



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2007

No. 22

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 6, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) for 5 minutes.

ORWELLIAN EARMARKING

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in his novel, 1984, George Orwell presents this concept of doublethink, which is defined as, "The power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously and accepting both of them."

I come to the floor today, Mr. Speaker, to review the repetitive lack of openness and accountability that we have seen on this House floor over the last month. Time and again, this new majority has governed on the premise that if you simply just say it, it will

become true. It is Orwellian doublethink, an amazing concept.

They believe that if you simply just say you are lowering drug prices, poof, it's done, ignoring the reality that prices really won't be lowered and fewer drugs will be made available to our seniors.

They believe that if you just say you are implementing all of the 9/11 Commission's recommendations, it changes the fact that the bill that was passed here on the floor doesn't reflect the totality of those recommendations.

They believe that if you just say you are cutting interest rates in half for college students, it doesn't matter that in reality you've pulled a bait-and-switch, with the rate cut lasting just 6 months.

Mr. Speaker, saying it doesn't make it so. And Democratic doublethink does a disservice to this Nation.

Now this makes for great talking points and great press releases, but yields very little for the people back home. Rather than bold policy initiatives, people are starting to realize that the Democratic agenda has been more pop than fizz. And now, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats are using this Orwellian newspeak, doublethink, in regard to spending Americans' hard-earned tax dollars.

On December 11 of last year, 2006, the two chairmen of the Appropriations Committee in the House and Senate, OBEY and BYRD, said, and I quote, "There will be no congressional earmarks in the joint funding resolution that we will pass." No earmarks. But sadly, once again, the facts just don't match the promises. Democratic doublethink is alive and well.

The majority used a loophole in the House rules to include millions of dollars of earmarks by simply saying that there were none. Clause 9 of rule XXI of the House rules says that it shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint resolution unless the chairman of each

committee of initial referral has a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks. So the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY, conveniently submitted to the record on January 29 that prior to the omnibus bill being considered, quote, "does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits." But, in fact, Mr. Speaker, this omnibus spending bill that the Democrats passed last week contained hundreds of millions of dollars of earmarks. Democrat doublethink.

If we follow this Democrat policy as long as you submit to the record that there are no earmarks, you can feel free to just load up any appropriations bill with as many earmarks as you like with absolutely no accountability.

Their actions completely violate the spirit of our earmarking rule, designed to bring greater transparency to our spending process. Rather than take the new rule seriously, the Democrat majority has used this sly interpretation that essentially allows for unlimited earmarks. In this new Democrat majority, if you just close your eyes and say there are no earmarks, miraculously millions of dollars of earmarks are wasted on things like rain forests in Iowa.

This isn't the type of open and honest government that our constituents expected in this Congress. Mr. Speaker, this doublethink is unacceptable to the American people, who work hard every day to provide for their families only to have Washington throw away their money, unsupervised, on pork projects.

There was a positive and honest and principled alternative to this spending injustice. Republicans offered an alternative eliminating these earmarks and targeting funds for military housing and drug enforcement. Our friends on the other side of the aisle chose to ignore it and throw money at their pet earmark projects.

□ 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.

H1213

For 12 years our colleagues on the other side blamed Republicans for every ill under the sun, and now that it is their time to govern, they hide behind bumper sticker and press release politics. Never before has such an enormous amount of taxpayer money been spent so quickly, over \$400 billion in one hour.

If our friends on the other side of the aisle truly desired to clean up earmarks and bring greater transparency to our spending, why would they then make this their first act? Their actions simply don't match their rhetoric. The American people expect more than a wink and a nod that they have gotten so far from this Democrat majority. Democrat doublethink does a disservice to our Nation.

In George Orwell's 1984 *Doublethink Newspeak*, he said that the lie always was one step ahead of the truth; but the American people are catching up, Mr. Speaker. Just saying something doesn't make it so.

IT'S TIME FOR A NEW DIRECTION IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor with some observations about Iraq, but I must comment on the presentation I just heard from my friend from Georgia.

You know, Mr. Speaker, independent observers agree that Democrats have moved quickly and aggressively to implement what we said we were going to do in the first 100 hours. I find it disingenuous that our friend was talking about somehow the Democrats not dealing with its commitment on earmarks, and mentioning the rain forest in Iowa. Mr. Speaker, again, independent observers agree that Mr. OBEY and Mr. BYRD did bring forward a clean continuing resolution that didn't have any new earmarks. It killed the earmarks that had been set aside in the failed budget of the Republicans in the last session of Congress.

What my friend is talking about, the rain forest in Iowa, was an earmark from several years ago, a Republican earmark, I might say, from several years ago. And now he is suggesting that as we have moved forward to clean up the budget mess left by the Republicans, failing to meet their commitments to produce budgets in a timely fashion, that we didn't go back and surgically remove earmarks that they had scattered throughout the budget for years. Well, I'm sorry. With all due respect to George Orwell and my friend from Georgia, I think that is doublespeak. We did what we said we were going to do. The CR has come forward without earmarks, and we have put in place a much more transparent process so people will know who is doing what on whose behalf.

But, Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor today to make a few comments about the situation in Iraq. There is much ado in the other body to work to catch up with the reality on the ground in Iraq and where the American public is. This is not the time just to oppose escalation of more troops in Iraq. We find that the 21,000 that the President referred to is actually going to mean 50 additional thousand when you put all the support in. It is time for Congress to deal in a comprehensive fashion with what we need to do to make the best of this tragically mismanaged situation, a war of choice that we didn't have to do, sadly mismanaged by the administration. It is time for Congress to rediscover our war powers with Iraq, and even more important, the saber rattling that is directed now towards Iran. It is time for us to rediscover the power of the purse, not provide an open-ended bank account, but tighten down the resources that are provided by Congress to the administration, and to rediscover oversight where there are daily reminders in every major newspaper of where Congress in the last few years has frankly been missing in action.

To be able to advance those goals in a comprehensive fashion, I have introduced new directions for Iraq. It sets forth goals for United States policy, supporting the Iraqi people, preventing greater violence, reestablish our international credibility and military readiness, and focusing on real national security threats. It calls not for escalation, but prohibiting the escalation without specific congressional approval, and for the redeployment of troops from Iraq to be completed in approximately 1 year.

It calls for the United States to forswear the establishment of permanent bases in Iraq, as well as U.S. control over Iraq's oil infrastructure and economic policies. It redirects United States reconstruction funding from large foreign contractors to Iraqi-owned businesses to help create jobs in Iraq. It instructs the President to nullify contracts where any company has not fulfilled an Iraq reconstruction contract, and to recover lost funds.

We ought not to just stop the fraud in terms of the contracting, but we ought to aggressively punish war profiteering, encouraging Congress to investigate and the Attorney General to aggressively prosecute profiteering and fraud.

It requires a regional diplomatic initiative because ultimately it is going to require diplomacy on the part of the United States and all of the surrounding countries to be able to turn this around.

I strongly urge my colleagues to look at the New Direction For Iraq Act of 2007 as a comprehensive way to change the situation in Iraq.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 43 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at noon.

PRAYER

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

Creator of the stars in the heavens and all upon Earth, the winter sun You let shine upon our Nation is a great gift for which we give You thanks.

In the midst of cold winds and uncertain and sometimes disastrous weather patterns, the consistent warm rays of light fall upon the good and the bad, the believers and unbelievers alike. Gradually, the days are already growing longer but like the movement of Your grace often unnoticed.

Lord, You are ever-present, especially to those most in need. Show Your mercy to the most vulnerable, the children, the poor, the elderly, the homeless. We commend them to You now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon 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.

PRESIDENT BUSH UNDERESTIMATES NUMBER OF TROOPS AND AMOUNT OF MONEY NEEDED FOR TROOP ESCALATION PLAN

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, last week, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office released a report saying that President Bush is understating the number of troops and the amount of money needed to move forward with his troop escalation plan.

While the President claims he plans to send 21,500 troops to Iraq, the Congressional Budget Office says the number will be as high as 48,000. As any soldier like myself knows, that to put a

combat unit on the ground you need substantial support forces, including personnel to staff headquarters, serve as military police, provide communications, provide mess facilities, engineering and other services.

The Congressional Budget Office also said that the President has seriously underestimated the cost of troop escalation. While President Bush claims it should not cost any more than \$5.6 billion, the Congressional Budget Office says a 4-month deployment will cost between \$9 and \$13 billion, 12 months between \$20 and \$27 billion. This is a 400 percent underestimate.

Madam Speaker, this is a serious report that cannot and will not be ignored. President Bush cannot expect Members of Congress to support his troop escalation plan when he is not telling us the whole story on the number of troops and the funds involved to make it happen.

CONGRESSIONAL INACTION JEOPARDIZES HOOD RIVER COUNTY SEARCH AND RESCUE

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the failure of Congress to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act amounts to a breach of faith to the almost 600 forested counties across America and 4,400 school districts.

Hood River County, Oregon, is my home and hosts two of Oregon's icons: Mount Hood and the powerful Columbia River, both attractions for outdoor recreation and the dangers that come with it. Surely you remember the December search for the mountain climbers lost on Mount Hood? This event unfolded just miles from my home.

The county paid for this rescue and recovery effort entirely with county payment funds. This included the airplanes, snowcats and equipment for volunteers, radios and medical supplies.

County Sheriff Joe Vampler says, "We will do search and rescue on Federal lands and waterways no matter what but the Nation must share this cost."

County payments also fund many other vital services like the County Health Department's vaccination program for children.

County Commission Chair Ron Rivers says, "The loss of these funds will have a significant impact on all services, including those provided to protect our most vulnerable citizens."

Congress must keep the Federal Government's word to timbered communities and pass H.R. 17. Time is running out.

CREATION OF A U.S. DEPARTMENT OF PEACE

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my strong support for H.R. 808, as it would create a U.S. Department of Peace.

The importance of peace in the world today is often overlooked due to the severity of constant conflict, but, as a mother and lawmaker, the reality of war concerns me for the future of our Nation and this planet. The promotion of peace, not violence, should be number one on our agenda.

For years, I have worked to raise awareness in the women within our society, and around the world, so that they can spread the word of peace and build a culture of peace in this world.

Women in themselves are a powerful entity, and I believe by working together we as a society can stop the escalation of violence. We can prevail by joining together and building a U.S. Department of Peace. War is not the way, but peace is.

I am proud to support this resolution, creating a U.S. Department of Peace and urge my colleagues' support.

SUPPORT REPUBLICAN SENATORS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in disbelief at the actions of the Democratic Senators' resolutions against the United States efforts in Iraq. These very same Senators voted unanimously to confirm General David Petraeus. It is unbelievably hypocritical to undermine the efforts of the very man they confirmed, along with all the brave men and women who serve with him.

The actions of these Senators will simply encourage the terrorists and undermine the U.S. efforts to succeed in Iraq and the war on terror. Republicans want to debate this issue, yet the Democrats only want to pass a resolution. It is time to take a real stand on the issue. If the Democrats want to end the war, then they should stand up and call for it.

The hypocritical actions of the Democrats are wrong. They have offered no plan for success in Iraq and are interfering with the President's powers to execute a war that the Congress has already approved. Democrats must realize there is only one commander-in-chief, and it is his job and responsibility to manage the war as he sees fit.

Mr. Speaker, I support my Republican colleagues in the Senate who want a real debate on this issue and victory in the central front on the global war on terror.

NEED TO SUPPORT OUR TROOPS

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, soldiers don't choose to go to war. Soldiers do not allocate funds for which they use

to fight the war. Soldiers may face danger, soldiers may risk their lives and sometimes lose their lives, but the least a Nation can do that sends a young person into harm's way is to fully support, fully equip and fully allow that young person to be successful to protect their own lives.

And yet this administration has not done that. We failed in the early part of this war to provide Kevlar. This administration has failed to provide Humvees that were fully armored for our young people, and now what we see is tens of billions in backlog on maintenance so that the equipment that young people are relying on to protect their lives and to fully do their duty is unavailable.

This is wrong, and we must call attention to this wrong, and we must do something about it now.

NO END BUT VICTORY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as debate continues surrounding President Bush's new way forward in Iraq, I hope all sides are heard.

I am a 31-year veteran of the South Carolina Army National Guard. I have four sons serving in the military, the eldest of whom served for a year in Iraq. I sit on the Armed Services Committee, and I have visited Iraq six times and Afghanistan twice. I am committed to my family and our Nation's survival and prosperity, all of which will be threatened should we not triumph in the global war on terrorism.

As elected public officials, Members of Congress have an obligation to debate war strategy and exercise congressional oversight. If by conscience they disagree with the President's direction, they have a responsibility to put forth an alternative plan.

Political posturing in the form of nonbinding resolutions, however, brings nothing to the debate regarding the protection of American families.

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

HONORING THE MEMORY OF POLICE OFFICER SHAWN JOSHUA DEAN WILLIAMS

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

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the memory of Police Officer Shawn Joshua Dean Williams. Officer Williams died while responding to a fellow officer's call for assistance last Thursday night in Old Fort, North Carolina. He was only 23 years old.

I offer my condolences to his wife, Shannon Kirby Williams; his young daughter, Rye-Lee Alexis; his parents, Max Suttles and mother Holly Williams; and all of his family and friends.

I also want to extend my thoughts and prayers to his fellow Old Fort police officers and the entire law enforcement community in McDowell County.

Mr. Speaker, Officer Williams' life was an example of service for all of us to follow.

I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing remorse at all the passings and the dedication of all law enforcement officers and gratitude to all those who protect and serve our communities every day.

ANTI-WAR PROTESTERS' GRAFFITI

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, a week ago, the anti-war rally in Washington made headlines across America. Lost in most of the coverage, however, was the complete lack of basic decency displayed by some of these protesters. The anti-war protesters defaced our Capitol by spray-painting graffiti on the Capitol's west terrace.

