

IDAHO LAND ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1131) to authorize the exchange of certain Federal land within the State of Idaho, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1131

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 "Idaho Land Enhancement Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AGREEMENT.—The term "Agreement" means the agreement executed in April 2005 entitled "Agreement to Initiate, Boise Foot-hills—Northern Idaho Land Exchange", as modified by the agreement executed in March 2006 entitled "Amendment No. 1", and entered into by—

(A) the Bureau of Land Management;

(B) the Forest Service;

(C) the State; and

(D) the City.

(2) BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND.—The term "Bureau of Land Management land" means the approximately 605 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management (including all appurtenances to the land) that is proposed to be acquired by the State, as identified in exhibit A2 of the Agreement and as generally depicted on the maps.

(3) BOARD.—The term "Board" means the Idaho State Board of Land Commissioners.

(4) CITY.—The term "City" means the city of Boise, Idaho.

(5) FEDERAL LAND.—The term "Federal land" means the Bureau of Land Management land and the National Forest System land.

(6) MAPS.—The term "maps" means maps 1 through 7 entitled "Parcel Identification Map: Idaho Lands Enhancement Act Land Exchange" and dated February 28, 2006.

(7) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.—The term "National Forest System land" means the approximately 7,220 acres of land (including all appurtenances to the land) that is—

(A) administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the Idaho Panhandle National Forests and the Clearwater National Forest;

(B) proposed to be acquired by the State;

(C) identified in exhibit A2 of the Agreement; and

(D) generally depicted on the maps.

(8) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(9) STATE.—The term "State" means the State of Idaho, Department of Lands.

(10) STATE LAND.—The term "State land" means the approximately 11,815 acres of land (including all appurtenances to the land) administered by the State that is proposed to be acquired by the United States, as identified in exhibit A1 of the Agreement and as generally depicted on the maps.

SEC. 3. LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with the Agreement and this Act, if the State offers to convey the State land to the United States, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall—

(1) accept the offer; and

(2) on receipt of title to the State land, simultaneously convey to the State the Federal land.

(b) VALID EXISTING RIGHTS.—The conveyance of the Federal land and State land shall be subject to all valid existing rights.

(c) EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The value of the Federal land and State land to be exchanged under this Act—

(A) shall be equal; or

(B) shall be made equal in accordance with subsection (d).

(2) APPRAISALS.—The value of the Federal land and State land shall be determined in accordance with appraisals—

(A) conducted in accordance with—

(i) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

(ii) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice;

(B) reviewed by an interdepartmental review team comprised of representatives of Federal and State agencies; and

(C) approved by the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture, as appropriate.

(3) TERM OF APPROVAL.—The term of approval of the appraisals by the interdepartmental review team is extended to September 13, 2008.

(d) CASH EQUALIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the value of the Federal land and State land is not equal, the value may be equalized by the payment of cash to

the United States or to the State, as appropriate, in accordance with section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)).

(2) DISPOSITION AND USE OF PROCEEDS.—

(A) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.—Any cash equalization payments received by the United States under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the "Sisk Act") (16 U.S.C. 484a).

(B) USE OF PROCEEDS.—Amounts deposited under subparagraph (A) shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture, without further appropriation and until expended, for the acquisition of land and interests in land for addition to the National Forest System in the State.

(e) TIMING.—It is the intent of Congress that the land exchange authorized and directed by this Act shall be completed not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—

(1) RIGHTS-OF-WAY TO NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.—The Secretary of Agriculture, under the authority of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), shall convey to the State any easements or other rights-of-way to National Forest System land that are—

(A) appropriate to provide access to the National Forest System land acquired by the State; and

(B) agreed to by the Secretary of Agriculture and the State.

(2) RIGHTS-OF-WAY TO STATE LAND.—The State shall convey to the United States any easements or other rights-of-way to land owned by the State that are—

(A) appropriate to provide access to the State land acquired by the United States; and

(B) agreed to by—

(i) the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(ii) the State.

(g) COSTS.—The City, either directly or through a collection agreement with the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, shall pay the administrative costs associated with the conveyance of the Federal land and State land, including the costs of any field inspections, environmental analyses, appraisals, title examinations, and deed and patent preparations.

SEC. 4. MANAGEMENT OF FEDERAL LAND.

(a) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is transferred from the Secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture administrative jurisdiction over the land described in paragraph (2).

(2) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (1) is the approximately 2,110 acres of land that is administered by the Bureau of Land Management and located in Shoshone County, Idaho, as generally identified in exhibit A3 of the Agreement.

(3) WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS.—Any land designated as a Wilderness Study Area that is transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture under paragraph (1) shall be managed in a manner that preserves the suitability of land for designation as wilderness until Congress determines otherwise.

(b) ADDITIONS TO THE NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall administer any land transferred to, or conveyed to the United States for administration by, the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with—

(1) the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the "Weeks Act") (16 U.S.C. 480 et seq.); and

(2) the laws (including regulations) applicable to the National Forest System.

(c) LAND TO BE MANAGED BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall administer any State land conveyed to the United States under this Act for administration by the Secretary in accordance with—

(1) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(2) other applicable laws.

(d) LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.—For purposes of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-9), the boundaries of the Idaho Panhandle National Forests and the Clearwater National Forest shall be considered to be the boundaries of the Idaho Panhandle National Forests and the Clearwater National Forest, respectively, as of January 1, 1965.

SEC. 5. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—The Secretary, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Board may modify the descriptions of land specified in the Agreement to—

(1) correct errors; or

(2) make minor adjustments to the parcels based on a survey or other means.

(b) REVOCATION OF ORDERS.—Subject to valid existing rights, any public land orders withdrawing any of the Federal land from appropriation or disposal under the public land laws are revoked to the extent necessary to permit disposal of the Federal land.

(c) WITHDRAWALS.—

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, pending completion of the land exchange, the Federal land is withdrawn from—

(A) all forms of location, entry, and patent under the mining and public land laws; and

(B) disposition under the mineral leasing laws and the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

(2) STATE LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, the land transferred to the United States under this Act is withdrawn from—

(A) all forms of location, entry, and patent under the mining and public land laws; and

(B) disposition under the mineral leasing laws and the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

(3) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section precludes the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture from using common varieties of mineral materials for construction and maintenance of Federal roads and facilities on the State land acquired under this Act. Passed the Senate September 29, 2006.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The Boise foothills provide a beautiful, open-space backdrop for the city of Boise. For decades, community members have sought a way to protect open space, and in May 2001, the citizens of Boise approved a tax to secure open space in the foothills.

Roughly 7,700 acres of land in the Boise foothills is owned by the State of Idaho. The State is required to manage these lands to maximize revenue, which would likely lead to development. S. 1131, introduced by Senator LARRY CRAIG in the Senate and Congressman BUTCH OTTER in the House, would remedy this problem by codifying an agreement produced collaboratively by the city of Boise and the State of Idaho and the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. The agreement would exchange Idaho State endowment lands on an equal-value basis with other Federal and State lands across a broad area in the State.

I urge support of this important measure.

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

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

(Ms. HERSETH asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, this land exchange reflects an agreement reached between the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, Idaho Department of Lands, and the city of Boise.

The city of Boise has significant interest in preserving the Boise foothills for open space. However, the State of Idaho has a constitutional mandate to maximize revenue on their State lands and cannot manage State lands in the Boise foothills for open space.

Therefore, S. 1131 transfers 11,815 acres of lands from the Idaho Department of Lands to the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management to be managed for open space preservation for the benefit of the city of Boise. The State Department of Lands will acquire 7,220 acres of National Forest System lands that are timber-producing lands and 605 acres of lands from the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. Speaker, we have no objections to S. 1131.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1131 the Idaho Land Enhancement Act. This legislation directs the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to exchange land with the State of Idaho, including key parcels in the Boise Foothills and North Idaho.

Protecting the Boise Foothills from unchecked development has long been a priority for residents of Boise, Idaho. In May 2001 the citizens of Boise, in one of the highest voter turnouts in city history, elected to tax themselves in order to provide funding to secure permanent public open space in the Boise Foothills. The land exchange before you today is a key component of that effort.

The exchange concept was developed between the Idaho Department of Lands, the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service with the assistance of the City of Boise. It uses both Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service acreage to balance an exchange with Idaho State Endowment lands on an equal-value basis. Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service and Idaho Department of Lands staff have identified parcels

that help reduce threats to federal forests and grasslands identified by the Chief of the Forest Service while conveying land to the State of Idaho that help the State's endowment fund beneficiaries.

I introduced identical legislation H.R. 2718, and I appreciate all of the assistance we got from the House Resources Committee in moving this bill through the process. This land exchange is an agreement on which everyone wins. The state of Idaho gets more timberland; the schools get more timber revenue; the people of the Boise area get more open space; and the state and federal agencies involved get a higher level of management efficiency.

I would appreciate your support of this small but important piece of legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1131.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PITKIN COUNTY LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 2006

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1129) to authorize the exchange of certain land in the State of Colorado.

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 "Pitkin County Land Exchange Act of 2006".

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to authorize, direct, expedite, and facilitate the exchange of land between the United States, Pitkin County, Colorado, and the Aspen Valley Land Trust.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ASPEN VALLEY LAND TRUST.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term "Aspen Valley Land Trust" means the Aspen Valley Land Trust, a nonprofit organization as described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term "Aspen Valley Land Trust" includes any successor, heir, or assign of the Aspen Valley Land Trust.

(2) COUNTY.—The term "County" means Pitkin County, a political subdivision of the State of Colorado.

(3) FEDERAL LAND.—The term "Federal land" means—

(A) the approximately 5.5 acres of National Forest System land located in the County, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Ryan Land Exchange-Wildwood Parcel Conveyance to Pitkin County" and dated August 2004;

(B) the 12 parcels of National Forest System land located in the County totaling approximately 5.92 acres, as generally depicted on maps 1 and 2 entitled "Ryan Land Exchange-Smuggler Mountain Patent Remnants Conveyance to Pitkin County" and dated August 2004; and

(C) the approximately 40 acres of Bureau of Land Management land located in the County, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Ryan Land Exchange-Crystal River Parcel Conveyance to Pitkin County" and dated August 2004.

(4) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term "non-Federal land" means—

(A) the approximately 35 acres of non-Federal land in the County, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Ryan Land Exchange-Ryan Property Conveyance to Forest Service" and dated August 2004; and

(B) the approximately 18.2 acres of non-Federal land located on Smuggler Mountain in the County, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Ryan Land Exchange-Smuggler Mountain-Grand Turk & Pontiac Claims Conveyance to Forest Service" and dated August 2004.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 4. LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the County offers to convey to the United States title to the non-Federal land that is acceptable to the Secretary, the Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) accept the offer; and

(2) on receipt of acceptable title to the non-Federal land, simultaneously convey to the County, or at the request of the County, to the Aspen Valley Land Trust, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land, except as provided in section 5(d), subject to all valid existing rights and encumbrances.

(b) TIMING.—It is the intent of Congress that the land exchange directed by this Act shall be completed not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. EXCHANGE TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE.—The value of the Federal land and non-Federal land—

(1) shall be equal; or

(2) shall be made equal in accordance with subsection (c).

(b) APPRAISALS.—The value of the Federal land and non-Federal land shall be determined by the Secretary through appraisals conducted in accordance with—

(1) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions;

(2) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice; and

(3) Forest Service appraisal instructions.

(c) EQUALIZATION OF VALUES.—

(1) SURPLUS OF NON-FEDERAL LAND.—If the final appraised value of the non-Federal land exceeds the final appraised value of the Federal land, the County shall donate to the United States the excess value of the non-Federal land, which shall be considered to be a donation for all purposes of law.

(2) SURPLUS OF FEDERAL LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the final appraised value of the Federal land exceeds the final appraised value of the non-Federal land, the value of the Federal land and non-Federal land may, as the Secretary and the County determine to be appropriate, be equalized by the County—

(i) making a cash equalization payment to the Secretary;

(ii) conveying to the Secretary certain land located in the County, comprising approximately 160 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Sellar Park Parcel" and dated August 2004; or

(iii) using a combination of the methods described in clauses (i) and (ii).

(B) DISPOSITION AND USE OF PROCEEDS.—

(i) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.—Any cash equalization payment received by the Secretary under clause (i) or (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall be deposited in the fund established by Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the "Sisk Act") (16 U.S.C. 484a).

(ii) USE OF PROCEEDS.—Amounts deposited under clause (i) shall be available to the Secretary, without further appropriation, for the

acquisition of land or interests in land in Colorado for addition to the National Forest System.

(d) CONDITIONS ON CERTAIN CONVEYANCES.—

(1) CONDITIONS ON CONVEYANCE OF CRYSTAL RIVER PARCEL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of the conveyance of the parcel of Federal land described in section 3(3)(C) to the County, the County shall agree to—

(i) provide for public access to the parcel; and

(ii) require that the parcel shall be used only for recreational, fish and wildlife conservation, and public open space purposes.

(B) REVERSION.—At the option of the Secretary of the Interior, the parcel of land described in section 3(3)(C) shall revert to the United States if the parcel is used for a purpose other than a purpose described in subparagraph (A)(ii).

(2) CONDITIONS ON CONVEYANCE OF WILDWOOD PARCEL.—In the deed of conveyance for the parcel of Federal land described in section 3(3)(A) to the County, the Secretary shall, as determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, in consultation with the County, reserve to the United States a permanent easement for the location, construction, and public use of the East of Aspen Trail.

SEC. 6. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) INCORPORATION, MANAGEMENT, AND STATUS OF ACQUIRED LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Land acquired by the Secretary under this Act shall become part of the White River National Forest.

(2) MANAGEMENT.—On acquisition, land acquired by the Secretary under this Act shall be administered in accordance with the laws (including rules and regulations) generally applicable to the National Forest System.

(3) LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.—For purposes of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460l-9), the boundaries of the White River National Forest shall be deemed to be the boundaries of the White River National Forest as of January 1, 1965.

(b) REVOCATION OF ORDERS AND WITHDRAWAL.—

(1) REVOCATION OF ORDERS.—Any public orders withdrawing any of the Federal land from appropriation or disposal under the public land laws are revoked to the extent necessary to permit disposal of the Federal land.

(2) WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL LAND.—On the date of enactment of this Act, if not already withdrawn or segregated from entry and appropriation under the public land laws (including the mining and mineral leasing laws) and the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), the Federal land is withdrawn, subject to valid existing rights, until the date of the conveyance of the Federal land to the County.

(3) WITHDRAWAL OF NON-FEDERAL LAND.—On acquisition of the non-Federal land by the Secretary, the non-Federal land is permanently withdrawn from all forms of appropriation and disposal under the public land laws (including the mining and mineral leasing laws) and the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

(c) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary, the Secretary of the Interior, and the County may agree to—

(1) minor adjustments to the boundaries of the parcels of Federal land and non-Federal land; and

(2) modifications or deletions of parcels and mining claim remnants of Federal land or non-Federal land to be exchanged on Smuggler Mountain.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 1129, introduced by Representative MARK UDALL, would authorize a small land exchange in Pitkin County, Colorado, between the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Forest Service, and Pitkin County. This bill was passed by the House of Representatives on December 6, 2005, but was recently amended by the Senate. The amendment simply removed a provision of the bill encumbering the land known as the Crystal River parcel with a conservation easement.

The remaining portion of the bill would transfer 35 acres, once part of the Ryan Ranch in the White River National Forest to the Forest Service. This property is nearly surrounded by public land and valued by the community as open space. In exchange, Pitkin County would acquire 5.5 acres known as the Wildwood parcel from the Forest Service and a total of 45.92 acres from the Bureau of Land Management consisting of mining claims and land along the Crystal River.

The exchange is strongly supported by local officials and would help to consolidate public and private ownership in Pitkin County.

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

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

H.R. 1129 authorizes the exchange of certain lands between the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Pitkin County in Colorado.

One of the properties the Forest Service will acquire is a 35-acre parcel referred to as the Ryan property, which is one of the scenic gems of the Roaring Fork Valley. At the urging of the Forest Service, in 2000 Pitkin County and the Aspen Valley Land Trust acquired the Ryan property to protect it from development until a land exchange transferring it to Forest Service ownership could be arranged. Five years later, H.R. 1129 accomplishes that goal.

We would like to recognize Representative MARK UDALL for his leadership on H.R. 1129, as well as cosponsor Representative JOHN SALAZAR.

Mr. Speaker, we support H.R. 1129.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1129, the Pitkin County Land Exchange Act and to express my thanks to Chairman POMBO and Ranking Member RAHALL for making it possible for the House to consider it today.

The bill provides for completion of a land exchange that involves Pitkin County, Colo-

rado, on the one hand and two federal agencies—the Forest Service and BLM—on the other.

Under the exchange, the county will transfer two parcels to the Forest Service—a 35-acre tract known as the “Ryan property” near the ghost town of Ashcroft; and addition about 18.2 acres of patented mining claims on Smuggler Mountain near Aspen, Colorado.