Mr. Speaker, it never ceases to amaze me how nonpeaceful these so-called peace protesters can be. There is no question that Americans have a constitutional right to peaceably assemble, but when you brazenly deface cherished public property, you are no longer assembling peacefully. You are committing a crime.

Mr. Speaker, we can have a thoughtful public debate on our policies overseas, but we must remember this. Our freedom was not earned by protesters with poster paint. It was earned by the thousands of brave men and women who courageously stand up to fight for it, many of whom paid with their lives.

□ 1215

DEPARTMENT OF PEACE BILL INTRODUCTION

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is time to make a real commitment to the peace that we want to see in the world. That is exactly what H.R. 808, introduced by Congressman KUCINICH, with 52 cosponsors, would do by creating the Department of Peace.

We are now spending \$8 billion each month on the occupation of Iraq. Imagine if a small portion of that money was invested, instead, in conflict resolution, diplomacy, weapons reduction, and human rights. As the drum beats of war against Iran are now heard, imagine if the debate included not only the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense, but a Secretary of Peace. Guaranteed the military option would be taken off the table and our world would not be led again into another useless, senseless war.

Imagine if we were to direct a small portion of the \$583 billion Pentagon

budget to promoting nonviolence here at home by investing in efforts to stop domestic violence, gun violence, child abuse, gang violence, violence in schools, hate crimes, racial violence, religious intolerance and the mistreatment of the elderly.

Dr. King said that peace is not just the absence of tension; it is the presence of justice. This isn't something we should just hope for, but we must work for it.

RUSSIAN BORDER CONTROL

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, a government spokesman has said people from poor countries are taking jobs and giving nothing back to the country. But the government spokesman was not from the United States, but Russia.

Under a new Russian crackdown on illegal immigration, illegals are being ordered out of the country and employers who hire them are being prosecuted. Russia is also securing its visa program against fraud. All of these actions are working. The illegals are leaving the country by the thousands. No massive deportation is needed, no amnesty or path to citizenship.

Similar to the United States, millions of illegals are crossing Russian borders. They take government resources from legal citizens. The Russian Government, however, unlike the U.S. Government, isn't giving in to those who want cheap plantation labor. The Russian Government doesn't care if illegals or businesses don't like the new rules.

Russia is enforcing border security by prosecuting illegals and those that hire them. The U.S. Government could learn something from Russia. Prosecute businesses that knowingly hire illegals, and illegals will leave. Russia has proven it. But does America have the moral will to do the same? We shall see.

And that's just the way it is.

THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE ESTIMATE

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

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, no one can deny that the situation on the ground in Iraq is grave and rapidly deteriorating and therefore deserves the immediate and undivided attention of this Congress.

Last week, the National Intelligence Estimate released a pessimistic outlook on the future of Operation Iraqi Freedom. The NIE offers no hope that under the likeliest of scenarios the level of violence in Iraq will be significantly reduced between the next 12 to 18 months.

Additionally, the Iraq Study Group has identified the increase of sectarian

violence in Iraq as a principal challenge to stability in the Middle East. In light of the current situation, a military approach is no longer a viable solution to stabilizing Iraq. Our success in Iraq is dependent upon a forward change in direction, which involves input of Iraq's neighbors and the entire international community.

Through political and diplomatic engagement we have a serious chance of reducing sectarian tensions, bringing our troops home, and ultimately declaring victory in Iraq. I urge my colleagues in both Houses to put aside partisan differences and honestly debate our strategy in Iraq.

THE CONSTITUTION AND WAR

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

Mr. PENCE. The father of our Constitution, James Madison, wrote, "The Constitution expressly and exclusively vests in the legislature the power of declaring a state of war. The separation of the power declaring war from conducting it is wisely contrived to exclude the danger of its being declared for the sake of its being conducted."

As we begin the process of hearing resolutions down the hall of this Capitol in the United States Senate, non-binding resolutions over the way and the manner in which we would conduct our war, we would do well to reflect on the wisdom of our Founders, who separated the article I powers of this body from the article II powers of our Commander in Chief.

Let us remember, as Franklin Roosevelt said, "Hostilities exist, there is no blinking at the fact that our people, our territory and our interests are in grave danger." Let this grave danger color our debates. Provide the oversight that is our purview, but we have but one Commander in Chief, and let him lead us to victory in Iraq.

CELEBRATING TONY DUNGY, THE FIRST AFRICAN AMERICAN COACH TO WIN A SUPER BOWL

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

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my district in the Tampa Bay area to herald the terrific achievement of our hometown hero, Tony Dungy. While Coach Dungy is the first African American coach to win a Super Bowl title, he is also a living testimony to faithful leadership.

Since Coach Dungy's 11-year path to the Super Bowl title came through my hometown of Tampa, I think it is fair to say that everyone in the Tampa Bay area feels attached to his win, and we are proud to claim him as a resident. My friends and neighbors back home remember Coach Dungy as the former coach of the Buccaneers, who in that capacity brought a winning spirit and

gracious leadership to that team and our community.

We watched with pride Sunday when this man showed that nice guys can finish first. His team came from eight points behind, withstood the weather and won the game. Coach Dungy, as the first African American coach to win a Super Bowl, provides the perfect start to the month-long celebration of Black History Month. His victory follows the march of other men and women who have stood up for justice and opened doors for others.

Congratulations to him and all that understand that perseverance and teamwork is the best answer to life's obstacles.

HONORING DR. DARRELL JOHNSON, SUPERINTENDENT OF GREENWOOD SCHOOLS

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

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Darrell Johnson, the superintendent of Greenwood School District 50 for South Carolina, was quoted saying: "I pledge to do the best I can and work together as a team."

I would like to honor Dr. Johnson during February's Black History Month as a very notable and distinguished African American who has heavily impacted the Third Congressional District of South Carolina. Dr. Johnson's extensive background and his many leadership positions as a teacher, coach and administrator has laid the groundwork for him being named to the position of district superintendent.

Since 1991, Dr. Johnson worked for Rock Hill School District Three, beginning as assistant principal at the Rock Hill High School. After serving as assistant principal and principal for Sunset Park Elementary School, he moved to the district office in 1998 as director of student services. In 2001, he was named assistant superintendent.

His dedication to making a difference in education propelled him to earn his superintendent position, and rightfully so. I congratulate Darrell Johnson for being able to excel in this capacity where he may apply his natural ability to lead those who are most important to our future, our students.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to health care, I agree with the President in one respect, it is time to start redistributing resources within our health care system. The problem comes when we talk about where we bring those resources from.

The President's plan that he put before us in his State of the Union speech and in his budget presented to this

House yesterday would take resources from families who have good insurance and give it to families who have no insurance.

I would propose instead, and many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle would propose instead, that we take resources from the HMOs that have enjoyed massive profits off our Medicare systems, to take money from the drug companies who have enjoyed the pleasure of not having to negotiate with the bulk purchasing power of the Federal Government, and redistribute resources from those that are making millions of dollars of profit off this system and put those resources into the hands of those who have nothing.

We can agree on some things. We can agree that this health care system has to be made better. It is just a matter of where we take and who we give it to.

GO RED FOR WOMEN DAY AND THE AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize February as National Heart Month. Heart disease is the number one killer of women in America, taking the lives of nearly half a million women a year. That is one per minute.

It claims the lives of more women than the next five causes of death. In my home State of West Virginia, heart disease kills 12 women per day. That is 31 percent of all female deaths between the years of 1999 to 2003.

On February 2, people from across the Nation participated in Go Red for Women Day to support the fight against heart disease. Go Red for Women is the American Heart Association's nationwide movement that celebrates the energy, passion and power we have as women to band together and fight this disease.

Too few people realize the threat associated with heart disease. The good news is that heart disease can largely be prevented. By learning all of the serious health threats such as high blood pressure, high cholesterol, diabetes, obesity, we can work to reduce our risks.

Go Red for Women is an innovative way to raise awareness of heart disease, and 64 percent of women who died of coronary heart disease had no symptoms. We have to take action for our hearts. By joining together across America, we can help support ongoing research and education about women and heart disease. When we wear our red, it reminds us of our responsibility.

I urge my colleagues to join together in celebrating National Heart Health Month.

WASTEFUL SPENDING IN IRAQ

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, as the President gets ready to ask this Congress for an additional \$145 billion to fund his efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan, a new report has come out showing tens of millions of dollars in wasteful spending by our government in Iraq.

Stuart Bowen, the Special Inspector General for Iraqi Reconstruction, released his quarterly report last week. It concluded that the \$300 billion U.S. war and reconstruction effort is plagued with waste, spiraling violence, and corruption. Among the worst misuses are \$43.8 million for a residential training camp that stands empty, about \$4.2 million for 20 VIP trailers and an Olympic-sized pool that was ordered by the Iraqi ministry of interior.

Perhaps the most disconcerting, however, is that our government spent \$36.4 million for armored vehicles, body armor and communications equipment that could greatly benefit our troops, but it is completely unaccounted for. Mr. Speaker, this abusive spending in Iraq must stop for the American taxpayer and for the troops.

LENAWEE COUNTY, ONE OF THE 100 BEST COMMUNITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House today to draw attention to an honor recently received by my home community back in Lenawee County, Michigan. America's Promise—The Alliance for Youth, a foundation formed in 1997 to help children and youth from all socioeconomic sectors in the United States, recently named Lenawee County one of the 100 best communities for young people as part of its 10-year anniversary celebration.

The criteria for winning included strong community support of children and youth, possessing valuable resources for children and youth, youth and child outcomes, overall progress within communities, and innovations in the areas of policy, practice, and resources.

Communities in 38 States received this award and Lenawee County is one of the five communities in the Great Lakes State to be named a winner. This recognition is a tribute to all of the police officers, local officials, firefighters, outstanding teachers, community leaders and civil servants that make Lenawee County and south-central Michigan a great place to live.

DEPARTMENT OF PEACE AND NONVIOLENCE

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a bill was introduced into the House of Representatives that gives

the promise of transforming our country and the world. H.R. 808 creates a Department of Peace and Nonviolence. It is now supported by 52 Members of the House of Representatives, and it is supported by groups who yesterday came to Washington representing 45 States. Last night, nearly 1,000 people came to the George Washington University campus to hear about the Department of Peace and the hope that it brings for America.

Mr. Speaker, if you were to look at this clerk's desk, just around the corner you will see engraved right into the desk of the clerk of the House of Representatives the word "peace." Peace is a foundational principle of this Congress and of this country, and the bill gives it a chance to have an animating power in our civic life by addressing the issues of domestic violence, spousal abuse, child abuse, violence in the schools, racial violence, all of those concerns we have both domestically and internationally.

Peace.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BAIRD). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of the proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

CONTINUE FUNDING OUR TROOPS IN IRAQ

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, in the other body yesterday, under the leadership of Senator REID, the gentleman from New Hampshire, Senator GREGG, had a resolution supporting the funding of our troops, and the Senate leadership prevented that resolution from being brought to the floor under regular order because they wanted first to bring a resolution condemning the President.

Now the Speaker of the House has announced that next week we will have a resolution brought to the floor of this body condemning the President's plan for a new way forward in Iraq.

I challenge the Speaker and the Democratic leadership, if that resolution is on this floor, to bring forward also the resolution of a true war hero, Representative SAM JOHNSON of Texas, supporting the continued funding of the troops in Iraq.

We have heard Members on the other side of the aisle continue to say we can and will, if necessary, cut off funding. This will give them an opportunity to put their money where their mouth is.

SUPPORT AND FULLY FUND OUR TROOPS

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, we do know that the war in Iraq will come up for debate in this body, as it should. But the debate on this floor should not be about partisan politics. It should be about doing what is in the best interests of our troops, making certain that we win in this global war on terror, and how we are going to keep this Nation and our communities and our cities safe.

I recently read a quote from Specialist Tyler Johnson. He is serving his first tour of duty in Iraq. When asked about the criticism back home, he said that passing no-confidence resolutions does send a message to our troops overseas: "You may support or say we support the troops, but you're not supporting what they do, what they're here sweating for, what we bleed for, what we die for. It all just doesn't make sense to me."

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Tyler and our troops. Passing no-confidence resolutions does send a message, and it is not a message of courage, of confidence and strength.

I agree, let's support Sam Johnson's House Resolution 511. Stand with and fully fund our troops.

□ 1230

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

BAINBRIDGE ISLAND JAPANESE AMERICAN MONUMENT ACT OF 2007

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 161) to adjust the boundary of the Minidoka Internment National Monument to include the Nidoto Nai Yoni Memorial in Bainbridge Island, Washington, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 161

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 "Bainbridge Island Japanese American Monument Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The boundary of the Minidoka Internment National Monument, located in the State of Idaho and established

by Presidential Proclamation 7395 of January 17, 2001, is adjusted to include the Nidoto Nai Yoni ("Let it not happen again") memorial. That memorial—

(1) commemorates the Japanese Americans of Bainbridge Island, Washington, who were the first to be forcibly removed from their homes and relocated to internment camps during World War II under Executive Order 9066; and

(2) consists of approximately 8 acres of land owned by the City of Bainbridge Island, Washington, as depicted on the map titled "Bainbridge Island Japanese American Memorial", numbered 194/80,003, and dated September, 2006.

(b) MAP.—The map referred to in subsection (a) shall be kept on file and made available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Parks Service.

SEC. 3. ADMINISTRATION OF MONUMENT.

(a) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") shall administer the Nidoto Nai Yoni Memorial as part of Minidoka Internment National Monument in accordance with—

(1) Presidential Proclamation 7395 of January 17, 2001;

(2) laws and regulations generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including the Act of August 25, 1916 (popularly known as the "National Park Service Organic Act,"; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq); and

(3) any agreements entered into pursuant to subsection (b).