In return, the Federal Government would transfer to the county—

A 5.5 acre tract south of Aspen known as the “Wildwood” parcel, which the county will transfer to private ownership after reserving a permanent public easement for a trail;

About 5.92 acres in 12 scattered locations on Smuggler Mountain that abut or are near lands now owned by the county;

And, finally, a 40-acre tract of BLM land along the Crystal River, which will be subject to a permanent conservation easement limiting future use to recreational, fish and wildlife, and open space purposes.

The bill requires standard appraisals of all properties involved. It provides that if the lands going to the county are worth less than what the county is giving to the Federal Government, the county will waive additional payment, while if the lands provide by the county are worth less than those the county is to receive, the county will either pay cash to equalize or will convey an additional tract of about 160 acres, in the Sellers’ Meadow area near Hagerman Pass, to make up the difference.

The Resources Committee made some technical changes suggested by the administration and the county and the House passed the bill as so amended last year.

On September 29th, the Senate by unanimous consent passed an amended version of the House-passed bill, adding some provisions regarding public access to and future use of the lands to be acquired by the county and making a number of other, technical changes.

The Senate’s changes are consistent with the original intent of the legislation and are acceptable to the county. Accordingly, I urge the House to concur in the Senate amendment and so to send the bill to the President for signing into law.

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. 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 California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 1129.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOWER FARMINGTON RIVER AND SALMON BROOK WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY ACT OF 2005

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 435) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Farmington River and Salmon Brook in the State of Con-

necticut for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 435

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 “Lower Farmington River and Salmon Brook Wild and Scenic River Study Act of 2005”.

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF ADDITIONAL SEGMENT OF FARMINGTON RIVER AND SALMON BROOK IN CONNECTICUT FOR STUDY FOR POTENTIAL ADDITION TO NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(139) LOWER FARMINGTON RIVER AND SALMON BROOK, CONNECTICUT.—The segment of the Farmington River downstream from the segment designated as a recreational river by section 3(a)(156) to its confluence with the Connecticut River, and the segment of the Salmon Brook including its mainstream and east and west branches.”.

(b) TIME FOR SUBMISSION.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the study required by the amendment made by subsection (a).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Speaker, Senate 435, introduced by Senator LIEBERMAN of Connecticut and a companion to H.R. 1344 sponsored by our colleague NANCY JOHNSON, would study a segment of Farmington River and Salmon Brook in Connecticut for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic River System.

I urge adoption of the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the majority has already explained the purpose of S. 435, which passed the Senate in December 2005. The legislation is nearly identical to a bill which has already passed the House. Since S. 435 simply authorizes a study of a proposed river designation, we have no objection to the adoption of the legislation by the House today.

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

□ 1430

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 435,

the Lower Farmington River and Salmon Brook Wild and Scenic River Study Act of 2005. Once passed, the bill will designate a segment of the Farmington River and Salmon Brook in the State of Connecticut for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. I would like to thank the chairman of the Resources Committee, Mr. POMBO, for bringing this legislation to the floor and for working with me to ensure that this important study can commence promptly.

The bill commissions a feasibility study to evaluate whether the Lower Farmington River and the Salmon Brook qualify as a Wild and Scenic Partnership River within the National Park Service's Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The Lower Farmington River is defined as the 40-mile stretch between the end of the west branch of the Farmington River in Canton, Connecticut, and the Rainbow Dam in Windsor, and the Salmon Brook, an additional 32-mile stretch in the top 12 in the State of Connecticut for diversity of aquatic insects it hosts. The study area crosses both the Fifth and First Congressional Districts. The Farmington River and Salmon Brook's recreational and environmental contributions to our State are well-known and a valuable resource for future generations.

The 14 miles of the Farmington River's west branch, designated as a Wild and Scenic Partnership River in 1994, is a resounding environmental and economic success story. Partnership designation for the west branch has fostered public-private partnerships to preserve the area's environment and heritage while yielding economic benefits to river towns. Its designation has preserved it as a home to trout, river otter, and bald eagle populations; and historic structures still grace its banks. Fishermen, hikers, canoeists, and kayakers enjoy the river year-round.

I hope to see the rest of the Farmington River, as well as Salmon Brook, enjoy similar success. This new initiative is an ideal way to showcase the whole river's unique cultural and recreational resources. The direct economic impact of the final designation is estimated at \$3 million and an additional \$9 million in total economic impact from recreational users.

This legislation has broad bipartisan support at the local, State, and Federal level, and I urge my colleagues' support for the bill.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman from Connecticut for her hard work and bipartisanship in advancing this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 435.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PACTOLA RESERVOIR REALLOCATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 819) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reallocate costs of the Pactola Dam and Reservoir, South Dakota, to reflect increased demands for municipal, industrial, and fish and wildlife purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 819

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 "Pactola Reservoir Reallocation Authorization Act of 2005".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) it is appropriate to reallocate the costs of the Pactola Dam and Reservoir, South Dakota, to reflect increased demands for municipal, industrial, and fish and wildlife purposes; and

(2) section 302 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7152) prohibits such a reallocation of costs without congressional approval.

SEC. 3. REALLOCATION OF COSTS OF PACTOLA DAM AND RESERVOIR, SOUTH DAKOTA.

The Secretary of the Interior may, as provided in the contract of August 2001 entered into between Rapid City, South Dakota, and the Rapid Valley Conservancy District, reallocate, in a manner consistent with Federal reclamation law (the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388, chapter 1093), and Acts supplemental to and amendatory of that Act (43 U.S.C. 371 et seq.)), the construction costs of Pactola Dam and Reservoir, Rapid Valley Unit, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, South Dakota, from irrigation purposes to municipal, industrial, and fish and wildlife purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Senate 819, introduced by Senator TIM JOHNSON of South Dakota, reallocates the costs of the Pactola Dam and Reservoir to reflect growing municipal needs for water. As Rapid City's municipal water needs are growing at a rapid rate and demand for local irrigation water decreases, this legislation appropriately reallocates the costs associated with the changing water needs. This bill is a win for the citizens of Rapid City and a win for the American taxpayer, and I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation.

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

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

(Ms. HERSETH asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support S. 819, sponsored by Senator TIM JOHNSON, which is the counterpart to legislation I sponsored which passed this body earlier this year. This bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to reallocate the construction costs of Pactola Dam and Reservoir. This important water supply project is located just 15 miles west of Rapid City in my home State of South Dakota.

The water supply needs of the Rapid City area have changed dramatically since the Bureau of Reclamation built Pactola Dam 50 years ago. Rapid City is the second largest city in South Dakota, and there is no doubt this metropolitan area will continue to enjoy strong economic and population growth. The cost reallocation authorized in this legislation will simply allow the Secretary of the Interior to modernize the financial structure of the project to reflect the changing water supply needs of this area of my State.

I want to thank Chairman RADANOVICH, Ranking Member NAPOLITANO, and committee staff for working with me to advance the House counterpart of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support S. 819.

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, the Pactola Dam, located near Rapid City, South Dakota, stores water from Rapid Creek and is part of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program. This bill authorizes reallocation of a portion of the construction costs of the Pactola Dam and Reservoir from irrigation purposes to municipal and industrial and fish and wildlife purposes.

The effort to reallocate Pactola Dam costs stems from the population growth around Rapid City, with corresponding increases in demand for M&I water and decreases in demand for irrigation water. Pactola Dam originally provided water storage for flood control, irrigation, and M&I uses. A 40-year water service contract between the Bureau of Reclamation and Rapid City for M&I water expired in 1991.

Water for Rapid City has been subsequently provided under annual contracts. A second 40-year contract between reclamation and the Rapid Valley Conservancy District for irrigation water expired in 2001. The district decided not to renew this contract due to decreased irrigation demand and sufficient alternative water sources. Since the district no longer needs Pactola water, repayment of construction costs originally allocated to irrigation can be reallocated to M&I uses and fish and wildlife purposes. Under law, Congress must authorize this reallocation.

As I close with the Resources Committee issues today, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Lisa Pittman, our chief counsel on the Resources Committee, for all her hard work during the 109th Congress.

Thank you, Lisa.

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

Ms. HERSETH. 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 California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 819.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the 6 bills just considered.

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

There was no objection.

REAUTHORIZING LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN BASIN RESTORATION PROGRAM

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6121) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize a program relating to the Lake Pontchartrain Basin, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 6121

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

SECTION 1. LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN BASIN RESTORATION REAUTHORIZATION.

The first section 121 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1273) (relat-

ing to Lake Pontchartrain Basin) is amended in subsection (f) by striking "2005" and inserting "2011".

SEC. 2. TECHNICAL CORRECTION.

The second section 121 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1274) (relating to wet weather watershed pilot projects) is redesignated as section 122.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 6121, to reauthorize the Lake Pontchartrain Basin Restoration Program.

The Lake Pontchartrain Basin is a 5,000 square mile watershed encompassing 16 parishes in Louisiana and four Mississippi counties. The area comprises the largest estuary in the gulf coast region and one of the largest estuaries in these United States.

In 2000, Congress added section 121 to the Clean Water Act to establish a Lake Pontchartrain Basin Restoration Program within EPA. The program authorizes the Environmental Protection Agency to help people in Louisiana and Mississippi address pollution problems affecting Lake Pontchartrain. Now it is time to reauthorize the Lake Pontchartrain Basin Program.

H.R. 6121, introduced by Mr. BAKER, would reauthorize the Lake Pontchartrain Basin Restoration Program for an additional 5 years. I would like to commend Representative BAKER for his efforts to restore the ecological health of Lake Pontchartrain, and I urge all Members to support this legislation.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I too rise in support of H.R. 6121, the reauthorization of the Lake Pontchartrain Basin Program. My good friend and colleague from Wisconsin gave a clear and convincing summary of what the bill is about, and I see no reason to actually prolong this. I agree with the sentiment, and I strongly support it.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr.

PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6121.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENATOR WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR. BRIDGE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1140) to designate the State Route 1 Bridge in the State of Delaware as the "Senator William V. Roth, Jr. Bridge".

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1140

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF SENATOR WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR. BRIDGE.

The State Route 1 Bridge over the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal in the State of Delaware is designated as the "Senator William V. Roth, Jr. Bridge".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law (including regulations), map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the bridge described in section 1 shall be considered to be a reference to the Senator William V. Roth, Jr. Bridge.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

This bill will designate the State Route 1 bridge in the State of Delaware as the Senator William V. Roth, Jr. Bridge.

Senator Roth began his public service when he was elected to the House in 1966. He served two terms in the House before being elected to the Senate in 1970, where he served for 30 years. During that time, Bill Roth rose to the chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs and the Senate Finance Committee. Senator Roth was a well-known fiscal conservative who is probably best known outside his home State of Delaware as the creator of the individual retirement account that bears his name, the Roth IRA.

I would note that the Senate passed this bill by unanimous consent last year, and our colleague, Representative MIKE CASTLE, has introduced an identical bill here in the House. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S.

1140. Naming this bridge after Senator Roth is a fitting tribute to his many years of public service.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I too rise in support of S. 1140.

I appreciate the clear analysis from my friend from Wisconsin. I would have just one other element to add, and that is that I think it is particularly fitting and appropriate for our committee to advance this and to commemorate Senator Roth. He was keenly interested in environmental protection in the course of his career and was one of the most aggressive and active supporters of Amtrak, at a time when, as my colleague and friend mentioned, Senator Roth was a fiscal conservative to the bone.

□ 1445

But he was very clear that investment in a national rail passenger service, Amtrak, was good sound fiscal investment. It was good for the environment. It was good for transportation. I am only sorry that it is not a railroad bridge that we are naming after Senator Roth, but I am proud to support this legislation.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 1140, legislation to name the State Route 1 Bridge over the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal in Delaware after the late Senator William V. Roth, Jr.

S. 1140 passed the Senate unanimously in June 2005, and as the sponsor of the House companion, H.R. 2800, I am pleased to join Senators CARPER and BIDEN in offering my full support for S. 1140 and to encourage its adoption by the House today.

A leader and dedicated public servant, Senator Roth served honorably during his years in Congress and set a tremendous example for future generations of Americans. Best known for creating the successful "Roth IRA," Senator Roth also fought hard in Congress to improve the quality of transportation in the State of Delaware. In the early 1990s, Senator Roth played an important role in helping to build the State Route 1 Bridge in New Castle County, Delaware.

Senator Roth was first elected to the House in 1966, serving two terms, before being elected to the Senate, where he served for 30 years. He also won the Bronze Star for his service in the U.S. Army during World War II. He died in 2003 at the age of 82.

Nothing in my mind would serve as a better tribute to Senator Roth's many years of dedicated public service than to rename this bridge, a true architectural gem in Delaware, in his honor.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 1140.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1140.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANIMAL ENTERPRISE TERRORISM ACT

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 3880) to provide the Department of Justice the necessary authority to apprehend, prosecute, and convict individuals committing animal enterprise terror.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 3880

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 "Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act".

SEC. 2. INCLUSION OF ECONOMIC DAMAGE TO ANIMAL ENTERPRISES AND THREATS OF DEATH AND SERIOUS BODILY INJURY TO ASSOCIATED PERSONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 43 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 43. Force, violence, and threats involving animal enterprises

"(a) OFFENSE.—Whoever travels in interstate or foreign commerce, or uses or causes to be used the mail or any facility of interstate or foreign commerce—

"(1) for the purpose of damaging or interfering with the operations of an animal enterprise; and

"(2) in connection with such purpose—

"(A) intentionally damages or causes the loss of any real or personal property (including animals or records) used by an animal enterprise, or any real or personal property of a person or entity having a connection to, relationship with, or transactions with an animal enterprise;

"(B) intentionally places a person in reasonable fear of the death of, or serious bodily injury to that person, a member of the immediate family (as defined in section 115) of that person, or a spouse or intimate partner of that person by a course of conduct involving threats, acts of vandalism, property damage, criminal trespass, harassment, or intimidation; or

"(C) conspires or attempts to do so; shall be punished as provided for in subsection (b).

"(b) PENALTIES.—The punishment for a violation of section (a) or an attempt or conspiracy to violate subsection (a) shall be—

"(1) a fine under this title or imprisonment not more than 1 year, or both, if the offense does not instill in another the reasonable fear of serious bodily injury or death and—

"(A) the offense results in no economic damage or bodily injury; or

"(B) the offense results in economic damage that does not exceed \$10,000;

"(2) a fine under this title or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both, if no bodily injury occurs and—

"(A) the offense results in economic damage exceeding \$10,000 but not exceeding \$100,000; or

"(B) the offense instills in another the reasonable fear of serious bodily injury or death;

"(3) a fine under this title or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both, if—

"(A) the offense results in economic damage exceeding \$100,000; or

"(B) the offense results in substantial bodily injury to another individual;

"(4) a fine under this title or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both, if—

"(A) the offense results in serious bodily injury to another individual; or

"(B) the offense results in economic damage exceeding \$1,000,000; and

"(5) imprisonment for life or for any terms of years, a fine under this title, or both, if the offense results in death of another individual.

"(c) RESTITUTION.—An order of restitution under section 3663 or 3663A of this title with respect to a violation of this section may also include restitution—

"(1) for the reasonable cost of repeating any experimentation that was interrupted or invalidated as a result of the offense;

"(2) for the loss of food production or farm income reasonably attributable to the offense; and

"(3) for any other economic damage, including any losses or costs caused by economic disruption, resulting from the offense.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'animal enterprise' means—

"(A) a commercial or academic enterprise that uses or sells animals or animal products for profit, food or fiber production, agriculture, education, research, or testing;

"(B) a zoo, aquarium, animal shelter, pet store, breeder, furrier, circus, or rodeo, or other lawful competitive animal event; or

"(C) any fair or similar event intended to advance agricultural arts and sciences;

"(2) the term 'course of conduct' means a pattern of conduct composed of 2 or more acts, evidencing a continuity of purpose;

"(3) the term 'economic damage'—

"(A) means the replacement costs of lost or damaged property or records, the costs of repeating an interrupted or invalidated experiment, the loss of profits, or increased costs, including losses and increased costs resulting from threats, acts of vandalism, property damage, trespass, harassment, or intimidation taken against a person or entity on account of that person's or entity's connection to, relationship with, or transactions with the animal enterprise; but

"(B) does not include any lawful economic disruption (including a lawful boycott) that results from lawful public, governmental, or business reaction to the disclosure of information about an animal enterprise;

"(4) the term 'serious bodily injury' means—

"(A) injury posing a substantial risk of death;

"(B) extreme physical pain;

"(C) protracted and obvious disfigurement; or

"(D) protracted loss or impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ, or mental faculty; and

"(5) the term 'substantial bodily injury' means—

"(A) deep cuts and serious burns or abrasions;

"(B) short-term or nonobvious disfigurement;

"(C) fractured or dislocated bones, or torn members of the body;

"(D) significant physical pain;

"(E) illness;

"(F) short-term loss or impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ, or mental faculty; or

"(G) any other significant injury to the body.

"(e) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

"(1) to prohibit any expressive conduct (including peaceful picketing or other peaceful

demonstration) protected from legal prohibition by the First Amendment to the Constitution;

“(2) to create new remedies for interference with activities protected by the free speech or free exercise clauses of the First Amendment to the Constitution, regardless of the point of view expressed, or to limit any existing legal remedies for such interference; or

“(3) to provide exclusive criminal penalties or civil remedies with respect to the conduct prohibited by this action, or to preempt State or local laws that may provide such penalties or remedies.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 43 in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“43. Force, violence, and threats involving animal enterprises.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 3880 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3880, the Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act.

In recent years, some animal rights activist groups have employed violence and intimidation against enterprises that use or sell animals or animal products for food, agriculture, research testing or entertainment uses. In 1992, the Animal Enterprise Protection Act was enacted to provide additional authority to prosecute extremists whose attacks create damages or research losses of at least \$10,000.

However, the last several years have seen an increase in the number and the severity of criminal acts and intimidation against those engaged in animal enterprises. These groups have attacked not only employees of companies conducting research, but also those with any remote link to such research or activities. This has included employees of banks, underwriters, insurance companies, investors, university research facilities, and even the New York Stock Exchange.

Victims have experienced threatening letters, e-mails and phone calls, repeated organized protests at their homes and the blanketing of their neighborhoods with defamatory literature. Some of the more violent acts by these groups include arson, pouring acid on cars, mailing razor blades, and defacing victims' homes.

Many of the actions that the groups have engaged in are not addressed by the current animal enterprise terrorism statute, 18 United States Code 43. This legislation would expand the reach of Federal criminal law to specifically address the use of force, violence or threats against not only animal enterprise organizations, but also those who do business with them. S. 3880 would make it a Federal crime to intentionally damage the property of a person or entity having a connection to, relationship with, or transactions with an animal enterprise. The bill would also make it a criminal act to intentionally place a person or family member in reasonable fear of death or serious bodily injury because of their relationship with an animal enterprise.

Additionally, the legislation expands the definition of economic damage to include loss of property, the costs incurred because of a lost experiment or lost profits. It also includes a definition of the term “economic disruption” to mean losses or increased costs resulting from threats, acts of violence, property damage, trespass, harassment, or intimidation against a person or entity because of their relationship with an animal enterprise. This does not include a lawful boycott.

Finally, an amendment to S. 3880 incorporated during floor consideration in the other body addresses concerns that were raised about the bill's potential impact on lawful protests. S. 3880 clarifies that nothing in this bill shall be construed to prohibit any expressive conduct protected by the first amendment, nor shall it criminalize non-violent activities designed to change public policy or private conduct.

Before closing, I would like to recognize the efforts of my colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. PETRI, who introduced a similar measure in this body and has helped raise awareness of this important issue. I believe this bill can help protect law-abiding citizens who are engaged in lawful activities such as research, farming sales, or manufacturing that involves animals or animal products.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 3880, so we may send this important legislation to the President for his signature.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 3880 is a companion bill to H.R. 4239, the Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act. It reflects a compromise bill arrived at after considerable effort of a bipartisan group involving both House and Senate Judiciary Committee staff over several months.

From hearings in the House and from other reports, we have learned that current Federal law designed to protect animal enterprises have been proven to be reasonably effective in protecting animal enterprises. However, serious gaps and loopholes have been identified

in current law with respect to protecting employees and associates of animal enterprises. Present law protects employees of an animal enterprise, but we have found that employees, board members and family members of businesses and nonprofits affiliated with or doing business with such enterprises are complaining that they are now being stalked, harassed, intimidated or threatened, with some individuals even being physically assaulted, and had their homes, businesses or cars vandalized. Since the Animal Enterprise Terrorism law was enacted in 1992, there have been some 1,100 complaints of such incidents, with property losses reported of being more than \$120 million. Those complaining include farmers, scientists, biomedical and biotechnology industries, research universities, teaching hospitals, financial institutions, magazines, newspapers and other advertising groups and others who are viewed as assisting or enabling targeted animal enterprises.

The evidence is that in many instances extremist elements among the animal rights groups are taking advantage of the fact that the animal enterprise laws do not cover affiliates and associates by using threats, harassment, intimidation and fear and other extreme tactics to pressure them into severing their activities with such enterprises.

S. 3880 is designed to cover these gaps or loopholes by providing to employees, businesses and associates of animal enterprises similar protections to those already covered. In other words, the bill prevents a person from doing indirectly to an animal enterprise what they are prohibited to do directly.

Now, citizens engaging in legitimate animal enterprise activities and anyone associated with them are entitled to be protected from criminal acts and to be able to go about their daily activities free from threats to their person or property and that of their family and associates. State laws are generally good at providing those protections. However, the interstate nature of the planning and execution of the criminal harassment tactics used by some individuals or groups skilled at exploiting gaps or weaknesses in the laws have made it difficult for States to get at problems effectively. That is why this bill is deemed necessary.

While we must protect those engaged in animal enterprises, we must also protect the right of those engaged in first amendment freedoms of expression regarding such enterprises. It goes without saying that first amendment freedoms of expression cannot be defeated by statute. However, to reassure anyone concerned with the intent of this legislation, we have added in the bill assurances that it is not intended as a restraint on freedoms of expression such as lawful boycotting, picketing or otherwise engaging in lawful advocacy for animals.

In addition, we also wanted to recognize that there are some who conscientiously believe that it is their duty to peacefully protest the operation of animal enterprises to the extent of engaging in civil disobedience. If a group's intention were to stage a sit-in or lie-down or to block traffic to a targeted facility, they certainly run the risk of arrest for whatever traffic, trespass or other laws they may be breaking. But they should not be held more accountable for business losses due to causes such as delivery trucks being delayed any more than a boycott or protest against any other business.

To violate the provision of the bill, one must travel or otherwise engage in interstate activity with the intent to cause damage or loss to an animal enterprise. While the losses of profits, lab experiments or other intangible losses are included, it must be proved that such losses were specifically intended for the law to be applied. If there is no damage or economic loss, or damage or loss is less than \$10,000, the offense is a misdemeanor, not a felony.

This bill does not satisfy everyone, but it does represent a reasonable compromise in protecting employees and associates of animal enterprises while avoiding violation of first amendment freedoms.

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

MR. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support for the bill before us, the Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act, which is the Senate version of legislation I introduced earlier this Congress. The bipartisan legislation that passed the Senate by unanimous consent amends the existing animal enterprise terrorism statute which has been law since 1992. It extends existing protections for animal enterprises to individuals, businesses and agencies including farmers, scientists, biomedical and biotechnical industries, research universities, teaching hospitals, financial institutions and others who have associations with animal enterprise.

This legislation is in response to rising incidents of violence and threats against these entities as a way to adversely impact animal enterprises without directly violating the existing Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act. The bill before us clarifies that it is a crime to damage or interfere with animal enterprise and expands parameters in existing law to cover threats, harassment and other illegal activities against those who are connected with such enterprises, not just the enterprises themselves. The law increases criminal penalties based on the level of violence or property loss, while specifically exempting from its coverage all first amendment protected activities.

Between January of 1990 and June of 2004, extremist movements such as the Animal Liberation Front, Stop Huntington Animal Cruelty, and the Envi-

ronmental Liberation Front committed more than 1,100 acts of terrorism, causing more than \$120 million in damage. Animal rights extremists advance their cause through direct action, which includes death threats, vandalism, animal releases and bombings. Their actions are calculated to aggressively intimidate and harass those identified as targets.

The FBI considers these extremist groups among its most serious domestic threats. Current Federal law including the Animal Enterprise Protection act is inadequate to address the threats and violence committed by animal rights extremists.

In my own State of Wisconsin, mink farmers and biomedical researchers have experienced their own share of intimidation, harassment and vandalism at the hands of animal rights extremists. Farmers have had their properties raided, causing thousands of dollars of damage.

Scientists around the State have received, in the mail or at their home, razor blades with letters stating that they were laced with the AIDS virus. Personal information such as home addresses, phone numbers, and photographs of researchers have been posted on extremist Web sites. Many of these same scientists report death threats and home visits by animal rights extremists who, through their terrorism, have a goal of driving the scientists out of their research, research which has and will continue to improve human health and quality of life.

□ 1500

The House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security held a hearing on the act in May of this year. At the hearing, a primate researcher from the University of Wisconsin, Madison, testified about the harassment and intimidation which she has experienced.

She has even considered leaving the Parkinson's research field and fears others may do so in the current environment. This statement has proven to be true. Just this past August, a researcher at UCLA halted his primate research because of the repeated harassments by animal rights extremists. The bill will provide Federal authorities with the necessary tools to help prevent and better investigate and prosecute ecoterror cases.

This legislation is widely supported by those in agriculture, biomedical and biotechnology industries, as well as many research universities, teaching hospitals and other research institutes. Enactment of this legislation will enhance the ability of law enforcement and the Justice Department to protect law-abiding American citizens from violence and the threat of violence posed by animal rights extremists.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleague, Chairman SENSENBRENNER, Subcommittee Chairman COBLE, Ranking Member CONYERS, Subcommittee Ranking Member ROBERT

SCOTT, Senator INHOFE and Senator FEINSTEIN for their support in moving this bill forward.

Mr. Speaker, I also have a letter from Advance Publications that details some of the violent and threatening acts made against editors of their magazines, such as Vogue, because of the fashion industry's use of fur or animal products that would be covered under this legislation.

ADVANCE PUBLICATIONS, INC.,
Staten Island, NY, November 13, 2006.

Re Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act S. 3880

Hon. THOMAS E. PETRI,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PETRI: I write to support the passage of the Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act, S. 3880. Advance Publications is engaged throughout the United States in the publication of newspapers, business journals, and consumer magazines and websites on a variety of topics. Advance Publications is also affiliated with Bright House Networks, an operator of cable television systems in numerous states. For your information, a representative listing of Advance's publications and of the locations of Bright House Networks' cable systems is attached.

Our interest in this bill arises from the unfortunate fact that at least one of our publications, Vogue magazine, and its editor, Anna Wintour, have been repeatedly targeted by animal activists who disagree with Vogue magazine's decision to publish editorial content about, and carry advertising for, fur and other animal products, and its support for fashion designers who may use fur. These opponents are, of course, entitled to express their views, but their opposition often takes the form of physical attacks on Ms. Wintour and her home, threats and efforts to harm her, stalking her on the streets and at industry events, and even at a memorial service for her deceased father, and at least one actual physical invasion of Vogue's offices (which put numerous persons in fear, behind locked doors), as well as other attempts to do so.

While fortunately Ms. Wintour has not yet sustained any serious lasting injuries, she has suffered physical pain from those attacks (for example, from a "flour bomb" thrown in her eyes, the effects of which hurt and hampered her for days) and has often with good cause been concerned for her safety and the safety of her family. Indeed, when Ms. Wintour is appearing in public as part of her job (for example, at fashion shows or fashion industry events), we now feel we must provide guards, sometimes armed, to protect her. On a number of occasions we are convinced, had it not been for the presence of these unusual safeguards, Ms. Wintour could have been injured by the efforts to make physical attacks on her. We are of course concerned that these extreme activists will step up the severity of their attacks because their efforts have so far been unsuccessful at silencing Vogue.

We understand that among the arguments made in opposition to the AETA are alleged concerns that it may infringe on First Amendment rights. Our business is wholly dependent upon respect for First Amendment rights, and we are second to none in our defense of such rights. We have closely examined the AETA with this in mind, and we do not agree that the AETA, especially with the "rules of construction" that were added to it, in any way would inhibit or punish free speech or other First Amendment rights.

If anything, the opposite is the case. The real chilling effect on First Amendment rights comes about when editors and others

are put in fear of physical, violent attack because of what they publish or say. It is the violent animal activists who diminish free speech and free press by threatening and attacking editors, publications, and telecasters.

We strongly believe that enactment of S. 3880 will serve to deter many persons from engaging in these and worse violent and threatening acts in the future. In addition, the new law will give prosecutors a powerful new tool to go after those who continue to commit these acts.

Please let me know if we can provide any further information that would be helpful to you.

Very truly yours,

S.I. NEWHOUSE, Jr.,
Chairman.

ADVANCE PUBLICATIONS INC.—REPRESENTATIVE NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES (PUBLISHED BY SUBSIDIARIES AND AFFILIATES)

I. Daily Newspapers

Alabama: The Birmingham News, The Huntsville Times, Mobile Register.

Louisiana: The Times-Picayune. (New Orleans).

Massachusetts: The Union News/Sunday Republican (Springfield).

Michigan: The Ann Arbor News, The Bay City Times, The Flint Journal, The Grand Rapids Press, Jackson Citizen Patriot, Kalamazoo Gazette, The Muskegon Chronicle, The Saginaw News.

Mississippi: Mississippi Press (Pascagoula).
New Jersey: Bridgeton News, The Jersey Journal (Jersey City), The Star Ledger (Newark), Today's Sunbeam (Salem), The Times of Trenton, Gloucester County Times, (Woodbury).

New York: Staten Island Advance, The Post-Standard (Syracuse).

Ohio: Plain Dealer (Cleveland).

Oregon: The Oregonian (Portland).

Pennsylvania: The Express-Times (Easton), The Patriot-News (Harrisburg).

II. Consumer Magazines

The Condé Nast Publications: Allure, Architectural Digest, Bon Appétit, Bride's, Condé Nast Traveler, Details, Domino, Elegant Bride, Glamour, Golf Digest, Golf for Women, Gourmet, GQ, House & Garden, Jane, Lucky, Modern Bride, Self, Teen Vogue, The New Yorker, Vanity Fair, Vogue, W, Wired.

Parade Publications: Parade.

III. Cable Systems

Bright House Networks: Bakersfield, CA; Birmingham, AL; Central Florida; Detroit Suburbs, MI; Indianapolis, IN; Tampa Bay, FL.

IV. Business Journals

American City Business Journals Inc. Group:

Alabama: Birmingham Business Journal.

Arizona: The Business Journal Phoenix.

California: East Bay Business Times (Oakland), Sacramento Business Journal, San Francisco Business Times, Silicon Valley/San Jose Business Journal.

Colorado: Denver Business Journal.

District of Columbia: Washington Business Journal.

Florida: The Business Journal Serving Jacksonville and Northeast Florida, South Florida Business Journal (Miami), Orlando Business Journal, The Business Journal Tampa Bay.

Georgia: Atlanta Business Chronicle.

Hawaii: Pacific Business News (Honolulu).

Kansas: The Business Journal Serving Metropolitan Kansas City, Wichita Business Journal.

Kentucky: Business First: Greater Louisville's Definitive Source of Local Business.

Massachusetts: Boston Business Journal.

Maryland: Baltimore Business Journal.

Minnesota: City Business: The Business Journal (Minneapolis/St. Paul).

Missouri: St. Louis Business Journal.

New Mexico: New Mexico Business Weekly (Albuquerque).

New York: The Business Review Serving New York's Capital Region (Albany), Business First: Western New York's Business Newspaper (Buffalo).

North Carolina: The Business Journal Serving Charlotte and the Metropolitan Area, The Business Journal Serving the Greater Triad Area (Greensboro Winston-Salem), The Business Journal Serving The Triangle's Business Communities (Raleigh).

Ohio: Business Courier Serving the Cincinnati-Northern Kentucky Region, Columbus Business First (Columbia), Dayton Business Journal.

Oregon: Business Journal Portland.

Pennsylvania: Philadelphia Business Journal, Pittsburgh Business Times.

Tennessee: Memphis Business Journal, Nashville Business Journal.

Texas: Austin Business Journal, Dallas Business Journal, Houston Business Journal, San Antonio Business Journal.

Washington: Puget Sound Business Journal (Seattle).

Wisconsin: The Business Journal Serving Milwaukee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Would the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin yield for a question?

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Certainly.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. SENSENBRENNER, as I am reading through this act and looking at the types of injuries that would occur to people, it occurs to me that there are existing Federal statutes which come into play with respect to inflicting bodily harm on individuals. Why are we creating a specific classification here?

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. Please.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. The reason the bill is before us is that the current statute is drafted too narrowly and does not deal with threats by animal rights extremists in inflicting bodily harm, for example, against the publisher of Vogue magazine, because they put ads in depicting people wearing furs.

Mr. KUCINICH. Well, reclaiming my time, I certainly stand with every Member of this House in defense of the rights of individuals to be free of bodily harm or injury under all and any circumstances. I think it would be a little bit easier for some of us to support this legislation.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Well, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. I certainly will yield.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. The reason the bill is before us is that the current statute does not extend the reach of the Federal criminal law to those who do business with animal enterprise organizations, and the bill will make it a specific crime to intentionally damage the property of a person or entity having the connection to or relationship with or transactions with an animal

enterprise. That is not in the current law now.

Mr. KUCINICH. Reclaiming my time, and I thank the gentleman for pointing that out. However, I must say that the reach of the Federal law includes any place which does Federal research, and all these universities are involved in research projects as universities who are supporting this bill.

I cannot see why we need to have a specific law with this regard. I mean, just as we need to protect peoples' right to conduct their work without fear of assault, so too this Congress has yet to address some fundamental ethical principles with respect to animals. How should animals be treated humanely? This is a debate that hasn't come here.

There are some specific principles with respect to humane treatment of animals. My concern about this bill is that it could have a chilling effect on people who, the law says, well, their first amendment rights are protected. But the law also is written in such a way as to have a chilling effect on the exercise of the constitutional rights of protest, and so for that reason, I can't support this. I think that it would be important for this Congress to look at the claims of people who are sincere advocates of animal rights.