(b) AGREEMENTS.—

(1) For the purposes of defining the role of the National Park Service in administering the Nidoto Nai Yoni Memorial owned by the City of Bainbridge Island, the Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with—

(A) the City of Bainbridge Island;

(B) the Bainbridge Island Metropolitan Park and Recreational District;

(C) the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Community Memorial Committee;

(D) the Bainbridge Island Historical Society;

(E) successor entities to the entities named in subparagraphs (A) through (D); and

(F) other appropriate individuals or entities, at the discretion of the Secretary.

(2) In order to implement an agreement provided for in paragraph (1), the Secretary may—

(A) make grants to the City of Bainbridge Island for development of an administrative and interpretive facility for the Nidoto Nai Yoni Memorial;

(B) enter into a cooperative management agreement with the City of Bainbridge Island, pursuant to section 3(1) of Public Law 91-383 (16 U.S.C. 1a-2(1); popularly known as the "National Park System General Authorities Act"), for the purpose of providing assistance with operation and maintenance of the memorial;

(C) make grants to other non-Federal entities for other infrastructure projects at the memorial, subject to a match of non-Federal funding equal to the amount of a grant made pursuant to this paragraph; and

(D) make grants or enter into cooperative agreements with non-Federal entities to support development of interpretive media for the memorial.

(c) ADMINISTRATIVE AND VISITOR USE SITE.—The Secretary is authorized to operate and maintain a site in Seattle, Washington, for administrative and visitor use purposes associated with Minidoka Internment National Monument, using to the greatest extent practicable the facilities and other services of the Seattle unit of the Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park.

(d) COORDINATION OF INTERPRETIVE AND EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS AND PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall coordinate the development of interpretive and educational materials and programs for the Nidoto Nai Yoni Memorial and the Minidoka Internment National Monument site in the State of Idaho with the Manzanar National Historic Site in the State of California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 161, introduced by my colleague on the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Washington State, Representative INSLEE.

This noteworthy legislation would authorize a memorial to commemorate the Japanese Americans of Bainbridge Island, Washington, who were the first Americans to be forcibly removed from their homes and relocated in internment camps during World War II.

The new memorial will serve as an important remembrance of a sad chapter in American history. Shortly after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, President Franklin Roosevelt issued an executive order providing for the relocation of Japanese Americans living along the west coast.

On March 30, 1942, the relocation began at the Eagledale Ferry Dock, with 227 Bainbridge Island residents being forcibly removed to internment camps away from the coast. Eventually, more than 12,000 Japanese Americans in Washington State and more than 110,000 Japanese Americans along the west coast were relocated.

Public Law 107-363 directed the Secretary of the Interior to study the Eagledale Ferry Dock on Bainbridge Island, Washington, to determine the suitability of designing the site as a unit of the National Parks System. The study was to include an analysis of the historical events associated with the dock and the potential for preserving and interpreting the site.

On May 1, 2006, the Department of Interior transmitted to Congress the study report. The study recommended designating a memorial site on Bainbridge Island, and that memorial will be managed as a satellite site of the Minidoka Internment National Monument, an existing National Park System unit in Idaho. H.R. 161 would implement the recommendations contained in the study.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend and congratulate my colleague, Mr. INSLEE, for his commitment and leadership in this matter. A hearing was held on a nearly identical measure last Congress, and Representative INSLEE arranged for the Subcommittee on National Parks to receive moving testimony from an internee whose photograph showing her holding her infant child has become a searing image of the internment.

I would also note that for most of us the internment of Japanese Americans was a historical event that we read about in history books, but for two of our colleagues it was part of their life experience. My colleagues, MIKE HONDA and DORIS MATSUI, spent part of their childhoods in internment camps. I want to acknowledge their experiences in this unfortunate episode in history.

Mr. Speaker, we strongly support passage of H.R. 161 and urge its adoption by the House today.

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

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 161 and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

This legislation further recognizes a tragic period in our Nation's history by designating the "let it not happen again" Memorial on Bainbridge Island, Washington, as part of the Minidoka Internment National Monument in the State of Idaho.

While a hearing was held on this legislation in the 109th Congress, we are concerned that this bill has not gone through the markup process, where issues in this bill, such as its inclusion of 8 acres of land in the State of Washington in a monument over 700 miles away, could have been discussed.

Additionally, it is critical to point out that the National Park Service testified that this bill could divert scarce resources that are needed for existing parks and programs.

That being said, we will not oppose the bill.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Congressman JAY INSLEE of Washington for bringing forth H.R. 161 and yield to him as much time as he may consume.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, today, when we pass the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Monument Act of 2007, we will be making a strong American statement. That statement will be that the power of fear will never again be allowed to overcome the promise of liberty. These are images we should never see again in America; and today, with the passage of this bill, we will make a strong American statement that they will not.

On March 30, 1942, the American Army, pursuant to an executive order by an American President, rounded up 227 Americans living on Bainbridge Island and marched them down the Eagledale Dock in Eagle Harbor of Bainbridge Island, Washington, sur-

rounded by American soldiers, some having bayonets deployed. They were taken away to internment against their will, without trial and without recognition of their rights as citizens and their honor to serve America.

And now, today, when we are making the memorial on Bainbridge Island at the site of this dock, which is now being prepared and is under construction, we will be making an American statement that this cannot happen again.

The saying is "Nidoto Nai Yoni, never let it happen again," and by making this part of our National Parks System, we will be making a statement that these images will never happen to any generation of any creed in America.

I want to note some of the people. This is a picture of a young fellow at that time named Frank Kinamoto. In this picture, Frank had his little tag. Everyone was given a little tag they had to wear with a number on it. Frank grew up to be a respected dentist on Bainbridge Island, and Frank has done personally what this legislation will do nationally. He has spent many years going around showing a collection of photographs telling young students why the protection of our civil liberties is critical and why we should never be overcome by fear again, and I pay respects to Frank and his efforts.

Another young woman at the time, who testified several months ago, who has been pivotal in this effort, Fumiko Hayashida, shown with her daughter here just before she was marched down that pier. Fumiko came to town, who is 95 years young, who is the oldest internee that we are aware of, to send Congress a message to make a national statement to memorialize this.

Now, there are three reasons I think it is important that we pass this bill.

First, although this was a tragic episode in American history, it was an episode involving patriotism because, and this is incredible to me, of the 227 people marched down that pier, 62 of them turned around and volunteered to serve their nation in World War II, and 62 of these people served with distinction. These people were the ultimate patriots. Having been sent to camps by Uncle Sam, to turn around and fight for the freedoms to which they were not entitled was the ultimate act of patriotism, and we honor them as an act of patriotism in this memorial.

Second, it is a memorialization of their neighbors. Many of their neighbors rallied around them. Many of their neighbors guarded some of their equipment to wait for them to come home. And Walt Widward, the publisher of the Bainbridge Island Review, was the only publisher on the western coast of the United States to editorialize against this violation of American values. That is something to memorialize.

But, most importantly, Nidoto Nai Yoni, never let it happen again. And this will be a statement to ourselves,

to our children, to our grandchildren, that, when we are in fear in this country, we should never lose that anchor of American civil rights and civil liberties in respect to what we are as Americans.

We have gone through these days in the last several years. We have experienced fear that sometimes has infected the discussion here in the Chamber; and when we go through and deal with our fears today, I think it is well that we take a lesson from history of 1942 to hew to the power of liberty, rather than the power of fear.

So I am happy today that we will pass this bill that will make this part of our National Parks System. I will invite all Americans to come visit us in Bainbridge Island. We will invite the world to come see that America is a country that makes mistakes but learns and improves. And this is a continuation of that American tradition of improving the American value system. So I am happy today this House will take this step.

I want to thank the Bainbridge Island community and all of those who worked on this project. Clarence Moriwaki, who has led the effort on Bainbridge Island, congratulations. And congratulations to America for always being an improving country.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to yield 6 minutes to my good friend and colleague from Oregon, Congressman Wu.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 161, to expand the Minidoka Internment National Monument to include the Nidoto Nai Yoni Memorial, which commemorates the Japanese Americans of Bainbridge Island, the Japanese Americans of Bainbridge Island, Washington, who were interned during World War II.

On February 19, 1942, President Franklin Roosevelt signed an executive order which forcibly removed approximately 120,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry from their homes, their friends, and their communities. They were incarcerated by this government for their ancestry. Just over 1 month after the executive order was signed, 227 Bainbridge island men, women, and children were sent to internment camps. They were the very first Japanese American families in the United States to be incarcerated.

We in the Pacific Northwest would like to think that we live in a better part of the country, in a part of the country where things are the way they ought to be. But sometimes the way we want things to be is not the way things happen or reality. Because these Japanese Americans were taken from their homes in the heart of the Puget Sound. They were sailed to Seattle. They were loaded onto trains for a 3-day journey to Manzanar, a concentration camp in California's Mojave Desert. These Americans were the very first Americans to be so detained, and the last of the detainees were not released until October of 1946, 4½ years after the sign-

ing of the executive order and over a year after the end of World War II.

But this chapter of our history did not end there. Upon release from the internment camps, Japanese Americans could not return to the lives that they had led before the tragic and misled executive order. I would like to submit further information about General DeWitt's decisions and recommendations, and I will do that at a different time, but during the period of internment, they had lost their homes, their businesses, and their livelihoods.

By commemorating Japanese Americans who were so detained, we ensure that this sad episode in our history will never be forgotten and hopefully not repeated, because we need to learn from the mistakes of the past.

Thirty years passed before the executive order was formally rescinded in 1976. In 1988, a Presidential apology was issued internees.

This is not an abstraction. This is not a theoretical debate. The Military Commissions Act passed by this Congress on September 30, 2006, potentially puts American citizens at risk of military detention. That is a plain reading of the Military Commissions Act. It was hotly debated between the then chairmen of two committees and this Member. It has been commented upon to a limited extent in the national press.

But I think that a fair reading of the Military Commissions Act would show you that if a person is just walking down the street and is detained by military authority for whatever reason, and we are not talking about aliens in Afghanistan, we are talking about someone walking down the streets of Portland, Oregon, or in Bainbridge Island. What could potentially happen to that person?

The better course under the Military Commissions Act is that they are subject to military justice, a very limited review by a military tribunal, and the end of that appeal road is the Secretary of Defense. That is actually the better course.

Now, I have to point out that there are 25 detainees in Guantanamo who, after 5 years of detention, have not had their first review yet; and I say that is the better course because the course that is actually more troubling under the Military Commissions Act is that if there is not a review, there is no appeal. There is no appeal to a civilian court. There is no habeas corpus, a doctrine which has served Anglo American societies well for almost a thousand years.

This memorial, which H.R. 161 helps us remember, is not an abstraction. It was real suffering for the Japanese Americans, for the Americans who were incarcerated. But it is also a reminder that, as was said of the executive order much later, when actions are taken by this government in an atmosphere of hysteria, great injustices can be perpetrated; and we need to be careful in our era lest we be put in a posi-

tion to issue an apology decades from now.

Following the attack on Pearl Harbor, Hawaii passed under martial law, the writ of habeas corpus was suspended, and the military police took several hundred suspected spies and saboteurs of Japanese extraction into custody. But the very size of the Japanese community in Hawaii (nearly half the territory's population), and its vital importance to the islands' economy, foreclosed any thought of wholesale evacuation. The mainland community, however, was proportionately much smaller (in California, barely 1 percent of the population), more economically marginal and socially isolated, and long buffeted by racist pressures. The mainland Japanese for the most part kept warily to themselves, many of them toiling with exemplary efficiency on their family fruit and vegetable farms. Insular and quiescent, they were also internally riven by age and legal status. Their elders, the forty thousand first-generation immigrant Japanese, or Issei, were generally over the age of fifty and debarred from citizenship by the Immigration Restriction Act of 1924, a statutory impediment that perversely exposed them to the accusation that as non-citizens they were poorly assimilated into American society. A majority of their children, the eighty thousand second-generation Nisei, were under the age of eighteen. Born in the United States, they were also citizens. Alien and citizen alike, the peculiarly vulnerable Pacific Coast Japanese community was about to feel the full wrath of war-fueled hysteria.

Curiously, no clamor for wholesale reprisals against the mainland Japanese arose in the immediate aftermath of the Pearl Harbor attack. The Los Angeles Times soberly editorialized on December 8 that most of the Japanese on the Coast were "good Americans, born and educated as such," and serenely foresaw that there would be "no riots, no mob law." General John L. DeWitt, chief of the army's Western Defense Command, at first dismissed loose talk of mass evacuations as "damned nonsense." He condemned any broadside assaults on the rights of the American-born Nisei. "An American citizen, after all, is an American citizen," he declared. Individual arrests were another matter. Government surveillance, ongoing since 1935, had identified some two thousand potentially subversive persons in the Japanese community. Along with fourteen thousand German and Italian security risks nationwide, they were quietly rounded up in the last days of 1941. But those individual detentions stopped well short of wholesale incarcerations. "I was determined," Attorney General Francis Biddle wrote, "to avoid mass internment, and the persecution of aliens that had characterized the First World War."

In fact, the immigrants whose loyalty had been questioned during World War I had then been freshly arrived and seemed to many observers unarguably alien. But by 1941 those older European groups were settled communities, well assimilated, their patriotism as well as their political loyalty actively cultivated by Roosevelt's New Deal. Though a surprising six hundred thousand Italians—more than 10 percent of the entire Italian-American community—remained Italian citizens and were automatically labeled "enemy aliens" after Mussolini's declaration of war, Roosevelt instructed Biddle to cancel that designation in a joyfully received announcement at Carnegie Hall, shrewdly delivered on Columbus Day 1942, just weeks before the congressional elections.