I am not talking about people who would threaten anyone with death because they don't agree with them, but there are individuals who love animals, who don't want to see animals hurt, who have a point and a right to speak out. I think for that reason, this bill has not yet reached its maturity.

I think I understand what the sponsors of this bill are trying to do, but I don't think that the end that it is going to, you are hoping to achieve, that you are going to reach, because unless this Congress makes a clear statement about ethical principles with respect to animals, and how we treat animals, how are animals treated in research, these are really serious questions that millions and millions of Americans care about.

So I understand the intent here. But I just think that you have got to be very careful about painting everyone with the broad brush of terrorism who might have a legitimate objection to a type of research or treatment of animals that is not humane. So, again, I wanted to express this note of caution about this legislation, but notwithstanding that there are specific statements about protection of the first amendment. This bill is written in such a way as to have a chilling effect on the exercise of peoples' first amendment rights.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 11 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that my distinguished colleague from Ohio hasn't

read the bill, so I will read it for him. At the end of page 7 in the Senate-passed bill, there is a subsection (e) called "rules of construction," which says, in part: nothing in this section shall be construed, one, to prohibit any expressive conduct, including peaceful picketing or other peaceful demonstration, protected from legal prohibition by the first amendment to the Constitution.

Two, to create new remedies for interference with activities protected by the free speech or free exercise clause of the first amendment to the Constitution regardless of the point of view expressed or to limit any existing legal remedies for such interference.

That means that if somebody wishes to peacefully protest research on animals, they can do so, as the statute, with the amendment that was adopted on the floor in the other body, specifically prohibits a prosecution for that.

Now, let's look at what the people this bill has been designed to go after have been saying:

"I don't think you would have to kill too many researchers. I think that for 5 lives, 10 lives, 15 human lives, we could save 1 million, 2 million or 10 million nonhuman lives." Animal Liberation Press Officer Jerry Vlasak at the 2003 National Animal Rights Conference in Los Angeles.

Second: "Arson property destruction, burglary and theft are 'acceptable crimes' when used for the animal cause." That quote was from Alex Pacheco, who is the director of PETA.

Third: "I wish we all would get up and go into the labs and take the animals out or burn them down." That is Ingrid Newkirk, president of PETA at the National Animal Rights Convention '97, June 27, 1997.

"Get arrested. Destroy the property of those who torture animals. Liberate those animals interned in the hellholes our society tolerates." That is Jerry Vlasak of the Animal Defense League again on an Internet post of June 21, 1996.

"We have found that civil disobedience and direct action has been powerful in generating massive attention in our communities . . . and has been very effective in traumatizing our targets." J.P. Goodwin, Committee to Abolish the Fur Trade at the National Animal Rights Convention in Los Angeles June 27, 1997.

Or: "In a war you have to take up arms, and people will get killed, and I can support that kind of action by petrol bombing and bombs under cars, and probably at a later stage, the shooting of vivisectors on their doorsteps. It is a war, and there is no other way you can stop vivisectors." Tim Daley, British Animal Liberation Front leader.

Finally, another one from Jerry Vlasak: "If they won't stop when you ask them nicely, they don't stop when you demonstrate to them what they are doing is wrong, then they should be stopped using whatever means are necessary."

This bill is designed to criminalize whatever means are necessary outside the Constitution.

Mr. KUCINICH. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KUCINICH. I thank the gentleman. To calm the gentleman's concerns, I have read the bill, and I underlined the sections that I expressed concern about. I am concerned about, as you are, anyone who wants to commit violence against anyone. Remember, I am the author of the bill to create a Department of Peace and Nonviolence. I share your concern about violence. I am suggesting that carving out a special section of law here has a chilling effect.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Reclaiming my time, again, I will reread page 7, lines 10 through 21 of the bill that was passed by the other body that says nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit any expressive conduct, including peaceful picketing or other peaceful demonstration protected from legal prohibition by the first amendment to the Constitution.

Two, to create new remedies for interference with activities protected by the free speech or free exercise clause of the first amendment to the Constitution, regardless of the point of view expressed or to limit any existing legal remedies for such interference, unquote.

Now, what this section says is that nothing in the bill, absolutely nothing in the bill shall be construed to restrict what I have just read. This bill should pass. We should reject the red herrings that we are hearing from the gentleman from Ohio and other opponents.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Again, I applaud the gentleman from Wisconsin for his commitment to protecting people from harm. I would like to read the next paragraph that he didn't get to, because it raises a question about why this bill is necessary: nothing in this section shall be construed, number 3, to provide exclusive criminal penalties or civil remedies with respect to the conduct prohibited by this action.

So what is this all about? This bill, in effect, does provide exclusive criminal penalties for a certain type of conduct, and yet the drafting of this bill makes section 3, under rules of construction, totally contradictory. This says there aren't any exclusive penalties, but the whole of the bill maintains and establishes exclusive penalties. So this is why bringing up a bill like this under suspension, no matter how well intentioned it may be, is problematic.

This bill has an inherent flaw that I am pointing out. In addition, when that flaw is held up against the constitutional mandate to protect freedom

of speech, what we have done here is we have crippled free expression.

I am not and never have been in favor of anyone using a cloak of free speech to commit violence. The Supreme Court Justice said, your right to swing your fist ends at the tip of my nose. No one has the right to yell "fire" in a crowded theater. We have heard those kinds of admonitions.

On the other hand, the chairman's recitation of the statements of animal rights activists, statements that I, myself, would disagree with, those statements, in and of themselves, are constitutionally protected speech.

□ 1515

Yet under this bill they suddenly find themselves shifting into an area of doubt, which goes back to my initial claim that this bill was written to have a chilling effect upon a specific type of protest.

Again, I am not for anyone abusing their rights by damaging another person's property or person, but I am for protecting the first amendment and not creating a special class of violations for a specific type of protest.

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

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

I would just like to sum up that on October 30 the American Civil Liberties Union sent a letter to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), my ranking member, and myself, not opposing this legislation. They did ask for minor changes, but they did not express one concern about constitutionally protected first amendment rights being infringed upon or jeopardized in any way by this bill.

Now, if there ever was an organization that really goes all the way on one side in interpreting the first amendment as liberally as it can, it is the American Civil Liberties Union. My friend from Ohio, whom I have a great respect for, is even outside the definition of the first amendment that the ACLU has eloquently advanced in the halls of this Capitol for decades and will do so for decades to come.

This is a good bill. I think that all of the fears that the gentleman from Ohio has placed on the record are ill-founded by practically everybody who has looked through this bill, including the ACLU. All I need to do is go back to the quotes that I cited a couple of minutes ago to show why this bill is vitally necessary.

I urge a "yes" vote on the bill.

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 Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 3880.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TO VIETNAM

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5602) to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Vietnam, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5602

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) In July 1995, President Bill Clinton announced the formal normalization of diplomatic relations between the United States and Vietnam.

(2) Vietnam has taken cooperative steps with the United States under the United States Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command (formerly the Joint Task Force-Full Accounting) established in 1992 by President George H.W. Bush to provide the fullest possible accounting of MIA and POW cases.

(3) In 2000, the United States and Vietnam concluded a bilateral trade agreement that included commitments on goods, services, intellectual property rights, and investment. The agreement was approved by joint resolution enacted pursuant to section 405(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2435(c)), and entered into force in December 2001.

(4) Since 2001, normal trade relations treatment has consistently been extended to Vietnam pursuant to title IV of the Trade Act of 1974.

(5) Vietnam has undertaken significant market-based economic reforms, including the reduction of government subsidies, tariffs and nontariff barriers, and extensive legal reform. These measures have dramatically improved Vietnam's business and investment climate.

(6) Vietnam is in the process of acceding to the World Trade Organization. On May 31, 2006, the United States and Vietnam signed a comprehensive bilateral agreement providing greater market access for goods and services and other trade liberalizing commitments as part of the World Trade Organization accession process.

SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974 TO VIETNAM.

(a) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATIONS AND EXTENSION OF NON-DISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any provision of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2431 et seq.), the President may—

(1) determine that such title should no longer apply to Vietnam; and

(2) after making a determination under paragraph (1) with respect to Vietnam, proclaim the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of that country.

(b) TERMINATION OF THE APPLICABILITY OF TITLE IV.—On and after the effective date of the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment to the products of Vietnam under subsection (a), title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 shall cease to apply to that country.

SEC. 3. PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINING PROHIBITED SUBSIDIES BY VIETNAM.

(a) AUTHORITY OF TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.—The Trade Representative may conduct proceedings under this section to determine whether the Government of Vietnam is providing, on or after the date on which

Vietnam accedes to the World Trade Organization, a prohibited subsidy to its textile or apparel industry, if such proceedings are begun, and consultations under section 4(a) are initiated, during the 1-year period beginning on the date on which Vietnam accedes to the World Trade Organization.

(b) PETITIONS.—

(1) FILING.—Any interested person may file a petition with the Trade Representative requesting that the Trade Representative make a determination under subsection (a). The petition shall set forth the allegations in support of the request.

(2) REVIEW BY TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.—The Trade Representative shall review the allegations in any petition filed under paragraph (1) and, not later than 20 days after the date on which the Trade Representative receives the petition, shall determine whether to initiate proceedings to make a determination under subsection (a).

(3) PROCEDURES.—

(A) DETERMINATION TO INITIATE PROCEEDINGS.—If the Trade Representative makes an affirmative determination under paragraph (2) with respect to a petition, the Trade Representative shall publish a summary of the petition in the Federal Register and notice of the initiation of proceedings under this section.

(B) DETERMINATION NOT TO INITIATE PROCEEDINGS.—If the Trade Representative determines not to initiate proceedings with respect to a petition, the Trade Representative shall inform the petitioner of the reasons therefor and shall publish notice of the determination, together with a summary of those reasons, in the Federal Register.

(c) INITIATION OF PROCEEDINGS BY OTHER MEANS.—If the Trade Representative determines, in the absence of a petition, that proceedings should be initiated under this section, the Trade Representative shall publish in the Federal Register that determination, together with the reasons therefor, and notice of the initiation of proceedings under this section.

SEC. 4. CONSULTATIONS UPON INITIATION OF INVESTIGATION.

If the Trade Representative initiates a proceeding under subsection (b)(3)(A) or (c) of section 3, the Trade Representative, on behalf of the United States, shall, on the day on which notice thereof is published under the applicable subsection, so notify the Government of Vietnam and request consultations with that government regarding the subsidy.

SEC. 5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND CONSULTATION.

(a) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—In the notice published under subsection (b)(3)(A) or (c) of section 3, the Trade Representative shall provide an opportunity to the public for the presentation of views concerning the issues—

(1) within the 30-day period beginning on the date of the notice (or on a date after such period if agreed to by the petitioner), or

(2) at such other time if a timely request therefor is made by the petitioner or by any interested person, with a public hearing if requested by an interested person.

(b) CONSULTATION.—The Trade Representative shall consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and with the appropriate advisory committees established under section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155), with respect to whether to initiate proceedings under section 3 and, if proceedings are conducted, with respect to making the determination under subsection (c).

(c) DETERMINATION.—After considering all comments submitted, and within 30 days

after the close of the comment period under subsection (a), the Trade Representative shall determine whether the Government of Vietnam is providing, on or after the date on which Vietnam accedes to the World Trade Organization, a prohibited subsidy to its textile or apparel industry. The Trade Representative shall publish that determination in the Federal Register, together with the justification for the determination.

(d) RECORD.—The Trade Representative shall make available to the public a complete record of all nonconfidential information presented in proceedings conducted under this section, together with a summary of confidential information so submitted.

SEC. 6. ARBITRATION AND IMPOSITION OF QUOTAS.

(a) ARBITRATION.—If, within 60 days after consultations are requested under section 4, in a case in which the Trade Representative makes an affirmative determination under section 5(c), the matter in dispute is not resolved, the Trade Representative shall request arbitration of the matter under the Dispute Settlement Understanding.

(b) IMPOSITION OF QUOTAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Trade Representative shall impose, for a period of not more than 1 year, the quantitative limitations described in paragraph (2) on textile and apparel products of Vietnam—

(A) if, pursuant to arbitration under subsection (a), the arbitrator determines that the Government of Vietnam is providing, on or after the date on which Vietnam accedes to the World Trade Organization, a prohibited subsidy to its textile or apparel industry; or

(B) if the arbitrator does not issue a decision within 120 days after the request for arbitration, in which case the limitations cease to be effective if the arbitrator, after such limitations are imposed, determines that the Government of Vietnam is not providing, on or after the date on which Vietnam accedes to the World Trade Organization, a prohibited subsidy to its textile or apparel industry.

(2) LIMITATIONS DESCRIBED.—The quantitative limitations referred to in paragraph (1) are those quantitative limitations that were in effect under the Bilateral Textile Agreement during the most recent full calendar year in which the Bilateral Textile Agreement was in effect.

(c) DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE.—If, after imposing quantitative limitations under subsection (b) because of a prohibited subsidy, the Trade Representative determines that the Government of Vietnam is not providing, on or after the date on which Vietnam accedes to the World Trade Organization, a prohibited subsidy to its textile or apparel industry, the quantitative limitations shall cease to be effective on the date on which that determination is made.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) BILATERAL TEXTILE AGREEMENT.—The term "Bilateral Textile Agreement" means the Agreement Relating to Trade in Cotton, Wool, Man-Made Fiber, Non-Cotton Vegetable Fiber and Silk Blend Textiles and Textile Products Between the Governments of the United States of America and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, entered into on July 17, 2003.

(2) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT UNDERSTANDING.—The term "Dispute Settlement Understanding" means the Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes referred to in section 101(d)(16) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(16)).

(3) INTERESTED PERSON.—The term "interested person" includes, but is not limited to,

domestic firms and workers, representatives of consumer interests, United States product exporters, and any industrial user of any goods or services that may be affected by action taken under section 6(b).

(4) PROHIBITED SUBSIDY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “prohibited subsidy” means a subsidy described in article 3.1 of the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures.

(B) SUBSIDY.—The term “subsidy” means a subsidy within the meaning of article 1.1 of the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures.

(C) AGREEMENT ON SUBSIDIES AND COUNTERVAILING MEASURES.—The term “Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures” means the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures referred to in section 101(d)(12) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(12)).

(5) TEXTILE OR APPAREL PRODUCT.—The term “textile or apparel product” means a good listed in the Annex to the Agreement on Textiles and Clothing referred to in section 101(d)(4) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(4)).

(6) TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.—The term “Trade Representative” means the United States Trade Representative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5602 was a bill that was introduced in June of this year by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) and principally the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON). This is the culmination of a long and sometimes very difficult process.

The relationships between the United States and Vietnam have been difficult. When I was a member of the committee as a member of the minority and the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee was the gentleman from Nevada, Mr. GIBBONS, we traveled to Vietnam as the first official United States Delegation on Trade. That was a number of years ago. So we arrive today after an 11-year effort in working with Vietnam to enjoy the announcement that Vietnam is on the verge of joining the World Trade Organization.

Vietnam joining the WTO will bring substantial economic benefits obviously to the Vietnamese and to the United States, because Vietnam has agreed to open its markets to U.S. goods and services. However, to fully benefit from this move on the part of Vietnam to the World Trade Organization, the United States must first extend the so-called permanent normal trade relationship to Vietnam, and that is what this bill does.

I asked to take it up with the “as amended” phrase attached because we have been able to come to an agreement. One of the real concerns with an increase in trade between the United States and Vietnam is the textile industry. We have concerns about those areas in the United States that still

have an ability to provide and afford the production of textiles and the relationship we are going to continue to grow with Central America with the free trade agreement there and with the pending free trade agreements with Andean countries that will provide us with an excellent opportunity to move our raw and partially finished textile products to an area that will both advance those countries and the United States.

Vietnam will be a major player in the textile industry. The concern we have is in balancing the concerns of those who are on the retail side and those who are on the production side, and we believe that the amendment that we have offered will go a long way toward resolving those concerns.

There is still concern as far as the chairman is concerned and, I know, of other Members on Vietnam's record on human rights and religious freedom. Just because it decides to join the World Trade Organization doesn't mean that it has decided in all aspects to join the world's civilized nations in its behavior not only to its people and to others. However, I do firmly believe that if Vietnam lives up to its commitment in its membership in the World Trade Organization, it will encourage and accelerate the opportunity for needed reforms in a tangible way that impacts the Vietnamese people's lives daily. So although I have a number of reservations in that regard, I do support going forward.

This is a regime that is not a democracy. I do hope as we examine trade relationships that may be presented to this Congress before we adjourn sine die, that we take cognizance of the fact that we have an opportunity to enter into free trade agreements with growing and vibrant democracies in this hemisphere, and if we are anxious to move a trade agreement with a country that is not democratic, that we extend that same courtesy to those in the Western Hemisphere, specifically Peru, that have made significant sacrifices to come to a free trade agreement. They are, after all, a deserving people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I turn the balance of my time over to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee, and that he be allowed to yield said time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation because I believe, on balance, Vietnam's accession to the WTO is a positive step. It is a growing economy

with 90 million people. It remains a command economy basically and a one-party state, and that always leads to some concerns and some qualifications. That is true here in terms of some problems, serious ones in the past with human rights, and also some economic issues. However, I think, on balance, it is wise to proceed. Their becoming part of the WTO will mean that the disciplines of international regulations will apply to them.

Let me say, however, I have several concerns. One is that this bill is on the suspension calendar. This bill did not go through committee. There was no hearing. I think this is not a wise procedure. In fact, I am sure it is not a wise procedure, and it is not going to be followed in the future. Bills of this nature, I believe, will have hearings before a committee and will not come up on suspension.

Secondly, a second concern, there is an important omission here and there is no safeguard mechanism in this accession agreement. When nonmarket economies operate, they usually do not do so through the usual mechanisms of supply and demand or international market dynamics, and so it is easier for there to be surges of imports into this country and more difficulty in dealing with them. The Bush administration did not negotiate a general surge provision here nor a textile surge provision. They were both in the China accession agreement. This is a serious omission, or at least an omission that should not be replicated.

For example, there is now negotiation with Russia of an accession agreement. The bilateral has been completed and the multilateral will start. I don't think we should be approving PNTR bills, for example, with Russia, until there is a safeguard mechanism negotiated in the agreement itself.

I believe all of us on this side who are speaking today will be dedicated to making sure that there is such a safeguard mechanism, so that if there is that surge of exports to us, we have a mechanism to deal with it.

On balance, I think it is important to proceed with this bill, and therefore I urge support.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5602 would grant permanent normal trade relations with Vietnam and permit U.S. businesses to take full advantage of the commitments that Vietnam has made as part of its accession into the World Trade Organization.

On November 7, 2006, World Trade Organization members voted to approve Vietnam's entry into the organization and Vietnam is expected to officially become a member by the end of the year. To get to this point, Vietnam has clearly made significant economic reforms and will benefit not only the international community, but also the people of Vietnam.

As part of Vietnam's accession into the World Trade Organization, more

than 94 percent of all U.S. exports of manufactured goods will face duties no higher than 15 percent. Tariffs will also be reduced 15 percent or less on three-quarters of United States agricultural products.

Additionally, U.S. service providers will have increased access to Vietnam's market. My own State of Florida already exports over \$20 million of goods to Vietnam. With Vietnam's entry into the World Trade Organization, I expect this number to grow even higher, thus benefiting those that manufacture, create, grow and harvest these products, as well as those that package, store and transport them.

To say the United States and Vietnam have had a rocky relationship would be a dramatic understatement. Yet, much like with Japan, this opportunity to promote cooperation and conciliation demonstrates the great progress that is important when countries engage economically.

By enacting this legislation, the United States and Vietnam have a unique opportunity to show the world that no matter what the history between these countries may be, they can still have substantial economic and foreign policy benefits when the countries turn away from violent conflict and focus their efforts on economic interaction with an international rule-based system.

□ 1530

This legislation can provide an important symbolic example to countries throughout the world facing an important choice between violence and isolation or economic prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 5602 and support the efforts of American businesses striving to compete in this new and expanding market.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation granting Vietnam permanent normal trade relations.

Today is a day that shows America really at its best. With one piece of legislation, we will show the world the heart and spirit of our country. In the grand scheme of things, there is not a lot of money involved here, but there is an enormous amount of history and healing involved. Democrats support permanent normal trade relations with Vietnam because granting PNTR to Vietnam allows it to join the rule-based, multilateral trading system, the World Trade Organization. Vietnam's accession to the WTO will ensure that Vietnam is bound to international rules and concessions that aim to provide trade-related economic growth that is fair.

But PNTR does more than just bring Vietnam into a multinational trading relationship. PNTR continues to heal the wounds of a conflict whose wounds

are still felt today. The healing of the Vietnam War continues, and today marks another important step in that process.

The U.S.-Vietnam accession agreement, for the most part, is a strong one. The agreement will open an emerging market of almost 90 million people to American exporters of goods and services. This agreement will provide the Nation's exporters and consumers opportunities which are not available today.

In my home State of Washington, a State that relies heavily on exports to drive its economy, products like computer software, commercial aircraft, and agricultural goods will find better access to an increasingly dynamic economy through this agreement.

Subjecting Vietnam to the disciplines of the WTO and its rules and dispute settlement mechanisms will be a positive step in providing the United States more of an opportunity to ensure that Vietnam's economic reforms continue and move in the right direction. This will provide a new opportunity for the Vietnamese to improve their lives by participating in freer and fair markets. That is what makes this agreement worthy of support despite its flaws.

Even as we move, I hope, to pass this resolution, we must recognize a deeply flawed process by which the resolution is brought before the House. First, this is a major trade bill that is coming to the floor on a suspension calendar, the legislation introduced and made available to the Members and the public just a few hours ago without any significant debate, without any hearing in the committee of jurisdiction, and without the opportunity of any markup. I doubt most Members know anything about this bill, which was introduced just a few hours ago, as most Members are presently flying back from their districts across the country.

This is not the way the Congress should operate when we are legislating on matters of importance to the American people. We should follow the regular order, and I am hopeful that in the future we will do that. In fact, I am absolutely certain we will do that, having listened to Mr. LEVIN talk about it.

In fact, the bill, and Vietnam's accession agreement to the WTO, omits a critically important provision. The Bush administration failed once again to negotiate a safeguard mechanism with Vietnam, which is a country with a nonmarket economy. This is a major oversight. Nonmarket economies do not respond to normal market signals of supply and demand, and thereby they often create surplus supply that can lead to import surges in the U.S. market. These surges, and this administration's failure to address them effectively, are one of the areas in which the Bush administration has failed to stand up for American businesses, for their workers and the manufacturing sector in general.

In the new Congress, the House of Representatives and the Committee on

Ways and Means will need to consider ways that our trade law remedies can be updated and strengthened, including the antidumping laws. American firms are among the most competitive in the world, but they cannot compete with the treasury of foreign countries. The administration should know that in the new Congress; the new majority will insist that the administration incorporate safeguard tools in future PNTR agreements.

In closing, I support this bill because it is an important step that we should take to strengthen the multilateral trading system. It is an important step to provide opportunities for American and Vietnamese workers and entrepreneurs. Most importantly, this is a step we can take to improve U.S.-Vietnamese relations and our relationship with emerging Asian economies. It is unfortunate that the agreement has some key shortcomings that my colleagues on the House Ways and Means intend to address in the coming months.

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

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

I would like to clarify the record on the statement by the gentleman from Washington. He may have just gotten the amendments, but the bill has been out there since last spring and amendments were delivered to the staff of the minority office last Thursday asking for comments. We are trying to do this in as bipartisan a way as we can because we have support from the other side.

So I don't want anyone watching this process going forward to think that the majority here has in any way not shared the information that it has with the minority.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

I want to rise in strong support of this legislation, and I want to commend the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee for the work that they have done in advancing this bill, which will benefit both America and Vietnam for years to come. And I want to especially pay tribute to the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee for his long service in this Congress and for the work that he has done over the years in the area of trade, which has made such advances for better relations between the United States and other countries and improved the lot of people in other countries as well as the lot of workers and citizens here at home in the United States. His service will be greatly missed in the next Congress.

Permanent normal trade relations with Vietnam is the next logical step in our partnership with that country. Back in 1995, with my support and that of many others on both sides of the

aisle, we embarked on a new path of political progress with Vietnam. We restored political relations and we restored economic relations. We recognized how important it was to integrate a former adversary into the global economy.

Then in December of 2001, we passed a bilateral trade agreement that has spurred economic growth for all parties. By the end of 2005, two-way trade between the United States and Vietnam had reached nearly \$8 billion, a huge increase from the base it started at just a few years earlier. Now, with the passage of this legislation, with the adoption of permanent normal trade relations, we will magnify those benefits and we will allow the United States and Vietnam to work as partners in the World Trade Organization.

The impact for our Nation will be especially dramatic in the services sector. The bill will provide more open access in telecommunications, financial services, and energy services. This is crucial, absolutely crucial, for jobs here at home in the United States. Eighty percent of the American workforce is in the service sector.

At the same time, this legislation is about more than just economics, and I think that those on both sides of the aisle recognize this fact. Permanent normal trade relations will promote additional domestic reforms in Vietnam. By increasing transparency in that country's trade practices, this bill will contribute to greater transparency in all areas of government.

From the first time that I visited Vietnam after my service in the conflict there, more than 15 years ago, to today we have seen enormous changes take place in the political structure of Vietnam. And as a Vietnam veteran, I find this especially heartwarming and especially important. We are working and we must continue to work on behalf of development and of good governance in Vietnam.

This legislation shows us that Vietnam's best interests can align with the interests of this country as well, and this is what free trade is all about. This is what free trade does for two countries, and this is why this bill has bipartisan support, and it is why it will pass, why it should pass, today.

I can only hope that in the next Congress my colleagues will take the same commonsense approach to other trade bills that will be considered and that they will have the courage to embrace a free trade agenda which will benefit Americans and people around the world alike.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this bill.

I am honored to follow my friends Mr. SHAW and Mr. KOLBE, who have invested in making this work, and it is an example of how trade policy can, in fact, be bipartisan. This is one of those examples.

For those of us who entered political life during the Vietnam War era, the passage of normal trade relations and the final step towards normalization of relations with Vietnam is nothing short of astonishing. I was honored to accompany President Clinton on his historic visit to Vietnam in 2000 and to watch the spontaneous outpouring of interest and it appeared even affection, for the American President and for America at that point. This agreement cements this important political relationship with a key Southeast Asia partner and demonstrates a roadmap for other former enemy countries to repair relations and proceed together along a mutually beneficial path.

It contributes to the continued process of reform in Vietnam, strengthening the rule of law, promoting transparency in government, and decreasing that government's role in the Vietnamese economy.

It is also good economic policy for both the United States and Vietnam, strengthens the international trading system in the wake of the collapse of the Doha Round. U.S. exports to Vietnam have increased over 150 percent since that historic visit with President Clinton to over \$1.2 billion last year, and Vietnam continues to be the second fastest economic growth engine in the world.

Vietnam has agreed to open their markets to U.S. manufactured goods, services, and agricultural commodities, including things we care about in Oregon like beef, apples and pears.

Imports from Vietnam are also important in supporting many jobs in the Northwest, as my friend from Puget Sound mentioned. Companies, I would say, like Nike and Intel have the same sort of interests, and it will also provide advantages for American consumers. Access to U.S. markets can also play an important role in Vietnam's fight against poverty as it seeks to emulate the progress of the other "Asian tigers," which have lifted hundreds of millions of people out of poverty and sickness in East Asia.

However, I would offer two points of caution. I am concerned that the administration has agreed to self-initiate antidumping investigations against the Vietnamese textile industry, which employs 2 million people and is Vietnam's second largest export earner. By creating an uncertain atmosphere for U.S. business in Vietnam, I am concerned, and I hope that this concern is not proven to be founded, that the agreement between the administration and the Senators from North Carolina will deter U.S. companies from operating in Vietnam and harm companies that depend on imports from that country, limiting the benefits of this agreement both for the United States and the Vietnamese people, as well as setting, shall we say, a dubious precedent for future trade policy.

I do encourage the administration to work closely with the United States stakeholders and attempt to find a mu-

tually acceptable conclusion to this issue that is fair to the parties involved and does not set a dangerous precedent.

I would also repeat on the floor what I have said to friends and people that I have met in Vietnam, Vietnamese officials at the highest level in both countries, that the Vietnam record on religious freedom and human rights continues to be an impediment to a full flowering of the partnership with the United States. It decreases the legitimacy of the Vietnamese Government in the eyes of their people and people around the world.

□ 1545

A truly close relationship can only be based on shared values and the Vietnam Government's record must improve in the area of human rights and religious freedom. And it is not just about the relationship between the United States and Vietnam and helping oppressed people in Vietnam. It is only with this freedom of the economy and religion that they are going to be able to benefit the full flowering of their economy.

Mr. Speaker, in the end, permanent normal trade relations with Vietnam is a win for both the United States and Vietnam on all fronts. And I for one enjoyed working with the junior Senator from Oregon who helped lead the passage in the Senate, demonstrating once again that trade does not have to be one of these mindless partisan issues. I strongly support this legislation and urge my colleagues to do as well.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5602. Opposing PNTR for Vietnam is in the interest of the Vietnamese and the American people. As you know, Vietnam has been subject to a trade agreement with the United States since 2001. How has it gone? If you care about Vietnam, then you should care to know that Vietnam has a lot to lose as poor as that country may be.

Vietnam had a growth rate of 9 percent between 1993 and 1997, the year the Asian financial crisis hit. In other words, under the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, economic growth was very respectable, but the global experience of developing countries with WTO roles is disappointing at best.

During the WTO decade, that is 1995 to 2005, the number and percentage of people living on less than \$2 a day has jumped in South Asia, sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, the Middle East and the Caribbean. The rate of worldwide poverty reduction has slowed. Per capita income growth in poor nations decline when they sign up for the WTO.

And structural adjustment policies by the IMF and the World Bank also cause the economic situation of the people in those countries that sign up for the WTO to be impaired.

Per capita growth from 1980 to 2000 fell to half of what occurred between 1960 and 1980, 1980 prior to the imposition of the WTO-IMF package. I worry about the Vietnamese people if the PNTR should pass. If you care about Vietnam, then you should care to know that the PNTR could have the effect of causing, one, millions of peasants to be thrown off the land as agricultural supports are withdrawn; two, millions of workers to lose their jobs as state enterprises wither in the face of foreign competition or downsize and speed up operations in an effort to stay competitive.

Privatization, right on its way. At the beginning of this year, I was one of the Democratic representatives chosen by the Speaker of the House to visit Southeast Asia, and we visited Vietnam.

One of the things that struck me during the visit, particularly to the south part of Vietnam, was the ubiquitous nature of the bicycle. People use bicycles as a primary means of getting around, and it is linked to the culture. There are rules that impose high tariffs and taxes on bringing cars in to operate in Vietnam. Those rules and tariffs are just going to be wiped off the books, pushed aside.

This agreement is going to have a profound impact in creating a transition in the culture of Vietnam away from a use of an effective and efficient means of transportation, towards choking streets that are already clogged with a lot of people, with automobiles at a time that we should be thinking about the relationship between trade and global climate change.

I mean, after all, the WTO does not permit human rights, workers' rights or environmental quality principles to be put into trade agreements. So here we are celebrating the growth of free trade at the same time the worldwide economic crisis continues.

Somebody has got to make the connection between demanding that the WTO have environmental quality principles written into these agreements, and you are going to see countries like Vietnam suffer as a result of that lack. Have we not had enough of the folly of the World Trade Organization? Have we not lost enough good-paying jobs in this country? Have we not learned that the U.S. cannot for long be the world's biggest market and biggest consumer if our people are not making wealth through manufacturing? I mean, we need an American manufacturing policy where the maintenance of steel, automotive, aerospace and agriculture is seen as vital to our Nation's national security.

Mr. Speaker, if you care about jobs in the United States, then you should be concerned to learn that the U.S. balance of trade with Vietnam has gone from a surplus in 1993 to a deficit of over \$5 billion.

As Chinese manufacturers move south to Vietnam in search of even cheaper labor, more and more exports

will come from Vietnam to the United States and more and more jobs in the U.S. will disappear. Wake up, Congress. We have got close to an \$800 billion trade deficit, and this bill just keeps going in the same direction.

Goodbye, American jobs. No workers rights. No human rights. No environmental quality principles. Why are we doing this?

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida has the right to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has the right to close, that is correct.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I feel confident this measure before us will pass quite easily. I am glad that you have allowed the House to consider it today. I am sorry that Mr. RAMSTAD did not get a chance to come. We are going to miss Mr. SHAW as he leaves us. Mr. KOLBE, I am sorry he has left the floor. He was also a promoter of trade in underdeveloped countries and has been a real contributor to that effort here in the Congress.

However, this House has a little bit of work left to do in trade. And I talked to the chairman of the committee, Mr. THOMAS, before he left about whether or not we can get a bill between now and the time we get out of here. I would urge the Speaker and the chairman to act on a bill that extends the expiring trade preference programs, the Andean Trade Promotion Program and the generalized system of preferences. These are programs that have been in place for many, many years and have had a very positive effect in the underdeveloped world. And I think it is important that we not allow them to lapse in the midst of transition between party control and whatever.

There are a lot of people out there whose jobs depend on how those are implemented. And I think that the chairman understands that and has given me his assurance that he is going to talk to the Senate about whether we can get through such a piece of legislation, because it is vital to these developing countries and the workers and the American businessmen and consumers.

If you are trying to plan to source some of your material overseas and you do not know what the law is going to be applying to it, it is very hard for you to plan in advance, as the garment industry does or other industries. You need some certainty about when things are going to be available and what preferences will be in place so that the costs can be considered.

I would urge the Speaker in this thing to bring us a short-term clean extension. There are a lot of things out there that can get onto these bills that really do not add, in fact are very controversial.

But the clean extension should include the provisions for Haiti, which is

the poorest country in our hemisphere, and certainly we want to do what we can for them. Sub-Saharan Africa is also a very undeveloped area that is having enormous economic problems. And for those kinds of supports I think there ought not to be any kind of opposition to them. The problem is they always get coupled with everything else under the sun that people have always wanted to do.