The Japanese were not so fortunate. As war rumors took wing in the weeks following Pearl Harbor, sobriety gave way to anxiety,

then to a rising cry for draconian action against the Japanese on the West Coast. Inflammatory and invariably false reports of Japanese attacks on the American mainland flashed through coastal communities. Eleanor Roosevelt's airplane, en route to Los Angeles on the evening of the Pearl Harbor attack, was grounded in the Midwest while the first lady telephoned Washington to check a radio message that San Francisco was under bombardment. Painters at Stanford University blacked out the skylight of the library's main reading room so that it could not serve as a beacon to enemy pilots. Carpenters hammered up dummy aircraft plants in Los Angeles to decoy Japanese bombers away from the real factories. Athletic officials moved the traditional New Year's Day football classic from the Rose Bowl in Pasadena, California; the game was played instead in North Carolina, presumably safe from Japanese attack. Japan's astonishing string of victories in the Pacific further unsettled American public opinion. Hong Kong fell on December 2, Manila on January 2, Singapore on January 25.

The release at the end of January of a government investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack proved the decisive blow. The report, prepared by Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts, alleged without documentation that Hawaii-based espionage agents, including Japanese-American citizens, had abetted Nagumo's strike force. Two days later, DeWitt reported "a tremendous volume of public opinion now developing against the Japanese of all classes, that is aliens and non-aliens." DeWitt himself, described by Biddle as having a "tendency to reflect the views of the last man to whom he talked," soon succumbed to Rumor's siren. He wildly declared to an incredulous Justice Department official that every ship sailing out of the Columbia had been attacked by submarines guided by clandestine radio operators near the river's mouth. When evidence of actual attacks failed to materialize, DeWitt invoked the tortured logic that the very absence of any sabotage activity on the West Coast proved the existence of an organized, disciplined conspiracy in the Japanese community, cunningly withholding its blow until it could be struck with lethal effect. In February the respected columnist Walter Lippmann alleged that military authorities had evidence of radio communications between "the enemy at sea and enemy agents on land"—a charge that FBI director J. Edgar Hoover had already advised Biddle was utterly without foundation. A radio technician from the Federal Communications Commission reviewed DeWitt's "evidence" of electronic signals and declared it hogwash. All 760 of DeWitt's suspicious radio transmissions could be accounted for, and not one involved espionage. "Frankly," the technician concluded, "I have never seen an organization [the U.S. Army's Western Defense Command] that was so hopeless to cope with radio intelligence requirements. The personnel is unskilled and untrained. Most are privates who can read only ten words a minute. . . . It's pathetic to say the least."

But by this time facts were no protection against the building gale of fear and prejudice. "Nobody's constitutional rights," Lippmann magisterially intoned, "include the right to reside and do business on a battlefield." Lippmann's colleague Westbrook Pegler echoed him less elegantly a few days later: "The Japanese in California should be under armed guard to the last man and woman right now," Pegler wrote in his widely read column, "and to hell with habeas corpus until the danger is over." Unapologetically racist voices also joined the chorus. "We're charged with wanting to get rid of the Japs for selfish reasons," a leader of

California's Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association declared. "We might as well be honest. We do. It's a question of whether the white man lives on the Pacific Coast or the brown man." Prodded by such sentiments, in early February 1942 DeWitt officially requested authority to remove all Japanese from the West Coast. It was impossible he claimed, to distinguish the loyal from the disloyal in the peculiarly alien and inscrutable Japanese community. The only remedy was wholesale evacuation. The same man who had said a month earlier, "An American citizen, after all, is an American citizen," now announced, "A Jap's a Jap. . . . It makes no difference whether he is an American citizen or not. . . . I don't want any of them."

At the Justice Department several officials, including conspicuously Edward J. Ennis, director of the Alien Enemy Control Unit, as well as Biddle's assistant James H. Rowe, struggled to quell this irrationally mounting fury. Rowe denounced Lippmann and Pegler as "Armchair Strategists and Junior G-Men" whose reckless charges came "close to shouting FIRE! in the theater; and if race riots occur, these writers will bear a heavy responsibility." Attorney General Biddle informed Secretary of War Stimson "that the Department of Justice would not under any circumstances evacuate American citizens." But at a fateful meeting in the living room of the attorney general's Washington home on the evening of February 17, the gentle and scholarly Biddle buckled. Facing off against Assistant Secretary of War John J. McCloy and two army officers, Ennis and Rowe argued heatedly that DeWitt's request for evacuation orders should be denied. Unknown to his two subordinates, however, Biddle, new to the cabinet, unsure of his standing with Roosevelt, and overawed by the Olympian figure of Stimson, had told the secretary of war by telephone earlier in the day that he would not oppose DeWitt's recommendation. When this became clear, Rowe remembered, "I was so mad that I could not speak. . . . Ennis almost wept." Even Stimson had grave misgivings. "The second generation Japanese can only be evacuated," he wrote in his diary, "either as part of a total evacuation, giving access to the areas only by permits, or by frankly trying to put them out on the ground that their racial characteristics are such that we cannot understand or even trust the citizen Japanese. This latter is the fact but I am afraid it will make a tremendous hole in our constitutional system to apply it." Despite his own reservations and the sputtering opposition of the Justice Department officials, Stimson advised the president that DeWitt should be authorized to proceed. The cabinet devoted only a desultory discussion to the matter. On February 19 Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066. It directed the War Department to "prescribe military areas . . . from which any and all persons may be excluded." No explicit reference to the Japanese was necessary. When Biddle feebly objected that the order was "ill-advised, unnecessary, and unnecessarily cruel," Roosevelt silenced him with the rejoinder: "[T]his must be a military decision."

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 16, the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Monument Act of 2007. This important legislation will expand the boundaries of the federally-recognized Minidoka Internment National Monument to include the Nidoto Nai Yoni 'Let It Not Happen Again' Memorial in Bainbridge Island, Washington.

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 that authorized the forc-

ible removal and relocation of Americans of Japanese ancestry from the western United States nearly 3 months after the Imperial Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor precipitated the United States' entrance into World War II. Under the authority of Executive Order 9066, on March 24, 1942, Lieutenant General John DeWitt issued Civilian Exclusion Order No. 1, forcing the removal of the 227 Japanese Americans residing on Bainbridge Island.

This edict allowed Japanese Americans residing on Bainbridge Island only 6 days to sell their belongings, close their businesses, and pack up their lives before resettlement and internment in camps elsewhere in the United States. These Americans endured the additional burden and injustice of being congregated at Egleadale Ferry Dock under armed guard before transport to the mainland. Friends and neighbors converged as a symbolic gesture of unity and support for these Japanese Americans who were involuntarily removed from the community. They left behind all the belongings and possessions that they could not carry or wear. These Americans of Japanese ancestry were the first of over 100,000 Japanese Americans to be interned in remote and desolate camps. They were the first group of Japanese Americans to be stripped of their rights as American citizens under the authorities of Executive Order 9066.

Today, by authorizing this historical piece of land to be within the boundaries of the Minidoka Internment National Monument, we memorialize the sacrifices Japanese Americans made during World War II. We also would acknowledge through the enactment of this legislation the occurrence of an egregious infringement of American citizenship rights. By adopting this legislation we would provide an official record of our hope and determination that an act similar to this one is never repeated in the future. This site marks the beginning of the forced exodus of an entire ethnic minority from the western United States and today we hope to transform it into a means of educating future generations of the importance of civil liberties, especially in times of war.

This memorial, a short ferry boat ride from Seattle, is a fitting symbol of this disturbing and unfortunate chapter in American history. While the internment camps themselves are located in desolate areas, far away from everyday sight and thought, this monument, in the heart of the Pacific Northwest, will serve as a continual reminder of the patriotism of Japanese Americans during the Second World War and the mistakes that we should never let happen again. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation and I commend our colleague, the gentleman from Washington, Mr. INSLEE, for his sponsorship of this bill.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 161.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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.

COMMISSION TO STUDY THE POTENTIAL CREATION OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE AMERICAN LATINO ACT OF 2007

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 512) to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of the National Museum of the American Latino to develop a plan of action for the establishment and maintenance of a National Museum of the American Latino in Washington, DC, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 512

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 "Commission to Study the Potential Creation of the National Museum of the American Latino Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Museum of the American Latino (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Commission shall consist of 23 members appointed not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act as follows:

(1) The President shall appoint 7 voting members.

(2) The Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, the majority leader of the Senate, and the minority leader of the Senate shall each appoint 3 voting members.

(3) In addition to the members appointed under paragraph (2), the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, the majority leader of the Senate, and the minority leader of the Senate shall each appoint 1 nonvoting member.

(c) QUALIFICATIONS.—Members of the Commission shall be chosen from among individuals, or representatives of institutions or entities, who possess either—

(1) a demonstrated commitment to the research, study, or promotion of American Latino life, art, history, political or economic status, or culture, together with—

(A) expertise in museum administration;

(B) expertise in fundraising for nonprofit or cultural institutions;

(C) experience in the study and teaching of Latino culture and history at the post-secondary level;

(D) experience in studying the issue of the Smithsonian Institution's representation of American Latino art, life, history, and culture; or

(E) extensive experience in public or elected service; or

(2) experience in the administration of, or the planning for the establishment of, museums devoted to the study and promotion of the role of ethnic, racial, or cultural groups in American history.

SEC. 3. FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) PLAN OF ACTION FOR ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF MUSEUM.—The Com-

mission shall submit a report to the President and the Congress containing its recommendations with respect to a plan of action for the establishment and maintenance of a National Museum of the American Latino in Washington, DC (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Museum").

(b) FUNDRAISING PLAN.—The Commission shall develop a fundraising plan for supporting the creation and maintenance of the Museum through contributions by the American people, and a separate plan on fundraising by the American Latino community.

(c) REPORT ON ISSUES.—The Commission shall examine (in consultation with the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution), and submit a report to the President and the Congress on, the following issues:

(1) The availability and cost of collections to be acquired and housed in the Museum.

(2) The impact of the Museum on regional Hispanic- and Latino-related museums.

(3) Possible locations for the Museum in Washington, DC and its environs, to be considered in consultation with the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts, the Department of the Interior and Smithsonian Institution.

(4) Whether the Museum should be located within the Smithsonian Institution.

(5) The governance and organizational structure from which the Museum should operate.

(6) How to engage the American Latino community in the development and design of the Museum.

(7) The cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Museum.

(d) LEGISLATION TO CARRY OUT PLAN OF ACTION.—Based on the recommendations contained in the report submitted under subsection (a) and the report submitted under subsection (c), the Commission shall submit for consideration to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate recommendations for a legislative plan of action to create and construct the Museum.

(e) NATIONAL CONFERENCE.—In carrying out its functions under this section, the Commission may convene a national conference on the Museum, comprised of individuals committed to the advancement of American Latino life, art, history, and culture, not later than 18 months after the commission members are selected.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) FACILITIES AND SUPPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.—The Department of the Interior shall provide from funds appropriated for this purpose administrative services, facilities, and funds necessary for the performance of the Commission's functions. These funds shall be made available prior to any meetings of the Commission.

(b) COMPENSATION.—Each member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government may receive compensation for each day on which the member is engaged in the work of the Commission, at a daily rate to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

(c) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member shall be entitled to travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with applicable provisions under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Commission is not subject to the provi-

sions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

SEC. 5. DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF REPORTS; TERMINATION.

(a) DEADLINE.—The Commission shall submit final versions of the reports and plans required under section 3 not later than 24 months after the date of the Commission's first meeting.

(b) TERMINATION.—The Commission shall terminate not later than 30 days after submitting the final versions of reports and plans pursuant to subsection (a).

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the activities of the Commission \$2,100,000 for the first fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act and \$1,100,000 for the second fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 512, which was introduced by my colleague from California, Representative BECERRA.

The legislation directs the establishment of a commission to study the potential creation of a National Museum of the American Latino, to be located here in Washington, D.C. The commission will be composed of 23 qualified individuals, with seven appointed by the President and the remainder appointed by the majority and minority leadership of the House and Senate.

Under H.R. 512, the commission would be required to prepare a plan of action for the establishment and maintenance of the museum, including recommendations for a legislative plan of action to create and construct the museum. The commission's plan would be due not later than 24 months after the date of the commission's first meeting.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 512. Given the contributions that American Latinos have made and continue to make to the cultural and social history of the United States, this is a most fitting measure.

□ 1245

The legislation was the subject of hearings in the House last Congress, and I would note that a nearly identical measure passed the House on September 27, 2006.

As the face of this Nation is represented by many people, the museum would be an opportunity for all of

America to look at the diversity, to appreciate the many peoples that make up this great country of ours.

And I want to take this opportunity to also commend and congratulate my colleague from California, XAVIER BECERRA, for his leadership on this matter. He has worked very hard with many parties to bring this legislation to fruition.

Mr. Speaker, we strongly support H.R. 512 and urge the adoption of the legislation by the House today.

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

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 512, and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Latinos have played an integral part in American history since the founding of the United States. In fact, they were on the continent for more than two centuries prior to the signing of the Declaration of Independence. Despite the growth of Latino inclusion programs at the Smithsonian over the past decade, supporters of H.R. 512 believe that the "mosaic portrayed in the Washington museums" is incomplete without a museum dedicated to the community.

This bill passed the House in the 109th Congress, but we have concerns that this legislation requires the Secretary of the Interior to provide administrative services, facilities and funds for the operation of the commission. In a hearing on the bill, the National Park Service testified that the commission would fit better at the General Services Administration, whose mission is well suited to serve the commission. If the bill had been crafted this way, it would have enabled the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to provide its expertise on these issues.

Despite these concerns, I support the bill, commend the authors, including Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN for her persistence and hard work in helping craft this measure.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I would like again to commend Congressman XAVIER BECERRA of California for bringing H.R. 512 before us and yield him as much time as he may consume.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking the committees of jurisdiction for helping move this legislation forward quickly.

Last session what we found was that we just ran out of time. This bill passed unanimously out of the House of Representatives, not a single opposing vote, and we came very, very close in the Senate to having this actually go to the desk of the President, where I am sure he would have signed it. Unfortunately, time became the enemy. And I hope that now, moving this quickly through the process, we will be able to give the Senate the time it needs to move through its process as well.

I want to thank my colleague and friend from Florida, Ms. ILEANA ROS-

LEHTINEN, for her tireless efforts on behalf of this legislation. She and I have served as a, I hope, dynamic duo in trying to move this forward with all our colleagues who were supporting this legislation.

Many of us believe that there is no place on this Earth like the National Mall that we have here in Washington, D.C. If anyone from Mars were to come and ask what is it like to be an American, I would send them directly to the National Mall and say, go through the museums that we have at the Smithsonian. Take a look at the various artifacts that give you a sense of our culture, our history, our heritage as a Nation; and you will have a better sense of what it means to be an American after that walk. It would probably take you a few weeks if you want to go through all the different museums, but you will have a better sense of what it means to be an American than, I think, if you go anywhere else in this world.

The only problem I have, and the only disappointment I have, is that you don't get the full picture of what it has meant to be an American. We have moved forward to try to take care of that over the years. We have a museum that recently opened in the last 4 or 5 years that will help us better understand what it has meant to be a Native American in this country. We are going to put shovel in ground very soon in trying to help America understand the history and the plight of many Americans of African descent who have come into this country and the generations that have followed, and what it means to be African American in this country.

I hope, at some point, this commission will report back to us on what best we can do as a Nation to make sure that when someone does walk through the Mall of the Capital and visits those precious museums that we have, that they will have that sympathy and that understanding that comes from visiting those tremendous facilities of what it means to be an American and what it is to be proud of our American history and culture.

This legislation, which has the support, I am very glad to say, of a bipartisan group of Members in the House, should help us get a sense from the experts, not politicians, not people who have no real understanding of this, but from the experts of whether or not there is value in moving forward the idea of trying to have a place where we have resided within it, the culture, the experience, the history, the art, the heritage of Americans of Latino descent.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding me the time; thank the two committees of jurisdiction and certainly all the cosponsors of this legislation, but principally to my colleague in crime here, the Congresswoman from Florida, Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may

consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), a co-author of the legislation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I rise in strong support today, Mr. Speaker, of H.R. 512, the commission to study the potential creation of a National Museum of the American Latino Community Act. And I would like to thank my dear friend, Mr. BECERRA of California, for his commitment in bringing this important legislation to the floor. We have been working on it for a number of years. It has got strong bipartisan support, and it has been a delight for me to have worked with him and members of my staff to have worked with his staff as well.

As the Republican lead on this legislation, I am so pleased that this bill will take the next step in developing a plan of action for an establishment of a National Museum of the American Latino.

The commission would be comprised of experts in art and museum administration, as well as individuals with experience in the development of similar cultural institutions. The commission would have the responsibility of examining and reporting to Congress and the President a plan to establish a new national museum.

Even as the largest minority group in the United States, Hispanic Americans, are not fully represented by one of the permanent exhibits in Washington's museums, currently there are over 42 million Hispanics in the United States. Furthermore, the Census Bureau estimates that in the year 2050, the Hispanic population in the U.S. will reach over 100 million.

As we can see, Hispanic Americans are our country's largest and fastest growing minority group, and they continue to expand and contribute to the greatness of our wonderful country.

As the first Hispanic American woman elected to Congress, I am so proud to advance the issues affecting all citizens living in our great country. I have been proud to represent my diverse south Florida constituency for many years now in Congress, and I look forward to a future that is, indeed, bright for individuals across our terrific country.

Hispanic Americans are playing an increasing role also in the Nation's economy and in our workforce. For example, according to the Office of Management and Budget, the unemployment rate among the Hispanic community dropped to 4.7, an all-time record low. This statistic demonstrates that the economic policies of lower taxes and less government regulations are working and that all Americans are benefiting from it.

The great diversity of ethnicities and nationalities of the many people of the United States is what makes our Nation strong, is what continues to be a home for many different cultures; and this national museum will signify our strong commitment to proudly exhibit America's rich cultural diversity.

Therefore, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation to ensure that visitors to our Nation's Capital gain a more complete understanding of who we are as Americans.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield as much time as he may consume to my good friend from California (Mr. BACA), for remarks on H.R. 512, in which he has been a participant and a hard worker getting the legislation to this point.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for allowing me the time to say a few words. And I want to raise my strong voice in support of H.R. 512. This is important legislation that would establish a commission to study the potential creation of a National Museum of the American Latino.

And I want to thank my good friend, XAVIER BECERRA, for sponsoring this bill and championing this cause, which is of great significance to many Hispanics, Latinos throughout the Nation, throughout the country, including myself.

This is a bipartisan legislation that basically asks for a study to create a National Museum of the American Latino. Bipartisan.

Currently, there are over 45 million Latinos in the United States, including Puerto Rico. The social, cultural and economic contributions of Latinos in the United States have an important history, an important history, and are growing daily. We must realize that.

American Latinos are natives to many different parts of the world. Some are from Puerto Rico, some are from South America, while others have roots and ties to Mexico. But while we hail from different countries, including from right here in the United States, we have different backgrounds, and many of us share a similar experience and a wealth of common values.

A national museum of the American Latino will help share this experience and the values not only with Latinos, but with all. It will be a sense of pride, tradition, culture and arts that would be exhibited to all Americans to see, all individuals.

I urge my colleagues to cast a vote in favor and understanding of heritage of all Americans and support this legislation.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking Republican of the Committee on House Administration, which also has jurisdiction over the bill, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 512, which establishes a commission to study the possible creation of a national museum of the American Latino community. As you know, this bill mirrors H.R. 2134, which was referred to the Committee on House Administration in the last Congress and which I was pleased to guide through that committee and present to

the House for passage on September 27 of last year. It is only our regret that it did not pass the Senate.

The Latino American community is often recognized for its rich traditions, its sense of community, and deeply rooted beliefs which are woven throughout the fabric of American history. As the Nation's fastest growing ethnic community, the Latino population in America has more than doubled in size in the last 10 years to over 40 million, and continues to grow.

The creation of a national museum of the American Latino community would enable Latino Americans to tell their story in their own words and would create a destination for students, families and visitors that would accurately depict Latino American history.

In order to explore the possibility of creating such a museum, the legislation before us specifies that a commission be created with 23 members, seven of whom would be appointed by the President, and three voting and are non-voting. Each would be appointed by the Speaker, the House Republican leader, the Senate majority leader, and the Senate Republican leader.

Once appointed, the commissioners would assess the cost of the museum, its impact on other Hispanic and Latino-related museums, identify a possible location for the museum, and propose guidelines on the museum's operation. The commission would also work closely with the Latino American community during the design and development phase to ensure that the museum accurately captures the Latino American experience.

I urge my colleagues to, once again, support this important legislation which is the first step in creating a national museum of the American Latino community that will serve as a testament to the vibrant history and tradition of Latino Americans. And I would just be delighted to eventually see this constructed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being the skunk at the garden party, I would like to add a postscript expressing my concern about the proliferation of museums on the Mall and what this may do to the Mall. As you recall, the Mall was designed many, many years ago as a gathering place for America, and it has nobly served that purpose. I believe it is very important that we, in building any additional museums, not impinge on that intent.

□ 1300

So establishing location is I think going to be one of the most difficult parts of the work of this Commission, and I wish them well. But I think it is extremely important that we preserve the National Mall as the gathering place for America and make certain that any additional buildings on the Mall fit well with that purpose.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as chairwoman of the Committee on House Administration, which shares jurisdiction over H.R. 512 with the Committee on Natural Re-

sources, I urge my colleagues to move quickly so that the bill can become law this year and we can begin the process of planning a National Museum of the American Latino here in Washington, D.C.

I congratulate Representative BECERRA and Representative ROS-LEHTINEN for their leadership in introducing this legislation and for their hard work in pushing it successfully through the House last year.

Persons of Hispanic, or Latino, descent have lived in the Western Hemisphere for 500 years. In the United States, they have become the largest minority group, and their impact will only grow stronger in the future. The culture of the Americas reflects a unique mixture of what was brought from Europe, inherited from the indigenous Native Americans, contributed by Africans forced to come here during the era of slavery, and stirred in the melting pot of interaction with later immigrants from all around the world.

I am pleased to support consideration of a Latino Museum which I hope would undertake serious scholarly research, as well as create and display exhibits to tell the story of the American Latino to an ever growing population which will be increasingly exposed to such cultural influences in the years ahead. This is a project which all Americans can enthusiastically embrace.

Our Committee on House Administration worked for years with the gentleman from Georgia, Representative JOHN LEWIS, to establish the Smithsonian African American Museum which finally became law in 2003. That legislation worked its way through Congress over a period of 17 years, passed the House and the Senate in different forms during that time, and then was successfully revived and studied by a Commission appointed by the President and Congress.

Mr. Speaker, that Commission worked through 2002 and early 2003 to compile information and recommendations for Congress to use in considering whether to finally establish the museum, and in what form. While we did not accept all of the Commission's recommendations, I found that it provided invaluable focus and momentum in moving the project forward.

H.R. 512, and any future legislation to establish a new museum which may spring from it, will hopefully enjoy a less tortuous path to a successful conclusion. The Commission to be created relating to the Museum of the American Latino is largely patterned after the African American Museum Commission, and this time we are considering establishing the Commission at the beginning of the process of studying a museum rather than near the end.

The new Commission will examine, among other issues, whether this new museum should be part of the Smithsonian Institution, as is the new African American Museum. The Smithsonian has unique expertise in both museum governance and successfully presenting information which tells a story in both educational and entertaining ways.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 512, the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of the National Museum of the American Latino Act of 2007, which would recognize the tremendous cultural contributions of the American Latino community.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 512, which would create a 23 member commission responsible for developing a plan of action for the establishment and maintenance of a National Museum of the American Latino in Washington, DC. Specifically, this commission would be tasked with bringing experts, policymakers, and other interested parties together to discuss a viable blueprint for the museum. The commission would also design a public-private partnership to fund the museum. These recommendations would be reported to Congress within 24 months of the bill being signed into law.

During my tenure as Ranking Member of the House Administration Committee in the 108th Congress, the committee held a long overdue hearing on this legislation. In the 109th Congress, I was a cosponsor of this legislation and it passed in the House by a voice vote on September 27, 2006. Unfortunately, the Senate was unable to pass this bill before the adjournment of the 109th Congress.

The Latino population in the United States is estimated at 42.7 million, making the community the fastest growing group in the country. They also have a rich heritage in this country that is worth celebrating. I am hopeful that we can finally get this bill to the President's desk for signature and get the process underway for establishing this important museum. As a former high school history teacher, I believe that passage of this legislation is crucial in educating all Americans of our nation's cultural diversity.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 512, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOWING FOR RENEGOTIATION OF PAYMENT SCHEDULE OF CONTRACTS BETWEEN SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR AND REDWOOD VALLEY COUNTY WATER DISTRICT

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 235) to allow for the renegotiation of the payment schedule of contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and the Redwood Valley County Water District, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 235

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

SECTION 1. RENEGOTIATION OF PAYMENT SCHEDULE.

Section 15 of Public Law 100-516 (102 Stat. 2573) is amended as follows:

(1) By amending paragraph (2) of subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(2) If, as of January 1, 2006, the Secretary of the Interior and the Redwood Valley County Water District have not renegotiated the schedule of payment, the District may enter into such additional non-Federal obligations as are necessary to finance procurement of dedicated water rights and improvements necessary to store and convey those rights to provide for the District's water needs. The Secretary shall reschedule the payments due under loans numbered 14-06-200-8423A and 14-06-200-8423A Amendatory and said payments shall commence when such additional obligations have been financially satisfied by the District. The date of the initial payment owed by the District to the United States shall be regarded as the start of the District's repayment period and the time upon which any interest shall first be computed and assessed under section 5 of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (43 U.S.C. 422a et seq.).”

(2) By striking subsection (c).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) and the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. 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 gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

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

I rise in very strong support of H.R. 235, as amended. This legislation will allow the Redwood Valley County Water District in Northern California to renegotiate loans it received from the Federal Government for an unsuccessful water project. This action will clear the way for the Water District to initiate a new project that will develop a reliable supply of drinking water for that area. The District will rely only on private financing for the new project. No Federal money will be spent on this new project.

However, before the District can secure private financing for any project, it must renegotiate the existing loans to provide for their repayment subsequent to repayment of the new loan. Once the new project is built and delivering water, it will provide enough revenue to allow the District to repay both its private loan and the United States Government.

Specifically, this legislation allows the Redwood County Valley Water District to secure a private loan for a project to provide the region with a reliable water supply. It also requires the Water District to repay its current suspended loan to the Federal Government once the renewed water project is paid for.

In consultation with the minority, the legislation includes a minor

amendment to clarify the requirement that the Secretary of the Interior must reschedule loan payments and that the payments must begin immediately upon satisfaction of the Water District's newer financial obligation.

Similar legislation was passed by this House in the 109th Congress; and I congratulate my colleague, Congressman MIKE THOMPSON, for all of his hard work on behalf of the Redwood Valley County Water District.

I do urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 235, as amended.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of H.R. 235.

There were many last-minute questions about this bill mainly because a hearing wasn't held on it. I hope this will not be the standard procedure for how the majority party brings legislation to the House floor. That is why I am pleased that the majority has made additional inquiries regarding this bill and has decided to offer an amendment to address some concerns. With this amendment, I will not oppose the legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 235, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVING CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS ON MAMMOTH COMMUNITY WATER DISTRICT'S ABILITY TO USE CERTAIN PROPERTY ACQUIRED FROM THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 356) to remove certain restrictions on the Mammoth Community Water District's ability to use certain property acquired by that District from the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 356

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

SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS ON PROPERTY.