I hope the chairman and the committee and the subcommittee and the Speaker will all come together and bring us a bill and we will support it as we have done this one today.

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge that after all of these years, I finally found something that I agree with with the gentleman from Washington, and that is the statement with regard to the Andean countries, Africa, and with Haiti.

I would hope if we cannot conclude a satisfactory agreement, free trade agreement with the countries that we are working with now, most notably Peru and Colombia, that we should have some short-term extension of the Andean preference for those countries.

At this time we do not have one, an agreement with Ecuador. However, Ecuador is in a situation now of going into an election where they have one pro-American candidate, and one that is pro-Chavez. I think we should watch that very closely, and I think that we have an obligation to do everything we can for our friends and their economic growth. I will leave it right there.

But I think that we need to, and I would hope that in the next Congress, which I regret that I will not be part of, to see these things through that we should continue our work to become, and continue to be free trade.

I would like to also comment on the comments made by my friend from Ohio with regard to the low wages and low standard of living in Vietnam. I traveled there in the late 1980s with then-chairman Gibbons. It is the same CODEL that Mr. THOMAS made reference to in his opening remarks.

There we saw a very impoverished nation. We stayed at a government house in which the conditions were deplorable. In fact, one of the spouses along on the trip took all of her husband's undershirts and laid them on the bed before she would even get into the bed. We had rolling blackouts. The country was an economic disaster.

But we saw something very important. And I think this was really driven home, particularly, Jake Pickrel, whom many of us know, his wife fell and broke her hip. The doctors who was traveling with us took her down to the hospital in Vietnam, and he came back and said this is 1950s technology, the x-ray equipment there. And of course we immediately flew her out of Vietnam, where she could get and did get proper treatment.

I think we can look at Vietnam now, and I have not been back since then. But I understand the economic strides that they have made are really tremendous. And that is almost 100 percent due to their changing their economy so that it can thrive and it can grow and is not held back by the 100 percent socialistic tendencies that it seemed to have at the time.

Also I think that there is no question but that our trade will grow with Vietnam, because this is an agreement that works both ways. Their tariffs come down, our exports will increase, there is no question about that. As usual, and we find in most countries, that the tariffs of the country that we are taking down tariffs with has a higher tariff than we do.

So we should benefit, Vietnam should benefit and the economy of both countries will be better off for it. And when an economy as small as Vietnam mixes with an economy as large as the United States, it is very easy to realize that any type of stimulus that you give those economies will be a very, very big impact on their economy.

I have a letter here from the U.S.-Vietnam World Trade Coalition, and it is signed by Madeleine Albright, Jim Baker, Charlene Barshefsky, Samuel Berger, Harold Brown, Warren Christopher, William Cohen, Lawrence Eagleburger, Carla Hills, Michael Kantor, Henry Kissinger, Anthony Lake, Robert McNamara, Colin Powell, Robert Rubin, George Shultz, Robert Strauss, and Clayton Yeutter, very much in favor of this agreement.

Washington, DC, September 8, 2006.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As the bipartisan sponsors of H.R. 5602, to provide Vietnam with Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) status, we forward you the following letter signed by numerous former Cabinet Secretaries, U.S. Trade Representatives and others involved in trade and foreign policy in previous administrations.

We hope you find this letter useful as you consider your vote on this important issue.

Sincerely,

JIM RAMSTAD,
Member of Congress.
MIKE THOMPSON,
Member of Congress.

U.S. VIETNAM, WTO COALITION,
July 11, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT, *Speaker,*
House of Representatives.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader,
House of Representatives.

Hon. BILL FRIST,
Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Minority Leader,
U.S. Senate.

We strongly support the President's proposal to grant Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) status to Vietnam. America's long-term security and economic interests will be advanced by Vietnam's full integration into the rules-based global trading system. Vietnam can become a catalyst for growth and development in Southeast Asia, and will offer significant opportunities for U.S. companies, workers, and consumers.

In the thirty years since the end of the conflict in Southeast Asia, the United States

has worked steadfastly to normalize relations with its former adversary. This effort proceeded, step by step, as we sought the fullest possible accounting of American prisoners of war and personnel missing in action. The "Roadmap" to normalization helped to achieve significant progress in this regard. We enjoy today a multifaceted, mutually beneficial relationship with Vietnam that has enabled us to engage on a range of issues, including protection of religious freedom, labor, and human rights.

Vietnam is home to nearly eighty-five million people, more than half of whom are under the age of twenty-five. As a country facing a host of infrastructure and human development challenges, Vietnam merits not only our attention, but also our support for the promising reform process that is underway. In this vein, the 2001 U.S.-Vietnam Bilateral Trade Agreement was an important milestone, and it has contributed to the development of a more open, market-oriented economy with important potential benefits for the Vietnamese and American peoples.

PNTR and WTO accession for Vietnam will strengthen America's linkages with the commercially and strategically important region of Southeast Asia, which, with a GDP of nearly \$3 trillion, represents our fourth largest export market. The comprehensive WTO accession agreement reached by Vietnam and U.S. negotiators will provide even broader market access across a range of U.S. goods and services. Equally important, it will enhance transparency, accountability, and the rule of law.

The granting of PNTR for Vietnam represents the logical next step in the normalization of relations between our two countries, a process that has been made more effective by broad bipartisan support in Congress, and that has spanned successive presidential administrations during the past three decades. We support the granting of PNTR in advance of Vietnam hosting the Annual APEC Leaders Meeting in November, in which President Bush will participate. This will further encourage Vietnam's emergence as a responsible regional partner, as we together address a myriad of complex international economic and security issues.

We urge the Congress to approve PNTR for Vietnam at the earliest possible opportunity this summer.

Sincerely,

Madeleine K. Albright, James A. Baker III, Charlene Barshefsky, Samuel L. Berger, Harold Brown, Warren Christopher, William S. Cohen, Lawrence S. Eagleburger, Carla A. Hills, Michael Kantor, Henry A. Kissinger, Anthony Lake, Robert McNamara, Colin L. Powell, Robert E. Rubin, George P. Shultz, Robert S. Strauss, Clayton K. Yeutter.

□ 1600

I think the Members on both sides of the aisle will certainly find somebody on that list that they have a great deal of respect for for their particular view with regard to matters pertaining to trade.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to thank Mr. RAMSTAD, who

is trying to get back here in order to take time on the floor, and really I think if he were here, and I will not hesitate because he is not, to praise him for the good work that he has done and his foresight in bringing this particular bill forward.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I have serious concerns about establishing Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) with Vietnam without mandating essential human rights protections.

In August, the Government of Vietnam arrested and held a U.S. Citizen, Cong Thanh Do, on false charges. Only with the efforts of many U.S. officials was Mr. Do released.

The Government of Vietnam arrested and imprisoned Mr. Do, a U.S. citizen, on false charges even when it was trying to convince the U.S. Congress to grant permanent normal trade relations.

What practices will the Government of Vietnam engage in when they are not trying to convince the U.S. Congress to pass PNTR?

I believe that had the Majority allowed us ample time for consideration and debate on PNTR, we may have been able to include critical human rights protections.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill until sufficient time is granted to include necessary human rights protections.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my strong support for the permanent normalization of trade relations (PNTR) with Vietnam. With the Doha round of global trade talks in limbo, the U.S. must continue to pursue an active bilateral trade agenda that makes real gains for America's working families.

My hometown of Laredo has been transformed by trade. Since the implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), I have watched as trade transformed communities in Texas from areas of marginal business activity, to some of the most rapidly developing counties in the nation. Laredo now serves as the largest inland port in North America and takes in 60 percent of all NAFTA traffic.

But our current trade agreements are simply not enough. In today's global economy, we cannot afford to stand idle but instead must push ahead with increased trade liberalization. The Vietnam agreement does just that.

Agricultural products are crucial exports for my congressional district. With Vietnam's accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO) and our new trade relations, Vietnam will reduce tariffs on most U.S. agricultural exports to 15 percent or less. Texas farmers will be able to sell in the Vietnamese market on a level playing field with competitors in other WTO member countries. Without PNTR with Vietnam, Texas's exporters will lose. I urge my colleagues to join me today in making history and supporting America's working families by granting Permanent Normal Trade Relations to Vietnam.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5602 legislation to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Vietnam, and to establish a procedure for imposing quotas on imports of subsidized textile and apparel products of Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, as we speak American soldiers are dying in Iraq in support of a noble effort to create a democratic government. Why

then are we about to give Permanent Normal Trading Treatment to the dictatorship in Vietnam, a cabal of gangsters and thugs that mercilessly prohibits in Vietnam and Laos any democracy, freedom of law, freedom of the press, and human and religious rights? The Vietnamese government has never come clean on the whereabouts of over 600 American soldiers who were left behind in Vietnam after the war. I'm not talking about granting us permission to dig for American remains, I'm talking about their refusal to hand over the prison documents of those men who we know were alive when we left Vietnam thirty years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the same political party that forced us to cut and run from Vietnam has stubbornly refused to acknowledge the complete lack of freedom there and in Laos. It doesn't care if we retreat from Iraq just like we did from Vietnam, before the job is done. But what truly disturbs me is how the majority can go along with this and reward the thugs in Hanoi for what they did and continue to do to their own people and to the relatives of our veterans who never returned. Have we completely lost our moral compass? Is cheap labor so much more important than democracy, freedom of religion and supporting our soldiers and their families? Do we care anymore about freedom?

Accordingly, I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this misconceived initiative that insults our troops and ignores the wishes of good people of Vietnam who want to live free from the thugs in Hanoi.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I have long been an ardent supporter of trade expansion because the bottom line is jobs. Fully 95 percent of the world's population lives outside the United States, and the global economy is projected to grow at three times the rate of the U.S. economy. We must continue to take steps to make sure American farmers, manufacturers and service providers remain leaders in the international marketplace and our products have fair access to foreign markets.

Vietnam is the fastest growing economy in Southeast Asia and continues to grow in significance as a U.S. trading partner. By our granting Vietnam PNTR status, U.S. businesses will be able to take advantage of the increased market-access opportunities the Vietnamese have offered in return. And increased market access to Vietnam will also help provide U.S. companies a competitive sourcing counterbalance to China in the region.

Without passage of this legislation, U.S. companies will not be able to take advantage of the Vietnamese concessions. And in addition, the United States will not be able to engage in dispute-settlement cases with Vietnam in the World Trade Organization.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairmen THOMAS and SHAW for their leadership on bringing forward this important legislation, and I would also like to thank Ranking Member RANGEL and Representative THOMPSON for their support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 5602.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to granting permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) to Vietnam.

Just two months ago, the Vietnamese government arrested my constituent, a U.S. cit-

izen, Cong Thanh Do. Mr. Do had posted comments on the Internet while at home in San Jose, California advocating that Vietnam undergo a peaceful transition to a multi-party democracy. For exercising his U.S. Constitutional right of free speech, the Vietnamese arrested him and held him in prison for 38 days in Vietnam without charges.

Other U.S. citizens have been imprisoned in Vietnam for what appear to be political reasons, including the sister of another one of my constituents, Thuong Nguyen "Cuc" Foshee.

Although both are free today and back in America, I am concerned about hundreds of Vietnamese nationals as well as other U.S. citizens imprisoned in Vietnam.

The Vietnamese government has repeatedly violated human rights. Hundreds of Vietnamese have been imprisoned, put under house arrest, or placed under intense surveillance for simply practicing their religion or speaking out about democracy and human rights in Vietnam.

Following his return to the U.S., Mr. Do provided me a disturbing list of over 130 Vietnamese nationals and U.S. citizens he believes are currently imprisoned in Vietnam as prisoners of conscience or harassed by the government for simply speaking about democracy and human rights.

In addition, groups such as the Human Rights Watch have published reports of 355 Montagnard prisoners of conscience currently imprisoned in Vietnam.

I am not alone in my concerns about Vietnam's human rights record. The Department of State, the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, Amnesty International, the Committee to Protect Journalists, and various Vietnamese-American groups have documented egregious violations of religious freedom, human rights, and free speech in Vietnam.

I have been a supporter of international trade. But I also know that the Vietnamese Government would correct their behavior in order to perfect a trading relationship with the United States. Given the alarming human rights violations currently underway in Vietnam, it seems a mistake for our country to grant PNTR to Vietnam without requiring that the Vietnamese Government make significant improvements in respecting human rights, free speech, and freedom of religion.

The United States of America has a long and honorable tradition of safeguarding freedom and human rights throughout the world, especially with our trading partners. We should not make an exception for Vietnam.

At a time when we are spending 8 to 10 billion dollars a month and shedding the blood of our American servicemen and women proclaiming the cause to be democracy for Iraq, how is it that we can fail to use our mere economic leverage to try to achieve human rights in Vietnam?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill which would grant permanent normal trade relations for the government of Vietnam.

Why are we here today ready to give Vietnam—a country with an abysmal human rights record, which continues to abuse and oppress its own people—favorable trade status?

I am strongly opposed to this action and urge defeat of this legislation.

There are people in Vietnam right now, as we debate this bill, in jail for their support of

religious freedom, democracy, and freedom of speech—universal freedoms on which our country was built. If someone says they are for you, but do not want to be identified with you, how much are they really for you? Are we for democracy and religious freedom in Vietnam or are we more interested in promoting trade?

The answer to that question may lie in the incredible news just announced today that the State Department has conveniently removed Vietnam from its list of Countries of Particular Concern—a designation stamped on countries with egregious violations of human rights and religious freedom. Vietnam had been on the list in the company of China, Eritrea, Iran, Myanmar, North Korea, Saudi Arabia and Sudan.

I stand with the dissidents who remain in jails across Vietnam because they spoke out against human rights abuses being committed and condoned by their own government. Mr. Speaker, I call on this House to stand with the people of Vietnam who deserve our support as they seek democracy and freedom from oppression.

Later this week the President will make a historic trip to Vietnam. I have called on him to meet with Vietnamese human rights activists here in the United States, and I have asked that he meet with dissidents in Vietnam. I have asked President Bush to stand with the dissidents in the way that the Reagan administration did with regard to the Soviet Union. It is unacceptable for the United States to encourage democracy and respect for human rights and then fail to hold Vietnam to this standard before granting them PNTR.

Earlier today there was a groundbreaking ceremony on the National Mall to launch the memorial for Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. I ask my colleagues to think about Dr. King's words before voting on the legislation before us: "In the end we will remember not the words of our enemies but the silence of our friends."

If the Bush administration and this Congress want to be friends with those fighting for democracy, religious freedom and an end to human rights abuses, the silence should be broken. I call on the President and our ambassador in Vietnam to meet with dissidents and to break the silence about human rights abuses in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, our actions today are more than how much the U.S. will trade with Vietnam. The decisions we make will reach the 83 million Vietnamese people who are struggling to live in freedom. What will our answer be for them?

Mr. SHAW. 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 California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5602, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those voting have responded in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further

proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:20 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:20 p.m.

□ 1827

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 6 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 9, 2006.
Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from Ms. Ann McGeehan, Director of Elections, State of Texas, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held November 7, 2006, the Honorable Shelley Sekula Gibbs was elected Representative in Congress for the Twenty-Second Congressional District, State of Texas.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
November 9, 2006.

Ms. KAREN L. HAAS,
Office of the Clerk, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR Ms. HAAS: Our office has been requested to provide you with a letter as to the status of the special election for the unexpired term for U.S. Congressional District 22. Based on preliminary, unofficial election night returns reported to our agency from counties within U.S. Congressional District 22, the winner of the special election for this seat appears to be Shelley Sekula Gibbs. These results are not finalized and do not reflect all military and overseas votes that could still be counted, nor do they represent the official canvassed total. Also attached are the unofficial results of the other congressional special elections for full terms.

If you should have any questions, feel free to contact me.

Yours truly,
ANN MCGEEHAN,
Director of Elections.

TEXAS SECRETARY OF STATE ROGER WILLIAMS RACE SUMMARY REPORT UNOFFICIAL ELECTION TABULATION 2006 SPECIAL NOVEMBER ELECTIONS NOVEMBER 7, 2006

	Early vot- ing	(Percent)	Vote Total	(Percent)
U.S. Representative District 15: Multi County Precincts Reported: 278 of 278—100.00%				
Paul B. Haring—REP*	6,638	23.93	13,920	24.18
Ruben Hinojosa—Incumbent—DEM*	16,561	59.70	35,346	61.39
Eddie Zamora—REP*	4,543	16.38	8,311	14.43
Total Votes Cast	27,742		57,577	
U.S. Representative District 21: Multi County Precincts Reported: 308 of 309—99.68%				
Tommy Calvert—IND*	2,149	2.47	5,285	2.59
John Courage—DEM*	23,463	23.71	49,909	24.45
Gene Kelly—DEM*	8,378	8.47	18,355	8.99
James Lyle Peterson—IND*	930	0.94	2,198	1.08
Mark J. Rossano—IND*	590	0.60	1,443	0.71
Lamar Smith—Incumbent—REP*	61,550	62.19	122,880	60.19
James Arthur Strohm—LIB*	1,605	1.62	4,085	2.00
Total Votes Cast	98,65		204,155	
U.S. Representative District 22—Unexpired Term: Multi County Precincts Reported: 176 of 176—100.00%				
Don Richardson—REP*	2,475	5.24	7,402	5.97
Shelley Sekula Gibbs—REP*	31,057	65.74	76,940	62.08
M. Bob Smither—LIB*	8,056	17.05	23,427	18.90
Steve Stockman—REP*	4,732	10.02	13,593	10.97
Giannibicego Hoa Tran—REP*	920	1.95	2,566	2.07
Total Votes Cast	47,240		123,928	
U.S. Representative District 23: Multi County Precincts Reported: 326 of 326—100.00%				
August G. "Augie" Beltran—DEM*	1,185	2.03	2,650	2.14
Rick Bolanos—DEM	1,028	1.76	2,563	2.07
Henry Bonilla—Incumbent—REP*	30,063	51.44	60,147	48.60
Adrian Deleon—DEM*	843	1.44	2,198	1.78
Lukin Gilliland—DEM*	6,180	10.57	13,725	11.09
Ciro D. Rodriguez—DEM*	11,752	20.11	24,593	19.87
Craig T. Stephens—IND*	1,486	2.54	3,344	2.70
Albert Uresti—DEM*	5,907	10.11	14,529	11.74
Total Votes Cast	58,444		123,749	
U.S. Representative District 25: Multi County Precincts Reported: 253 of 253—100.00%				
Barbara Cunningham—LIB*	2,386	3.53	6,933	4.24
Lloyd Doggett—Incumbent—DEM*	45,439	67.30	109,839	67.25
Brian Parrett—IND*	1,224	1.81	3,594	2.20
Grant Rostig—REP*	18,467	27.35	42,956	26.30
Total Votes Cast	67,516		163,322	
U.S. Representative District 28: Multi County Precincts Reported: 236 of 236—100.00%				
Ron Avery—CON*	3,940	11.42	9,458	12.23
Henry Cuellar—Incumbent—DEM*	23,121	67.04	52,339	67.68
Frank Enriquez—DEM*	7,427	21.54	15,531	20.08
Total Votes Cast	34,488		77,328	

* CON—Constitution DEM—Democratic IND—Independent LIB—Libertarian REP—Republican

PROVIDING FOR SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE SHELLEY SEKULA GIBBS, OF TEXAS, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. SHELLEY SEKULA GIBBS, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

Her certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no

question has been raised with regard to her election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 8, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from Ms. Donna Kelly, Assistant Attorney General, State of New Jersey, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held November 7, 2006, the Honorable ALBIO SIRES was elected Representative in Congress for the Thirteenth Congressional District, State of New Jersey.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

Attachment.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
DEPT. OF LAW AND PUBLIC SAFETY,
Trenton, NJ, November 8, 2006.
Re Unofficial Results for the Special Election for the Unexpired Term for the Thirteenth Congressional District.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: Enclosed please find the unofficial results for the Special Election held on November 7, 2006 for the office of Member, House of Representatives, Thirteenth Congressional District, State of New Jersey. These unofficial results do not include the absentee or provisional ballot totals. You are further advised that no challenge or recount for this election is known at this time. The official results for the election will be certified by the Board of State Canvassers no later than December 5, 2006. Your office will be provided with the original Certificate of Election upon such certification.

If you have any question, please contact this office. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

DONNA KELLY,
Assistant Attorney General.
(For Stuart Rabner, Attorney General
of New Jersey).

UNOFFICIAL LIST—CANDIDATE RETURNS FOR UNEXPIRED TERM FOR NOVEMBER 2006 GENERAL ELECTION, THIRTEENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: ESSEX (PART)—HUDSON (PART)—MIDDLESEX (PART)—UNION (PART) COUNTIES

Name Address	Party/Designation	County	Slogan	Tally
Unexpired Term:				
Albio Sires, P.O. Box 300, West New York, NJ 07093	Democratic	Essex (part)	Democratic	9,516
		Hudson (part)	Democratic	48,357
		Middlesex (part)	Democratic	218
		Union (part)	Democratic	3,837
Total				61,928
Dick Hester, 233 East Delavan Ave., Newark, NJ 07104	Pro Life Conservative	Essex (part)	Pro Life Conservative	350
		Hudson (part)	Pro Life Conservative	1,391
		Middlesex (part)	Pro Life Conservative	61
		Union (part)	Pro Life Conservative	190
Total				1,992

Total Democrats—1
Total Republicans—0
Total Independents—1
Total Candidates—2

PROVIDING FOR SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE ALBIO SIRES, OF NEW JERSEY, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. ALBIO SIRES, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

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

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE SHELLEY SEKULA GIBBS, OF TEXAS, AND THE HONORABLE ALBIO SIRES, OF NEW JERSEY, AS MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Will the Representatives-elect and the Members of their respective delegations present themselves in the well.

The Representatives-elect will raise their right hand.

Ms. SEKULA GIBBS and Mr. SIRES appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation

or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now Members of the 109th Congress.

□ 1830

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE SHELLEY SEKULA GIBBS TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege on behalf of the Texas delegation to introduce to the 109th Congress the Honorable SHELLEY SEKULA GIBBS, Dr. GIBBS. She is a dermatologist in Houston, Texas. She serves on the Houston City Council at large. She has been active in the Ellington Field task force to help renovate that part of Houston, Texas.

She is a fifth-generation Texan. She has two children, two stepchildren, and, I think, three grandchildren. She is married to a graduate of Waco High School, which is the high school that I graduated from. She is going to do great honor to the 22nd Congressional District of Texas for the rest of the 109th Congress and it is with a great deal of personal Texas pride that I introduce to this body the Honorable SHELLEY SEKULA GIBBS.

Ms. SEKULA GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman is recognized.

There was no objection.

Ms. SEKULA GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the kind gentleman from Texas,

the dean of our Texas congressional delegation, for his remarks and the warm welcome that I received here today. He is a wonderful example of the type of Congress Member that I hope to emulate while serving in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the great people of the 22nd Congressional District who elected me for the confidence that they have placed in me in representing their values and allowing me to serve them for the remainder of the 109th Congress. I would also like to thank the Speaker and the rest of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives. I look forward to getting to know them and to know each of you and work on the initiatives that will help strengthen our country.

Most of all, I would like to thank the volunteers and the hard workers who have helped me, as well as my family and especially my husband, Robert, who is joining us today, as well as my son, Michael.

Thanks to their unyielding support throughout the last 3 months of our lives and those of my two daughters who are not here, Elyse and Mallory, and all of the people who have worked so hard on my campaign, I am now able to address this auspicious body.

During my time in the House of Representatives, I will ensure that my constituents receive the first-rate representation that they deserve. There are only a few weeks left until the session is over, and there is much work to be done, but I will work with my colleagues to guarantee that we do whatever is necessary to move this Nation forward and address the critical issues facing our country, including health care—as you would imagine, being a physician, I have very big concerns

about that—illegal immigration, and the war on terror.

Again to my colleagues in the House and all of those in public service, I would like to thank you for your service to our country. I am proud to be among you today, and, together, I am confident that we will meet the challenges that the future will bring our great country.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE ALBIO SIREs TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure and honor this evening to introduce the newest member of our New Jersey delegation, ALBIO SIREs. ALBIO won a special election last week to fill the remaining term of Senator MENENDEZ, who won reelection to the Senate last week. He was also elected to a full term and will be back with us in January as well.

ALBIO comes to this House after serving as the mayor of West New York and serving four terms in the New Jersey General Assembly, including two terms as the assembly speaker. During his tenure in the assembly, ALBIO championed legislation that increased the minimum wage in New Jersey by \$2. ALBIO also led the fight to help New Jersey families better afford college for their children by creating the STARS program, which offers full paid county and State college tuition scholarships to thousands of New Jersey students.

As this Congress prepares to tackle both the minimum wage and college affordability in January, ALBIO will be a strong voice on behalf of working-class families. ALBIO was born in pre-Communist Cuba, but fled with his family at age 12 to the United States. He was a star basketball player in both high school and college, and I am sure he would have no problem suiting up again as a member of the congressional basketball team.

He also joins both me and BILL DELAHUNT as the only current Members of Congress who earned a degree from Middlebury College in Vermont. He is joined here today by his wife, Adrienne, his stepdaughter, Tara Kole, and supporters from his new congressional district. Please join me in welcoming ALBIO SIREs to the House of Representatives.

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank you and to thank Mr. PALLONE for those kind words. I would like to express my deep gratitude to my wife, Adrienne, my stepdaughter, Tara, my friends and especially my neighbors in the 13th Congressional District of New Jersey, who have honored me by allowing me to represent them in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, when I left Cuba with my family 45 years ago, I could never have envisioned that I would be standing on the floor of the House of Representatives to give this speech. This day for me truly embodies the promise of this Nation, the promise of its founders, the promise of its many immigrant communities, the promise which means that anyone, no matter the circumstances of birth or class, can rise to become a Member of the greatest democratic body in history.

Mr. Speaker, it was the community of West New York that welcomed me and my family so many years ago. I have tried, tried every day to give back to my neighbors for their generosity, first as a teacher and a coach, then as a mayor and as a State assemblyman. The people of the 13th District have provided me with the greatest privilege of all, to represent them in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the honor and the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives and the faith that my constituents have placed in me by sending me here on their behalf. It is the trust of the people of New Jersey that has enabled me to be here today, and I intend to honor that trust every day that I serve as their representative.

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. SHELLEY SEKULA GIBBS, and the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. ALBIO SIREs, the whole number of the House is 433.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Concur in Senate amendment to H.R. 3085, by the yeas and nays;

S. 819, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5602, by the yeas and nays.

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

TRAIL OF TEARS STUDY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3085.

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.

RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3085, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 383, nays 3, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 517]

YEAS—383

Abercrombie	Davis (IL)	Johnson (IL)
Ackerman	Davis (KY)	Johnson, E. B.
Aderholt	Davis (TN)	Johnson, Sam
Akin	Davis, Jo Ann	Jones (OH)
Alexander	Davis, Tom	Kanjorski
Allen	Deal (GA)	Kaptur
Andrews	DeFazio	Keller
Baca	DeGette	Kelly
Bachus	Delahunt	Kennedy (MN)
Baird	DeLauro	Kennedy (RI)
Baker	Dent	Kildee
Baldwin	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kilpatrick (MI)
Barrett (SC)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kind
Barrow	Dicks	King (IA)
Bartlett (MD)	Dingell	King (NY)
Barton (TX)	Doollittle	Kingston
Bass	Doyle	Kirk
Bean	Drake	Kline
Beauprez	Dreier	Knollenberg
Becerra	Duncan	Kolbe
Berkley	Edwards	Kucinich
Berman	Ehlers	Kuhl (NY)
Berry	Emanuel	LaHood
Biggart	Emerson	Langevin
Billray	English (PA)	Lantos
Bilirakis	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (GA)	Etheridge	Larson (CT)
Bishop (NY)	Everett	Latham
Bishop (UT)	Farr	LaTourette
Blackburn	Fattah	Leach
Blumenaucr	Feeney	Lee
Blunt	Ferguson	Levin
Boehlert	Filner	Lewis (CA)
Boehner	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lewis (GA)
Bonilla	Forbes	Linder
Bonner	Ford	Lipinski
Bono	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Boren	Fossella	Lofgren, Zoe
Boswell	Fox	Lowey
Boucher	Frank (MA)	Lucas
Boustany	Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel
Boyd	Frelinghuysen	E.
Bradley (NH)	Garrett (NJ)	Lynch
Brady (PA)	Gerlach	Mack
Brady (TX)	Gingrey	Maloney
Brown (OH)	Gonzalez	Manzullo
Brown (SC)	Goodlatte	Marchant
Brown, Corrine	Gordon	Markey
Brown-Waite,	Granger	Marshall
Ginny	Graves	Matheson
Burgess	Green (WI)	Matsui
Butterfield	Green, Al	McCarthy
Buyer	Green, Gene	McCollum (MN)
Calvert	Grijalva	McCotter
Camp (MI)	Gutknecht	McCreery
Campbell (CA)	Hall	McDermott
Cannon	Harman	McGovern
Cantor	Harris	McHenry
Capito	Hart	McHugh
Capps	Hastings (FL)	McIntyre
Capuano	Hastings (WA)	McKeon
Cardin	Hayes	McMorris
Cardoza	Hayworth	Rodgers
Carnahan	Hensarling	McNulty
Carter	Herger	Meehan
Case	Herseth	Meek (FL)
Castle	Hinchev	Melancon
Chabot	Hinojosa	Mica
Chocola	Hobson	Michaud
Clay	Hoekstra	Millender-
Cleaver	Holden	McDonald
Clyburn	Holt	Miller (FL)
Coble	Honda	Miller (MI)
Conaway	Hoolley	Miller (NY)
Conyers	Hoyer	Miller, Gary
Cooper	Hulshof	Miller, George
Costa	Hunter	Mollohan
Costello	Hyde	Moore (KS)
Cramer	Inslee	Moore (WI)
Crenshaw	Issa	Moran (KS)
Crowley	Istook	Moran (VA)
Cuellar	Jackson (IL)	Murphy
Culberson	Jackson-Lee	Musgrave
Cummings	(TX)	Myrick
Davis (AL)	Jenkins	Nadler
Davis (CA)	Jindal	Napolitano
Davis (FL)	Johnson (CT)	Neugebauer

Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross

Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sekula Gibbs
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Stark

Stearns
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—3

Flake Jones (NC) Paul

NOT VOTING—46

Boozman
Burton (IN)
Carson
Chandler
Cole (OK)
Cubin
Doggett
Engel
Evans
Gallegly
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Goode
Gutierrez

Hefley
Higgins
Hostettler
Inglis (SC)
Israel
Jefferson
Lewis (KY)
McCaul (TX)
McKinney
Meeks (NY)
Murtha
Neal (MA)
Northup
Norwood
Osborne
Pickering

Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Shimkus
Slaughter
Souder
Spratt
Strickland
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (NC)
Udall (NM)
Walsh

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1905

Mr. MCNULTY changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PACTOLA RESERVOIR REALLOCATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 819.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 819, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 0, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 518]

YEAS—387

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley

Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Finer
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Hersteth
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof

Hunter
Hyde
Insole
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
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
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica

Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Rahall

Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sekula Gibbs
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)

Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Stark
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Roybal-Allard
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—45

Boozman
Burton (IN)
Carson
Chandler
Cubin
Doggett
Engel
Evans
Gallegly
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Goode
Granger

Gutierrez
Hefley
Higgins
Hostettler
Inglis (SC)
Israel
Jefferson
McCaul (TX)
McKinney
Murtha
Neal (MA)
Norwood
Osborne
Pickering
Pryce (OH)

Radanovich
Rush
Shimkus
Slaughter
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (NC)
Udall (NM)
Walsh

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1916

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TO VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5602, as amended.