Notwithstanding Public Law 90-171 (16 U.S.C. 484a; 81 Stat. 531), the approximately 25 acres patented to the Mammoth Community Water District (now known as the "Mammoth Community Water District") by Patent No. 04-87-0038, on June 26, 1987, and recorded in Volume 482, at page 517, of the official records of the Recorder's Office, Mono

County, California, may be used for purposes other than the purpose for which those lands were being used prior to the conveyance to the Mammoth County Water District and such lands may be transferred as authorized under State law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) and the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. 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 gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 356 removes congressionally imposed restrictions on the use of lands transferred in 1987 from the United States to the Mammoth Community Water District in California. This legislation would allow the District to modify the use of these lands so that those 12 acres of land now used for material storage may be put to a more beneficial use.

In 2004, the Subcommittee on Water and Power held a hearing on similar legislation. In the 109th Congress, similar legislation was favorably reported by the committee and passed by the House.

We have no objections on this non-controversial bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 356. H.R. 356, introduced by our colleague from California, BUCK MCKEON, removes land use restrictions on property acquired from the Forest Service by the Mammoth Community Water District in Mono County, California.

In 1987, the U.S. Forest Service conveyed 25 acres to the Water District under land use conditions at the time. Of these lands, 12 acres are now needed for different uses, including much-needed water utility operations. Implementation of this noncontroversial bill will ultimately benefit the local water consumer and will adhere to all Federal, State, and local environmental laws.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my strong support for HR 356, legislation I introduced earlier this year to remove restrictions on 25 acres of land patented to the Mammoth County Water District.

Prior to 1987, the District occupied this land through a special use permit with the Forest

Service. Of these 25 acres, 12 acres were used for the storage of materials, and prior to 1987, for oxidation ponds, which had become obsolete by that year.

After that time, Congress passed Public Law 97-465 that allowed these lands to be transferred directly to the District. While the law allowed for acquisition of these lands, it also directed that they could only be used for those purposes prior to the time of the conveyance.

Today, however, these 12 acres are no longer needed for the storage of materials and the community would like to utilize this land in a more economically and socially viable manner.

Such restrictions as those currently placed on the aforementioned acreage hinder the Mammoth community's ability to respond to the growing needs of its citizens and visitors.

As such, passage of this legislation would allow the town to accommodate for the growing economic and social needs of the region. In particular I am pleased to inform my colleagues of plans to use these acres for enhanced emergency services availability for the people of Mammoth Lakes.

I would like to express my deep appreciation to Chairman RAHALL for bringing this legislation to the floor and ask my colleagues to support its passage here today.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 356.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1315

YAKIMA-TIETON IRRIGATION DISTRICT CONVEYANCE ACT OF 2007

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 386) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain buildings and lands of the Yakima Project, Washington, to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 386

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 "Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District Conveyance Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN BUILDINGS AND LANDS OF THE YAKIMA PROJECT, WASHINGTON.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District, located in Yakima County, Washington, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the buildings and lands of the Yakima Project, Washington, in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in the agree-

ment titled "Agreement Between the United States and the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District to Transfer Title to Certain Federally Owned Buildings and Lands, With Certain Property Rights, Title, and Interest, to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District" (Contract No. 5-07-10-L1658).

(b) LIABILITY.—Effective upon the date of conveyance under this section, the United States shall not be held liable by any court for damages of any kind arising out of any act, omission, or occurrence relating to the conveyed buildings and lands, except for damages caused by acts of negligence committed by the United States or by its employees or agents before the date of conveyance. Nothing in this section increases the liability of the United States beyond that provided in chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code (popularly known as the Federal Tort Claims Act), on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) BENEFITS.—After conveyance of the buildings and lands to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District under this section—

(1) such buildings and lands shall not be considered to be a part of a Federal reclamation project; and

(2) such irrigation district shall not be eligible to receive any benefits with respect to any buildings and lands conveyed, except benefits that would be available to a similarly situated person with respect to such buildings and lands that are not part of a Federal reclamation project.

(d) REPORT.—If the Secretary of the Interior has not completed the conveyance required under subsection (a) within 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that explains the reason such conveyance has not been completed and stating the date by which the conveyance will be completed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) and the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. 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 gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 386 would transfer title for approximately 9 acres of land and several buildings to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District. The terms of the transfer are included in a formal agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the irrigation district. Other parts of the reclamation project, including the Tieton diversion dam and associated canals, would not be affected.

In the 109th Congress, the Subcommittee on Water and Power held a hearing on similar legislation. That bill was favorably reported by the committee and passed by this House. We have no objection to this legislation.

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

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 386 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 386, sponsored by our colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), conveys 9 acres of federally owned land and administrative buildings to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District in Washington State. No project facilities, such as dams, diversion structures or canals, are included in this title transfer. The transfer has been in the works for almost a decade.

This legislation, also introduced by the junior Senator from Washington State, will enhance more private ownership and decrease the Federal Government's liability. It is a win for the local community and a win for the American taxpayer.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bipartisan legislation.

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

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 386 is a pretty straightforward bill. This legislation would authorize the transfer of about 9 acres of Federal property along with a few associated structures from the Bureau of Reclamation to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District in central Washington.

The irrigation district has fully repaid its obligations to the Federal Government related to these properties and now simply pays the bureau for their operation and maintenance. This conveyance would enable the irrigation district to make needed improvements, while allowing the bureau to focus its limited resources where they are more urgently needed.

This legislation is based on a formula agreement negotiated between the bureau and the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District in 2004. I commend the irrigation district and the staff of the bureau for working together at the local level to resolve the concerns of the parties involved.

Mr. Speaker, this same legislation passed unanimously during the previous Congress, but didn't get through during the final parts of the session. So I urge my colleagues to support this bill again today so that we may move it on to the other body.

I want to thank Chairman RAHALL and Ranking Member YOUNG of the Natural Resources Committee and their staff for their assistance in expediting this bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 386.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. 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.

AMERICAN RIVER PUMP STATION PROJECT TRANSFER ACT OF 2007

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 482) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer ownership of the American River Pump Station Project, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 482

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 "American River Pump Station Project Transfer Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER.

The Secretary of the Interior (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall transfer ownership of the American River Pump Station Project located at Auburn, California, which includes the Pumping Plant, associated facilities, and easements necessary for permanent operation of the facilities, to the Placer County Water Agency, in accordance with the terms of Contract No. 02-LC-20-7790 between the United States and Placer County Water Agency and the terms and conditions established in this Act.

SEC. 3. FEDERAL COSTS NONREIMBURSABLE.

Federal costs associated with construction of the American River Pump Station Project located at Auburn, California, are non-reimbursable.

SEC. 4. GRANT OF REAL PROPERTY INTEREST.

The Secretary is authorized to grant title to Placer County Water Agency as provided in section 2 in full satisfaction of the United States' obligations under Land Purchase Contract 14-06-859-308 to provide a water supply to the Placer County Water Agency.

SEC. 5. COMPLIANCE WITH ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Before conveying land and facilities pursuant to this Act, the Secretary shall comply with all applicable requirements under—

(1) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(2) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

(3) any other law applicable to the land and facilities.

(b) EFFECT.—Nothing in this Act modifies or alters any obligations under—

(1) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); or

(2) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

SEC. 6. RELEASE FROM LIABILITY.

Effective on the date of transfer to the Placer County Water Agency of any land or

facility under this Act, the United States shall not be liable for damages arising out of any act, omission, or occurrence relating to the land and facilities, consistent with Article 9 of Contract No. 02-LC-20-7790 between the United States and Placer County Water Agency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) and the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. 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 gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 482 directs the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands and the water pumping facility under construction on the American River to the Placer County Water Agency in California. Currently, the Bureau of Reclamation is obligated by a previous agreement to supply temporary pumping service to satisfy the water rights of the Placer County Water Agency. This temporary pumping is done at considerable cost to the Bureau of Reclamation. The American River Pump Station will provide a permanent facility for the delivery of water to that agency.

H.R. 482 allows the bureau to satisfy its contractual obligations by transferring this facility and eliminates the continued cost of providing temporary pumping service to that agency.

In the 109th Congress, the Subcommittee on Water and Power held a hearing on similar legislation, and the bill was subsequently favorably reported by the committee and passed by the House. We have no objections to this legislation.

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

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 482, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 482, introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE), directs the Secretary of the Interior to transfer ownership of the American River Pump Station Project to the Placer County Water Agency in Northern California. To facilitate construction of the Auburn Dam nearly 40 years ago, the Federal Government removed a locally owned pump station located at the dam site.

The dam was never built. Now the Federal Government is building a permanent pump station to replace the

one it removed years earlier. Under an agreement, the Federal Government must transfer the pump station to the local water users once construction is complete. Before the transfer can take place, congressional authorization is needed, and this legislation achieves that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE), the author of the bill.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman of the committee, Mr. RAHALL, and the ranking member, Mr. YOUNG, and also thank Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS for their help on this legislation.

This has been quite a few years in production. The pump station is almost complete. It will be completed next year sometime, we anticipate; and we would like to have this last detail of the transfer put in order.

You have heard the explanation as to why we need the legislation, fulfilling an obligation made by the Federal Government years ago to the Placer County Water Agency.

I am very appreciative to our colleagues for bringing this bill up and urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today in support of H.R. 482, the American River Pump Station Project Transfer Act. This legislation will authorize the transfer of ownership of the American River Pump Station, located in Auburn, CA, to the Placer County Water Agency (Agency). I would like to thank the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Natural Resources Committee for bringing this legislation to the floor in such a timely manner.

During the 1960s, the Bureau of Reclamation (Bureau) acquired the site of the original American River Pump Station and removed it to facilitate contraction of the Auburn Dam. When construction of the dam was halted, the Agency was left unable to meet its water needs. Since 1990, the Bureau has installed seasonal pumps to help the Agency provide water during the dry summer. Unfortunately, these pumps need to be removed each winter and reinstalled in time for the summer months. This is an expensive process that leaves the Agency without the long-term water-use certainty it needs. To remedy this situation, a new American River Pump Station will be constructed by the Bureau, and this legislation is needed to authorize the transfer of that station to the local Agency for future operations.

This legislation is supported by the Bureau, the Agency and the local elected officials, and I appreciate all their hard work in this endeavor. I would specifically like to thank the members of the Placer County Water Agency: Current Board Chairman Lowell Jarvis; board members Alex Ferreira, Otis Wollen, and Mike Lee; and new board member Grey Allen have all worked to enable the Agency to meet the water-use needs of the community it serves. I also want to recognize former board member Pauline Rocucci who spoke with me many times on this issue. I want to thank General Manager Dave Breninger, who has been and remains a tireless and passionate advocate of

the permanent pump station and Strategic Affairs Director Einar Maisch who offered strong testimony in support of this bill and helped us to get here today.

As the completion of the pump station will provide regional benefits to so many in Western Placer County, I want to thank the City Councils in Rocklin and Lincoln and our County Board of Supervisors for their steadfast support of this critical project. I would also be remiss for not recognizing the commitment and dedication of two local U.S. Bureau of Reclamation staff: Regional Director Kirk Rodgers and Central Area Office Manager Mike Finnegan.

This entire group made up the team which worked for years in advancing the permanent American River Pump Station to get us to the point we are at today, and it is with them in mind that I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 482.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Hopefully, we will be able to continue working in a bipartisan manner to get these very, very critical projects going and approved and moving out of this House. I am sure that we are going to have others that are just equally important. I hope the same consideration is given to all those.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, let me just say congratulations to the chairman of the Water and Power Subcommittee. I do look forward to working with her on a bipartisan basis to move many of these projects forward, important projects, all across the country.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 482.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 161, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 386, by the yeas and nays.

The postponed vote on H.R. 482 will be taken tomorrow.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The re-

maining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

BAINBRIDGE ISLAND JAPANESE AMERICAN MONUMENT ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 161.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 161, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

YEAS—419

Abercrombie	Clarke	Giffords
Ackerman	Clay	Gilchrest
Aderholt	Cleaver	Gillibrand
Akin	Clyburn	Gillmor
Alexander	Coble	Gingrey
Allen	Cohen	Gohmert
Altmire	Cole (OK)	Gonzalez
Andrews	Conyers	Goode
Arcuri	Cooper	Goodlatte
Baca	Costello	Gordon
Bachmann	Courtney	Granger
Bachus	Cramer	Graves
Baird	Crenshaw	Green, Al
Baker	Crowley	Green, Gene
Baldwin	Cubin	Grijalva
Barrett (SC)	Cuellar	Gutierrez
Barrow	Culberson	Hall (NY)
Bartlett (MD)	Cummings	Hall (TX)
Barton (TX)	Davis (AL)	Hare
Bean	Davis (CA)	Harman
Becerra	Davis (IL)	Hastings (FL)
Berkley	Davis (KY)	Hastings (WA)
Berman	Davis, David	Hayes
Berry	Davis, Tom	Heller
Biggert	Deal (GA)	Hensarling
Bilbray	DeFazio	Herger
Bilirakis	DeGette	Herseth
Bishop (GA)	Delahunt	Higgins
Bishop (NY)	DeLauro	Hill
Bishop (UT)	Dent	Hinchee
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hinojosa
Blumenauer	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hirono
Blunt	Dicks	Hobson
Boehner	Dingell	Hodes
Bonner	Doggett	Hoekstra
Boozman	Donnelly	Holden
Boren	Doolittle	Holt
Boswell	Doyle	Honda
Boucher	Drake	Hooley
Boustany	Dreier	Hoyer
Boyd (FL)	Duncan	Hulshof
Boyda (KS)	Edwards	Hunter
Brady (PA)	Ehlers	Inglis (SC)
Brady (TX)	Ellison	Inslee
Braley (IA)	Ellsworth	Israel
Brown (SC)	Emanuel	Issa
Brown, Corrine	Emerson	Jackson (IL)
Brown-Waite,	Engel	Jackson-Lee
Ginny	English (PA)	(TX)
Buchanan	Eshoo	Jefferson
Burgess	Etheridge	Jindal
Burton (IN)	Everett	Johnson (GA)
Butterfield	Fallin	Johnson (IL)
Calvert	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Camp (MI)	Fattah	Johnson, Sam
Campbell (CA)	Feeney	Jones (NC)
Cannon	Ferguson	Jones (OH)
Cantor	Filner	Jordan
Capito	Flake	Kagen
Capps	Forbes	Kanjorski
Capuano	Fortenberry	Kaptur
Cardoza	Fossella	Keller
Carnahan	Fox	Kennedy
Carney	Frank (MA)	Kildee
Carson	Franks (AZ)	Kilpatrick
Castle	Frelinghuysen	Kind
Castor	Gallegly	King (IA)
Chabot	Garrett (NJ)	King (NY)
Chandler	Gerlach	Kingston

Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)

NOT VOTING—15

Bono
Buyer
Carter
Conaway
Costa

□ 1351

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YAKIMA-TIETON IRRIGATION DISTRICT CONVEYANCE ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BAIRD). The pending business is the

question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 386.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 386, 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 417, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—417

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggett
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGett
DeLahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Langevin
Gerlach
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)

Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Oberstar
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sessions
Sestak
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sessions
Sestak
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Bono
Buyer
Capito
Carter
Conaway
Costa
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Hastert
Lampson
McHenry
Norwood
Nunes
Peterson (PA)
Pryce (OH)
Rothman
Royce

□ 1400

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION AS CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 6, 2007.

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

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: This is to inform you that I am resigning my position as Clerk of the House effective midnight on February 14, 2007. Thank you for the honor of renominating me to serve in the position of Clerk of the House in the 110th Congress.

It has been an honor to serve the House of Representatives and to work with so many dedicated individuals. I will especially miss those hardworking men and women in the Office of the Clerk. Our Nation is a stronger place because of their efforts.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE
OFFICER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, February 6, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI, M.C.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: This is to inform you that I am resigning my position as Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives effective at midnight on February 14, 2007. Thank you for the honor of renominating me to serve in the position of Chief Administrative Officer in the 110th Congress.

Sincerely,

JAY EAGEN,
Chief Administrative Officer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

ELECTING OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 129) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 129

Resolved, That Lorraine C. Miller of the State of Texas, be, and is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives, effective February 15, 2007; and

That Daniel P. Beard of the State of Maryland be, and is hereby, chosen Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives, effective February 15, 2007.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have an opportunity to speak on the resolution before its immediate adoption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will distribute the time.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we will not take, certainly, the hour that is allotted; but I first of all want to say something about the two individuals who have just resigned their appointments as Clerk and as Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to serve from 1987 to 2000 on the House Administration Committee and worked with my friend, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. THOMAS, and others. I was a member of the House Administration Committee on which Vic Fazio, our former colleague from California, was the ranking member. He and Mr. THOMAS came together and selected Jay Eagen to be the Chief Administrative Officer.

I think it would be inappropriate if I did not rise and congratulate Mr. Eagen on the job that he has done. I believe that Jay Eagen has brought a degree of professional management to this House of Representatives, which has been a credit to the institution and a credit to all of the Members, and a credit, I might say, to my colleagues on the Republican side, to the Republican leadership on this issue, and I congratulate them for that.

Mr. Eagen is someone who has worked on this Hill for many years. He will be leaving the Hill and leaving this city and moving his family to the west, and we wish him the very, very best.

Mr. Speaker, Karen Haas, who has been the Clerk and who submitted her resignation is, as well, someone who has worked for this institution, cares deeply about the House, and has comported herself, although for a relatively short period of time as the Clerk of our House, in a way that brought honor to the Office of Clerk and brought credit to the House of Representatives.

I know from my perspective personally and from Speaker PELOSI, and I both want to, on behalf of our caucus, extend to them our deepest thanks and gratitude for the service that they have rendered to the House of Representatives and to our country. Both of them, I know, have very exciting things to come. They are both young, they both have much to offer, and we wish them the very best.

Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my comments on Ms. Miller and Mr. Beard and would certainly yield now to Mr. EHLERS, who may also want to say something.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I would join my colleague from Maryland in commending Jay Eagen and Karen Haas for the tremendous job they have done, and, before Karen, Jeff Trandahl, who served temporarily as CAO during the bridge time before the selection of Mr. Eagen, and who also served as the Clerk of the House very ably.

They both, Jay Eagen and Karen Haas, have done a great job in that office. The House has run very, very well as a result, and I commend them and wish them well in the future. I am cer-

tain that they have bright futures based on the excellent work that they did here.

I also would like to comment about the appointments that have been made. The new appointment for the Clerk, Ms. Miller, from everything I see, is an outstanding appointment. We recognize that as traditionally the appointment of the Speaker and can be made solely by the Speaker and has been in the past.

I look forward to good things from her. She is obviously very capable, has an outstanding record in working in the House, the Senate, and various other places. I look forward to good work from her.

In regard to the selected candidate for Chief Administrative Officer for the House, Mr. Beard, I do not object to his appointment. He is, I think, of relatively good background and should be able to manage the job, at least I seriously hope so.

But I have serious concerns about the lack of transparency and the selection process that resulted in his appointment. Just to give a better history, when I first arrived here, it was shortly before the Republicans took over the majority, and there had been considerable confusion in the House. We had the bank scandal, the post office scandal and so forth. A position was created, I forget the precise title, but something along the line of the director of the nonlegislative and financial functions of the House of Representatives.

The Speaker at that time, who was a Democrat, since they were in the majority, appointed a person to fill that post. It was General Wishart, I believe, and he resigned after several months saying basically he could not do the job, given the parameters that were imposed upon it.

When the Republicans took over the House of Representatives, they also appointed, and it was largely a Speaker's appointment at that time, appointed someone to serve as the Chief Administrative Officer of the House. That position was created and described by the new majority.

Mr. Faulkner had a good resume and had a lot of good ideas, but, frankly, did not really meet the needs that we had for that position at that time. We then decided, and I believe Mr. HOYER was on the committee at the same time with me, and we simply decided that we had to make this as nonpartisan a position as possible.

So we formed a group, two Republicans, two Democrats, and they conducted a nationwide search with a search firm to find the best person for the Chief Administrative Officer position.

They ended up selecting someone from the House of Representatives, someone who was familiar with it, but also someone with extensive administrative background who did a tremendous job of operating this institution since that time.

The main point I want to make is a process was set up that was bipartisan. It resulted in an excellent appointment, and I believe we should use that same process again.

In fact, I felt so strongly about it, I sent a letter to the Speaker last week pointing out that we should use that same process again. Barely was the letter delivered that she announced publicly that she had selected a new CAO, without using that process at all, without input from the minority party. Simply, we had the courtesy of chatting with the new appointee, but nothing to say in the appointment or whether or not that person should have the appointment.

I have met with him; I recognize he has considerable administrative ability. He has been around a long time, but I am very concerned because we did not use the same process. I think this new appointee is going to owe his allegiance to only one person, that is the Speaker of the House, and I don't believe that is the best way to operate the House of Representatives.

At the same time, should anything deleterious or improper happen, we recognize where the responsibility for that will lie, because it will be with the person who made the appointment.

But I have firsthand knowledge, having served on the House Administration Committee now for over 12 years, firsthand knowledge of the important role the Chief Administrative Officer plays in the House operations, and it is an extremely important job.

This is a complex organization on the Hill, over 10,000 employees. The position has many responsibilities that are of significant consequence to the House of Representatives.

While the proper administration of the House is ultimately the responsibility of the majority, the successful operation of the House is most certainly not a partisan manner.

Republicans and Democrats alike maintain a shared investment in preserving and building upon the professional improvements made by the House Chief Administrative Officer over the last 12 years.

In 1997, as I mentioned, the last occasion a new CAO was appointed, a search committee was constituted that, as I said, required a unanimous decision from all search committee members in order to select a candidate for the position of Chief Administrative Officer.

That last provision, I think, is very important, to ensure that it was not a partisan position required that both Republicans and both Democrats had to vote to select the final candidate for the position.

At that time, our current House majority leader, my colleague from Maryland, stated that the formulation of a search committee comprised of the leaders of both parties "was done to assure that we would have a bipartisan agreement on an administrator for the business of the House."

Mr. HOYER also stated that what this House needs is a bipartisan and effectively nonpartisan way to assure ourselves and the American people that the business of the House, the paying of our bills, the managing of our information systems, all of that which has nothing to do with the formulation of the policy, but everything to do with the effective management of the people's House, is being done in a proper fashion.

Now, I am not quoting this to throw the words in Mr. HOYER's face. That is not my intent at all. It is simply my intent to show how at that time we worked very hard to get a bipartisan agreement. That bipartisan agreement, which Mr. HOYER spoke of, resulted in the appointment of Jay Eagen, our current Chief Administrative Officer, who has served us so well for a number of years.

Under Mr. Eagen's tenure, just as an example, the House has achieved eight consecutive clean opinions from independent auditors, an impressive result by any measure. This should be contrasted with the result when the Republicans first took office, we asked for an independent outside audit, and the auditors came back and said the books are such a mess, we cannot even audit them; you will have to construct an entire new financial management system.

I was pleased that since I had helped develop the computer system that I was able to help develop a system that was appropriate for that task. I think all of this together has led to the clean audits that we have had for a number of years.

I certainly support the comments that Mr. HOYER made some years ago. They were very appropriate. They described the procedure accurately; and his points, as he made them, I totally agree that the appointment of a post was such a significant impact to this institution, we should be able to put aside our party affiliations and work together to find a suitable candidate.

I wish I could make a comparable statement today. I wish that such a bipartisan process had been followed this time. Instead, I am left only to express my sincere disappointment that it did not take place.

Let me make it clear, the qualifications of Mr. Beard are not under attack; but the process that Speaker PELOSI administered to make this appointment is. I think we should have had the same process, and I am disappointed that the Speaker chose not to do that.

Without a fair, open and competitive process, there simply is no way to determine whether the selection is in the best interest of the House, and the complete absence of transparency is cause for alarm for those who value the integrity of this institution.

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

Mr. HOYER. I will tell my friend, I don't have any other speakers on this side. Do you have a speaker?

Mr. EHLERS. Yes, I have several.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California, a newly appointed member of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to echo the words of those who have spoken the words about the job that Jay Eagen and Karen Haas have done. They have served this body well. They have done us honor by their service. I am sure they will continue with honorable service in the future.

When I returned to the House of Representatives after being away for 16 years, I observed that there were some things that were better about this House and some things that were worse about this House.

□ 1415

I noted that there was always a partisanship in this House, but there appeared to be a harder edge to that partisanship. And one of the things that struck me was that we needed to be around here more often. That is why I, frankly, am one of those on this side of the aisle that believes that attempting to go to a 5-day workweek not only is good in terms of the product that we will put out eventually, when we actually do go to 5-day workweeks, but the interchange and the interplay and the opportunity for Members to deal with one another and get to know one another I think may very well take the hard edge off the partisanship that is always going to be a part of the House when you have strong feelings argued by Members on both sides.

At the same time, I must say it is a disappointment, as a Member of the House Administration Committee, to see the manner in which the decision was made to choose a Chief Administrative Officer.

When I served here before, there is no doubt that the administration of this place was in a mess. You could ask questions and get no answers. You could attempt to try and decipher how this place was organized, and you could not find out. You would ask questions, and you would get a wink and a nod and a sense of don't ask, don't tell. You would try and find, for legitimate reasons, information; and you would find that either that was not made available to you or that it could not be made available to you.

And since that time, primarily I believe because of the institution of the position of Chief Administrative Officer and the organization that flow from that, it has changed. So I was trying to look back at the experience of the House to see how this was made and how the decision was made to fill that position.

When I discovered that both the Republican and the Democratic sides had come together stressing bipartisanship,

making a national search, attempting to try and find the best possible person for the job but, above that, requiring unanimous support from both sides of the aisle, it seemed to me that that was an encouraging step towards righting a wrong that existed in this House.

And that is why, even though I do not know Mr. Beard, and I will take on its face the recommendations that have been made on the other side about Mr. Beard, it is a missed opportunity we had in this House to manifest an effort in one of the legitimate areas where bipartisanship should reign, that is, in filling the position of someone who is to be the chief administrator of this body. It is a sorely missed opportunity.

I know that we should not be complaining about process, and people are tired about complaining about process, and I am tired about hearing the complaints about process. But this was a unique opportunity for us to work together, not as Democrats or Republicans but Members of the House of Representatives who have respect for this institution, who understand the necessity of having this place run at that level on a businesslike basis so that every Member can feel that the person who filled that job was chosen by the entire membership and that no one has to feel that they have allegiance only to one side.

It is very difficult in this place, because of the way it is organized, for us to find that sort of sweet spot, if you will, in the activities in which we are involved. This was one of those chances, and I am very sorry that we rejected the experience and the precedent of the recent past in making this selection.

I join the gentleman from Maryland and others in hoping that Mr. Beard will do an excellent job. It is in the interests of all of us that he does an excellent job. My only point is this was a tremendous opportunity for us to remove partisanship, to work together, as the gentleman suggested a number of years ago when the selection of Mr. Eagen was made.

My only hope is that this does not suggest how things will be done in the future when there is abundant reason for us to work together as Members of the House rather than as Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I congratulate Mr. Beard on his selection. I hope he will do the best for us, as Mr. Eagen has done. I only lament the fact that we had an opportunity that we missed.