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. 5602, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 161, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 519]

YEAS—228

Ackerman	Farr	Moran (KS)
Akin	Ferguson	Moran (VA)
Alexander	Flake	Musgrave
Allen	Forbes	Myrick
Andrews	Ford	Northup
Bachus	Fossella	Nunes
Baird	Frank (MA)	Nussle
Baker	Frelinghuysen	Oliver
Bass	Garrett (NJ)	Ortiz
Bean	Goodlatte	Otter
Beauprez	Gordon	Oxley
Berkley	Granger	Pearce
Berman	Graves	Pelosi
Berry	Harman	Pence
Biggart	Harris	Peterson (PA)
Billbray	Hart	Petri
Billirakis	Hastings (WA)	Platts
Bishop (GA)	Hensarling	Pombo
Bishop (NY)	Herger	Pomeroy
Blackburn	Herseth	Porter
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Price (GA)
Blunt	Hobson	Price (NC)
Boehlert	Holt	Putnam
Boehner	Honda	Ramstad
Bonilla	Hookey	Rangel
Bonner	Hoyer	Rehberg
Bono	Hulshof	Reichert
Boren	Hyde	Reynolds
Boustany	Inslee	Rogers (KY)
Boyd	Issa	Royce
Bradley (NH)	Istook	Ruppersberger
Brady (TX)	Jefferson	Ryan (WI)
Brown (SC)	Jindal	Ryan (KS)
Calvert	Johnson (CT)	Sabo
Camp (MI)	Johnson (IL)	Schiff
Campbell (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Schmidt
Cannon	Keller	Schwartz (PA)
Cantor	Kennedy (MN)	Schwartz (MI)
Capito	Kind	Sekula Gibbs
Capps	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Capuano	Kingston	Sessions
Cardin	Kirk	Shadegg
Cardoza	Kline	Shaw
Carnahan	Knollenberg	Shays
Carter	Kolbe	Shuster
Case	Kuhl (NY)	Simmons
Castle	LaHood	Simpson
Chabot	Larson (WA)	Skelton
Chocola	Larson (CT)	Smith (TX)
Clay	Latham	Smith (WA)
Clyburn	Leach	Snyder
Cole (OK)	Levin	Tauscher
Conaway	Lewis (CA)	Terry
Cooper	Lewis (KY)	Thomas
Costa	Linder	Thompson (CA)
Cramer	Lowey	Thornberry
Crenshaw	Lucas	Tiahrt
Crowley	Mack	Tiberi
Cuellar	Maloney	Udall (CO)
Davis (AL)	Manzullo	Upton
Davis (CA)	Marchant	Van Hollen
Davis (FL)	Matheson	Walden (OR)
Davis (KY)	Matsui	Wasserman
Davis, Tom	McCarthy	Schultz
DeGette	McCollum (MN)	Watson
Delahunt	McCrery	Watt
Dicks	McDermott	Waxman
Dingell	McGovern	Weiner
Doolittle	McKeon	Weldon (PA)
Drake	McMorris	Weller
Dreier	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Ehlers	Meek (FL)	Wexler
Emanuel	Mica	Whitfield
Emerson	Miller (NC)	Wicker
English (PA)	Miller, Gary	Wilson (NM)
Eshoo	Miller, George	Young (AK)
Etheridge	Moore (KS)	

NAYS—161

Abercrombie	Barrow	Boswell
Aderholt	Bartlett (MD)	Boucher
Baca	Barton (TX)	Brady (PA)
Baldwin	Becerra	Brown (OH)
Barrett (SC)	Bishop (UT)	Brown, Corrine

Brown-Waite,	Jenkins	Pitts
Ginny	Johnson, Sam	Poe
Burgess	Jones (NC)	Rahall
Butterfield	Jones (OH)	Regula
Buyer	Kanjorski	Renzi
Cleaver	Kaptur	Reyes
Coble	Kelly	Rogers (AL)
Conyers	Kennedy (RI)	Rogers (MI)
Costello	Kildee	Rohrabacher
Culberson	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cummings	King (IA)	Ross
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Rothman
Davis (TN)	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Davis, Jo Ann	Lantos	Ryan (OH)
Deal (GA)	LaTourette	Salazar
DeFazio	Lee	Sánchez, Linda
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	T.
Dent	Lipinski	Sanchez, Loretta
Diaz-Balart, L.	LoBiondo	Sanders
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lofgren, Zoe	Saxton
Doyle	Lungren, Daniel	Schakowsky
Duncan	E.	Scott (GA)
Edwards	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Everett	Markey	Serrano
Fattah	Marshall	Sherman
Feeney	McCotter	Sherwood
Finer	McHenry	Sires
Fitzpatrick (PA)	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Fortenberry	McIntyre	Sodrel
Foxx	McNulty	Solis
Franks (AZ)	Meehan	Stark
Gerlach	Melancon	Stearns
Gingrey	Michaud	Stupak
Gonzalez	Millender-	Taylor (MS)
Green (WI)	McDonald	Thompson (MS)
Porter	Miller (FL)	Tierney
Green, Al	Miller (MI)	Towns
Green, Gene	Miller (MI)	Turner
Grijalva	Mollohan	Velázquez
Gutknecht	Moore (WI)	Visclosky
Hall	Murphy	Wamp
Hastings (FL)	Nadler	Waters
Hayes	Napolitano	Weldon (FL)
Hayworth	Oberstar	Wilson (SC)
Hinchee	Obey	Wolf
Hoekstra	Owens	Woolsey
Holden	Pallone	Wu
Hunter	Pascrell	Wynn
Inglis (SC)	Pastor	Young (FL)
Jackson (IL)	Paul	
Jackson-Lee	Payne	
(TX)	Peterson (MN)	

NOT VOTING—43

Boozman	Hefley	Rush
Burton (IN)	Higgins	Shimkus
Carson	Hostettler	Slaughter
Chandler	Israel	Souder
Cubie	McCauley (TX)	Spratt
Doggett	McKinney	Strickland
Engel	Meeks (NY)	Sullivan
Evans	Murtha	Sweeney
Gallely	Neal (MA)	Tancredo
Gibbons	Neugebauer	Tanner
Gilchrest	Norwood	Taylor (NC)
Gillmor	Osborne	Udall (NM)
Gohmert	Pickering	Walsh
Goode	Pryce (OH)	
Gutierrez	Radanovich	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1926

Mr. HALL and Mr. MILLER of Florida changed their votes from “yea” to “nay”.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia changed his vote from “nay” to “yea”.

So (two-thirds of those voting having not responded in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 519, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was regrettably unable to be on the House Floor

for rollcall vote 517—passage of H.R. 3085—a bill to amend the National Trails System Act to update the feasibility and suitability study originally prepared for the Trail of Tears National Historic Trail; rollcall vote 518—passage of S. 819—the Pactola Reservoir Reallocation Authorization Act of 2005; and rollcall vote 518—passage of H.R. 5602—a bill to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Vietnam, and to establish a procedure for imposing quotas on imports of subsidized textile and apparel products of Vietnam.

Had I been present I would have voted “aye” for rollcall vote 517, “aye” for rollcall vote 518, and “no” for rollcall vote 519.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1696

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor on H.R. 1696.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1930

UNIFIED REPUBLICANS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, although Republicans face new challenges in the coming Congress, one thing is clear. We are unified in our determination to pursue policies to strengthen our Nation and our economy.

Republicans will continue to fight for complete victory in the global war on terror and work to ensure that the intelligence community and our troops have all the tools necessary to complete their mission. Through Republican policies of providing the administration the tools it needs to be successful in the war on terror, we helped defend our Nation from another attack on American soil.

Republicans are unified in our ideals of tax relief for all Americans to grow the economy and provide opportunities for every American to prosper. As a direct result of the Republican tax relief policies, unemployment is at 4.4 percent, there have been 38 consecutive months of job creation, and wages have risen 2.4 percent over the last year. These are undeniable accomplishments of the Republican-led Congress that affect all Americans. Republicans provided tax breaks for American families through the child tax credit and marriage tax penalty relief and voted to kill the death tax.

Republican policies have made our Nation safer and stronger, and we are unified in our fight to continue these successful policies.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a plane delay.

Mr. CHANDLER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and November 14 on account of official business.

Mr. ISRAEL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. MCKINNEY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

Mr. TANNER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and November 14 on account of official business.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and November 14 and 15 on account of official business.

Mr. OSBORNE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of official business.

Mr. SHIMKUS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and November 14 and November 15 until 2:30 p.m. on account of traveling with the NATO Parliamentary Assembly.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, November 14 and 15.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, November 15.

Mr. HAYWORTH, for 5 minutes, November 14.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, November 15.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1409. An act to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996 to modify the grant program to improve sanitation in rural and Native villages in the State of Alaska, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. 1726. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 324 Main Street in Grambling, Louisiana, as the "Coach Eddie Robinson Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

S. 3523. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the Tax Court may review claims for equitable innocent spouse relief and to suspend the running on the period of limitations while such claims are pending; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 3526. An act to amend the Indian Land Consolidation Act to modify certain requirements under that Act; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 3845. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at

301 Commerce Street in Commerce, Oklahoma, as the "Mickey Mantle Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

S. 3879. An act to implement the Convention on Supplementary Compensation for Nuclear Damage, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 3880. An act to provide the Department of Justice the necessary authority to apprehend, prosecute, and convict individuals committing animal enterprise terror; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 4044. An act to clarify the treatment of certain charitable contributions under title 11, United States Code, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2464. An act to revise a provision relating to a repayment obligation of the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation under the Fort McDowell Indian Community Water Rights Settlement Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. SEKULA GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 14, 2006, at 10 a.m., for morning hour debate.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 109th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

SHELLEY SEKULA GIBBS, Texas, Twenty-Second.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the

United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 109th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

ALBIO SIRES, New Jersey, Thirteenth.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9947. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency with respect to Iran, as declared by Executive Order 12170 on November 14, 1979, is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 109-150); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

9948. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sandel Avionics Incorporated Model ST3400 Terrain Awareness Warning System/Radio Magnetic Indicator (TAWs/RMI) Units Approved Under Technical Standards Order(s) C113, C151a, or C151b; Installed on Various Small and Transport Category Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24101; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-103-AD; Amendment 39-14718; AD 2006-16-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9949. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Models RB211 Trent 892, 884, 877, 875, and 892B Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2006-25713; Directorate Identifier 97-ANE-09; Amendment 39-14780; AD 97-06-13R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9950. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Models 1900, 1900C, and 1900D Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25760; Directorate Identifier 2006-CE-48-AD; Amendment 39-14757; AD 2006-18-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9951. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Model ATP Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25721; Directorate Identifier

2006-NM-132-AD; Amendment 39-14748; AD 2006-18-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9952. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-135 Airplanes and Model EMB-145, -145ER, -145MR, -145LR, -145XR, -145MP, and -145EP Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-22033; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-218-AD; Amendment 39-14391; AD 2005-24-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9953. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-200, -300, -400, -500 Series Airplanes Equipped with an Auxiliary Fuel System Installed in Accordance with Supplemental Type Certificate (STC) SA83NE, SA1078NE, ST0004NY, or ST01337NY [Docket No. FAA-2006-25746; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-151-AD; Amendment 39-14750; AD 2006-18-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9954. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Stemme GmbH & Co. KG Model STEMME S10-VT Sailplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25689; Directorate Identifier 2006-CE-45-AD; Amendment 39-14765; AD 2006-19-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9955. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF34-10E Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2006-25896; Directorate Identifier 2006-NE-33-AD; Amendment 39-14775; AD 2006-20-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9956. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2006-25584; Directorate Identifier 2000-NE-62-AD; Amendment 39-14733; AD 2006-17-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9957. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25657; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-187-AD; Amendment 39-14735; AD 2006-17-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9958. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney PW4077D, PW4084D, PW4090, and PW4090-3 Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2006-24034; Directorate Identifier 2006-NE-05-AD; Amendment 39-14729; AD 2006-17-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9959. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, trans-

mitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-100, DHC-8-200, and DHC-8-300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24290; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-243-AD; Amendment 39-14731; AD 2006-17-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9960. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767-400ER Series Airplanes and Model 777-200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-21713; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-085-AD; Amendment 39-14732; AD 2006-17-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9961. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; RECARO Aircraft Seating GmbH & Co. (RECARO) Model 3410 Seats [Docket No. FAA-2005-22876; Directorate Identifier 2005-NE-39-AD; Amendment 39-14734; AD 2006-17-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9962. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10-10 and DC-10-10F Airplanes; and Model MD-10-10F Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24999; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-060-AD; Amendment 39-14736; AD 2006-17-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9963. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.28 Mark 0070 and 0100 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24959; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-258-AD; Amendment 39-14737; AD 2006-17-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9964. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-100, DHC-8-200, DHC-8-300, and DHC-8-400 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24979; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-014-AD; Amendment 39-14738; AD 2006-17-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9965. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters, Inc. Model MD900 Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2006-24631; Directorate Identifier 2005-SW-01-AD; Amendment 39-14739; AD 2006-18-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9966. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-10, -20, -30, -40, and -50 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24368; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-230-AD; Amendment 39-14740; AD 2006-18-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9967. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, trans-

mitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-145XR Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-24439; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-039-AD; Amendment 39-14741; AD 2006-18-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9968. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D-1, -1A, -1B, -7, -7A, -7B, -9, -9A, -11, -15, -15A, -17, -17A, -17R, -17AR, -209, -217, -217A, -217C, and -219 Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2001-NE-30-AD; Amendment 39-14728; AD 2006-17-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9969. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B16 (CL-604) Airplanes and Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25724; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-197-AD; Amendment 39-14742; AD 2006-18-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9970. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Legal Description of Class D and E Airspace; Fairbanks, Fort Wainwright Army Airfield, AK [Docket No. FAA-2006-24813; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-16] received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9971. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E2 Surface Area; Elko, NV [Docket No. FAA-2006-25252; Airspace Docket No. 06-AWP-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9972. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Legal Description of Class D and E Airspace; Fairbanks, Fort Wainwright Army Airfield, AK [Docket No. FAA-2006-24813; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-16] received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9973. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of a Class E Enroute Domestic Airspace Area, San Louis Obispo, CA [Airspace Docket No. 05-AWP-12] received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9974. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Pierre, SD [Docket No. FAA-2006-24449; Airspace Docket No. 06-AGL-03] received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9975. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Barter Island, AK [Docket No. FAA-2006-23714; Airspace Docket No. 06-AAL-07] received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9976. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Chamberlain, SD [Docket No. FAA-2006-24450; Airspace Docket No. 06-AGL-04] received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9977. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Butler, GA [Docket No. FAA-2006-25392; Airspace Docket No. 06-ASO-10] received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9978. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Lake Ozark, MO [Docket No. FAA-2006-25008; Airspace Docket No. 06-ACE-6] received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9979. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Occupational Noise Exposure for Railroad Operating Employees [Docket No. FRA 2002-12357, Notice No. 2] (RIN: 2130-AB56) received November 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SKELTON (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 6313. A bill to expand the oversight and accounting authority of the Office of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction over funds appropriated for the Iraq Security Forces Fund and to restore a termination date for the Office based on the percentage of expenditures from the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund and the Iraq Security Forces Fund; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUYER:

H.R. 6314. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law and to expand eligibility for the Survivors' and Dependents' Educational Assistance program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 6315. A bill to afford students and parents with private civil remedies for the violation of their privacy rights under the General Education Provisions Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BAIRD:

H.R. 6316. A bill to extend through December 31, 2008, the authority of the Secretary of

the Army to accept and expend funds contributed by non-Federal public entities to expedite the processing of permits; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 6317. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an excise tax on any tax-exempt organization which accepts any contribution which may be used to relocate property held by the organization if the relocation is contrary to the intent of the donor of the property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 6318. A bill to implement the recommendations of the Office of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction to ensure that the Department of Defense properly accounts for all small arms weapons procured by the Department of Defense for use by the Iraqi Security Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 6319. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish centers to provide enhanced services to veterans with amputations and prosthetic devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 6320. A bill to create an additional judgeship for the eastern district of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. TANNER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GRAVES, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BARROW, Mr. FORD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BERRY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HOYER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. EMANUEL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WATT, Mr. WYNN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. RANGEL):

H. Res. 1078. A resolution congratulating the St. Louis Cardinals on winning the 2006 World Series; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. KIND:

H. Res. 1079. A resolution recognizing and celebrating the commitment of the Student Conservation Association to the United States' national parks and public lands; to the Committee on Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 354: Mr. MURTHA.
H.R. 363: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 517: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 550: Mr. TANNER and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 583: Mr. HULSHOF and Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 699: Mr. NADLER, Mr. ENGEL, and Mrs. BIGBERT.
H.R. 807: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 814: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 874: Mr. SHADEGG and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 898: Mr. JINDAL.
H.R. 998: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 1078: Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 1175: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1227: Mr. PITTS and Mr. SALAZAR.
H.R. 1249: Mr. MURTHA and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1298: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 1426: Mr. GILLMOR.
H.R. 1582: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1632: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 1950: Mrs. DRAKE.
H.R. 2051: Mr. EHLERS.
H.R. 2103: Mrs. MCCARTHY.
H.R. 2239: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 2421: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. KUHLMANN of New York, Mr. WICKER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LEACH, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. HALL, Mr. Wu, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CARSON, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2568: Mr. REYES, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 2719: Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2793: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 2861: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HALL, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2989: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 3019: Mr. NUSSLE.
H.R. 3159: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 3255: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 3380: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
H.R. 3617: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 3628: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 3762: Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 3949: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3954: Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 4033: Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. BONO, Mr. WOLF, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 4042: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 4098: Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 4188: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 4341: Mr. MCCRERY and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 4597: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4672: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 4727: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 4747: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4824: Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 4903: Mr. BACA, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 5022: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 5072: Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 5119: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 5179: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 5200: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. WATT.
H.R. 5225: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 5247: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 5416: Mr. JINDAL and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 5465: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 5501: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 5550: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 5554: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 5555: Mr. EVERETT.
H.R. 5624: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 5635: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 5674: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 5707: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 5757: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 5772: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. HALL.
H.R. 5829: Mr. KUCINICH.

- H.R. 5836: Mr. ETHERIDGE and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 5855: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H.R. 5878: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 5887: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
 H.R. 5888: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 5894: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. STARK, and Mrs. KELLY.
 H.R. 5897: Mr. ETHERIDGE and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 5905: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 5906: Mr. WYNN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
 H.R. 5959: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 5967: Ms. FOXX and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 5983: Mr. ROTHMAN.
 H.R. 5991: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 5996: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 6046: Mr. ROTHMAN.
 H.R. 6053: Mr. GOODE, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 6093: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. GOODE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. LEACH.
 H.R. 6096: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 6132: Mr. ETHERIDGE and Mr. WYNN.
 H.R. 6133: Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 6147: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 6155: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 6175: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 6178: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 6184: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 6187: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
 H.R. 6191: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H.R. 6210: Mr. SIMMONS.
 H.R. 6212: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 6215: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 6227: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 6235: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 6242: Mr. SHUSTER.
 H.J. Res. 96: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. MCHENRY.
 H. Con. Res. 340: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H. Con. Res. 343: Mr. TOWNS.
 H. Res. 548: Mr. RAMSTAD.
 H. Res. 759: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
 H. Res. 822: Mr. LEACH.
 H. Res. 964: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STUPAK, and Mrs. MALONEY.
 H. Res. 977: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H. Res. 993: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H. Res. 1051: Mr. TOWNS.
 H. Res. 1063: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HOLT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CONYERS, and Mrs. MALONEY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1696: Mr. KUHL of New York.