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

I appreciate the comments. I appreciated my comments when I made them. I still want you to know that I appreciate them, and I think that is a good practice.

I had the opportunity of sitting down with Mr. Beard just a few days ago, essentially, almost verbatim, in terms of how I believe he ought to operate his office in the sense that this is a busi-

ness office, this is not a partisan office. Hopefully, he will respond to doing what is in the best business management practice, best practices as well as his own judgment without respect to party or partisanship. I would hope that that would happen. I expect it to happen.

But I appreciate the comments that have been made.

I want to say that, also, I am strongly in support of Lorraine Miller. This is a historic appointment, first African American to serve as an officer of the House, not just as Clerk of the House but as an officer of the House.

Lorraine Miller has served for three Speakers now. She served President Clinton in the White House. She is president of the NAACP in Washington, D.C. She is an extraordinarily knowledgeable, able individual; and she will be a tremendous asset to this institution and I think will send a very strong and powerful message to all of America about inclusion, as the election of our Speaker did.

Mr. Beard, as some of you know, has more than three decades of experience in policy and executive management, including senior positions in the House of Representatives, the United States Senate, the White House and the Interior Department, as well as the Library of Congress. Obviously, he has a long, distinguished career in management and, as such, is a professional appointment.

Again, I appreciate the comments that have been made. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the nomination of both, because I believe both will serve this institution in a professional manner that brings credit on their offices and on this institution.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. CLYBURN be able to manage the balance of time available to me.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his comments.

I would also echo his comments about Mrs. Miller. I was astounded at her resume. In fact, I would love to have a resume that complete myself. She has served government in so many different agencies and in so many different ways that I am certain that she will perform very, very well as the Clerk of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to Mr. MCCARTHY of California, a brand new member of the Committee on House Administration but one with considerable experience on it because of his previous work as a staff member for the Honorable Bill Thomas, who chaired the committee.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today actually for two reasons, to congratulate Mrs. Miller, rightfully so. She was selected,

rightfully so, that the Speaker was able to appoint her. But today I actually rise in disappointment, disappointed in this resolution.

As the Member said, I am a new Member from California. But I am not new to this House. I had the pleasure of serving Mr. Thomas, who had served as the chairman of House Administration in 1995.

I know the work that was done and the respect for this House on both sides of the aisle. I never questioned the respect for this institution on either side. But to go about in bringing an audit to this House I knew the work that needed to be done. I worked as a staffer, and I found out in 1995 when we went to do the first audit, we did not keep enough books to even have an independent audit.

And what has transpired, in the last 8 years, we have had a clean, independent audit. And how were we able to achieve that? This body was able to achieve that by being bipartisan in the selection of the chief administrative officer, and to do this resolution today is actually a step backwards.

Transparency in this House, both sides will agree, is the best thing for the House of Representatives; and my question today is, I do not question the credentials of Mr. Beard. Will he make a great CAO? I do not know, quite frankly, because he has never come before us. We have never had the ability to go for the search, and we have actually done a disjustice to him, because we have gone through to select and not even empower him, when both sides of the aisle could go by and make a selection. That would empower that office in a bipartisan manner, much like we have done in the past.

My biggest disappointment is this side of the aisle was ready to work. I know the ranking member had sent a letter to the new Speaker to ask about doing it just like we did in 1997, where somebody from the Democrats and some from the Republicans got together and agreed unanimously. That is the respect of this office.

On my first day on this floor, I listened intently. I came with no animosity. I came to work together. I came to find common ground. And up in that top, I listened to the Speaker when she said, this is about partnership not partisanship.

But today is a step backwards. This was the opportunity to move forward in a partisanship much like we have done in 1997, much as history has shown. And I will tell you, in the end, the respect for this House has to come from both sides of the aisle that we have, and we have to do it when it comes to the resolution.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to offer my congratulations to those who have done so well, Mr. Speaker, Karen Haas and Mr. Jay Eagen in their duties and responsibilities to all of us as Members of this body.

I am a little bit interested in some of the convenient memory that is taking

place here. I happen to recall, Mr. Speaker, that in 1995 we had a CAO appointed; and, of course, I was a member of the bipartisan group that was selected by this body to hire Mr. Eagen. I was one of the ones that interviewed him, as well as others, and was one of the ones that decided to put him in the capacity that he is in.

So I just wanted to say to my friends on the other side that we hired Mr. Eagen to clean up a mess that was not created by those who were in power. It was created by the gentleman who took the office in 1995.

I would want us to be careful about how we recall the history of this, because that is the way all of this developed, and I was on that group that helped to clean it up with the hiring of Mr. Eagen. He has done a professional job. I want to thank him for that.

I, too, have met with Mr. Beard; and I have known Mrs. Lorraine Miller for a long, long time. I think she is an excellent choice. I think she is going to do great work for this institution, and I join with those who see this as a history-making and I think marble-ceiling-shattering appointment.

But when I met with Mr. Beard I said to him that I recognized his professional background. But I also said to him that I had one wish of him, that he carry out his duties and responsibilities in a professional manner. But I said to him when I spoke with him that this is my first elected job. I have been director or manager of something all of my life before coming here.

□ 1430

And one of the things I learned as a manager is that you have to try to balance efficiency and effectiveness. And in order to do the work of this body, I want all of those people who assume positions to be efficient. But I also would like to see the work done be effective. And to do so, we have to, I think, recognize the individual worth that exists in every human being. There are a lot of people working in and around this building who we sometimes don't see, but they come under the purview of the Chief Administrative Officer. So I asked Mr. Beard to remember, as he carried out his duties and responsibilities, that we must always work to balance out efficiency and effectiveness. So I think they will make good additions to the work here in this body, and I want to thank them for being willing to serve and thank the Speaker for making this appointment.

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I too want to join my colleagues at wishing a fond and reluctant farewell to Jay Eagen and Karen Haas. They have both served this institution with great distinction and reflected well on the institution of the House.

But I rise today to honor Lorraine Miller of Fort Worth, Texas, on her appointment as Clerk of the House of Representatives. Of course, as Clerk of the House of Representatives, Ms. Miller's responsibilities will include but not be limited to the page board, congressional travel reports and disclosure forms, the voting system, oversight of the legislative operation of the House floor. She is well prepared for this. She has worked at the highest levels of government, which have contributed to her leadership abilities and her knowledge of management.

The role of the Clerk is demanding and requires someone with great intellect. Ms. Miller will certainly bring strength and diversity to the Office of Clerk as the first African American woman to hold this top House position.

Ms. Miller first worked for the House of Representatives for U.S. Congressman Jim Wright back in Fort Worth, Texas, when he was majority leader. She moved on to work for then-Speaker Tom Foley, U.S. Congressman JOHN LEWIS, and finally the current speaker, Speaker PELOSI. Ms. Miller also worked as deputy assistant to the president of Legislative Affairs for the House of Representatives during the administration of Bill Clinton. She additionally held positions at the Federal Communications Commission and the Federal Trade Commission.

It is with great honor that I recognize Ms. Lorraine C. Miller for decades of hard work and selfless dedication. I want to join her friends and family, both here in Washington, D.C. and particularly back home in Fort Worth, Texas, where I represent, in congratulating her on this prestigious milestone. She has been an inspiration and a role model to many, and I know she will continue to be a role model to many of the young men and women who will watch her progress with pride here in the House of Representatives. And I, for one, look forward to working with her here in Congress.

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, in that case I will make my final comments. I assume the gentleman from South Carolina is able to close right after that.

Just hearing this debate reminds me again of all the things that happened. And first of all, I have to clarify that Mr. Eagen did not have to clear up a mess left by Mr. Faulkner. Mr. Faulkner may or may not have been the best choice for CAO at the time he took the job, but certainly improved the situation. And I was there. I saw the books as they were, ledger cards made out in pencil with erasures in the ledger book, an erasure of a number filled in with \$2,500,000 just to make the books balance. I have seen those books. I know the facts. It was a mess after 40 years of the rule of one party.

Now, I am not defending or criticizing either General Wishart or Scot Faulkner. They were there. They did

the best job they could in very difficult circumstances. But they were not there very long.

The point is simply that when we followed a good process, when we used a bipartisan process, we appointed someone who has served for a number of years and has served extremely well.

You know as well as I that if you hire a person, that person's loyalty is going to be to you. It is very important that this position be operated in a bipartisan fashion. And since the Speaker has appointed Mr. Beard, no matter how capable he is, no matter how much he tries, he will be suspected of partisanship in his decisions.

Daniel Beard may, in fact, be the right person to lead the CAO organization, and I truly hope that he is. However, given the selection process, there is simply no way of knowing that with any degree of confidence. This appointment could and should have occurred with the full confidence of all Members of the House. Unfortunately, the burden of proof now lies with Mr. Beard and, ultimately, Speaker PELOSI, to ensure that Mr. Beard is able to maintain the level of skill, professionalism and bipartisanship we have come to expect from the House CAO.

Mr. Speaker, I demand a division of the question on the adopting of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question will be divided.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

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

First, the question is on adopting the first portion of the question (relating to the election of Clerk).

The first portion of the question was adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Now, the question is on adopting the second portion of the question (relating to the election of Chief Administrative Officer).

The second portion of the question was adopted.

A motion to reconsider the adoption of the resolution was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLYBURN. 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 H. Res. 129.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, section 511 clause (a)(4)(B)(i) of H. Res. 6 provides that I submit the 302(a) allocations contemplated by

House Concurrent Resolution 376 of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, as adopted by the House. In addition, section 511 clause (a)(4)(B)(ii) of H. Res. 6 provides that I submit accounts identified for advance appropriations pursuant to section 401(b) of House Concurrent Resolution 376 of the One Hundred Ninth Congress, as adopted by the House.

The attached tables, which I submit, provide that information.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION
[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House committee	2007		2007–2011 total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture				
Armed Services	45	45	45	45
Education and Labor		1		30
Energy and Commerce				
Financial Services			2	2
Foreign Affairs	1	1	5	5
Homeland Security				
House Administration				
Judiciary				
Natural Resources	19	16	116	113
Oversight and Government Reform			6	6
Science and Technology				
Small Business				
Transportation and Infrastructure				
Veterans' Affairs	13	13	22	22
Ways and Means				

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007—APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION
[In millions of dollars]

	BA	OT
Section 302(a) Allocation	872,778	963,711

FY2008 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS—UNDER SECTION 401 OF H. CON. RES. 376
[In millions of dollars]

Appropriate Level	Budget authority
Accounts Identified for Advances:	23,565
Elk Hills	
Corporation for Public Broadcasting	
Employment and Training Administration	
Education for the Disadvantaged	
School Improvement	
Children and Family Services (Head Start)	
Special Education	
Vocational and Adult Education	
Transportation (highways, transit, Farley Building)	
Payment to Postal Service	
Section 8 Renewals	

IMPRISONMENT OF TWO U.S. BORDER PATROL AGENTS

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago two U.S. Border Patrol agents entered Federal prison. Agents Ramos and Compeon never should have been sent to Federal prison. These agents were convicted last spring for shooting a Mexican drug smuggler who brought 743 pounds of marijuana across our southern border into Texas.

Members of Congress have, and let me say, not only Members of Congress, but many American citizens, have repeatedly petitioned President Bush to pardon these agents. At the House Democratic Caucus last week, the President said: "We want our Border Patrol agents guarding the borders from criminals and drug dealers and terrorists."

Mr. President, we are calling on you today, as you said you would weeks ago, to take a sober look at this case.

Many Members of Congress have warned that if these two Border Patrol agents entered prison their safety would be threatened by those who hate law enforcement officers. Tragically, this happened last Saturday night when Agent Ramos was beaten while being in prison.

Mr. President, you have the authority to correct an injustice. Please, Mr. President, expedite your consideration of a pardon for these two men and help their families realize that America is a country that believes in justice.

Mr. Speaker, before closing, I want to repeat that: Mr. President, you have the authority to correct an injustice. Please expedite your consideration of a pardon for these two men and help their families realize that America is a country that believes in justice.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President submitted his budget to the United States Congress and to the country. And in that budget, the President made clear a number of priorities that I think are in direct opposition to the wishes and aspirations of the American people.

Most egregious, in my view, is that the President leaves in place a tax increase on the middle-class families of this country. Today, about three million Americans are affected by the al-

ternative minimum tax, meant to tax only the superwealthy. This year alone, it will reach 23 million middle-class families across the country. And the only way the President accomplishes any of his goals is to leave in place a tax that was never intended by the Congress or the President to affect middle-class families.

The Democrats make a pledge to, in fact, deal with the alternative minimum tax this year so middle-class families do not have a tax increase either this year, next year or the following year. It has been consistently.

But this is only one of the egregious misplaced priorities in the President's budget. The other highlights, in addition to increasing taxes on the middle class, it cuts health care for seniors \$100 billion over 5 years, \$300 billion over 10 years.

While we are dealing with the temperatures outside that are near freezing in my home area of Chicago, below zero, it cuts home energy assistance to our seniors by 18 percent.

It eliminates the COPS program for community policing, which has supported 120,000 police officers throughout the country.

It goes forward in the President's desire to privatize Social Security.

It cuts health care benefits for our returning veterans, forcing them to pay up to \$750 a year to enter the health care for veterans, one of the best health care systems in the country. And I don't think that is a welcome-home mat that our veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan deserve.

It also has cuts to education. It underfunds Leave No Child Behind by \$15 billion.

It cuts housing assistance for affordable housing. Returning again, in relationship to our veterans, it cuts the funding for research into brain trauma research, which is so significant. One of the greatest injuries for our veterans coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan have been the brain injuries that they have incurred there. And the first time ever we have gotten funding inside the Pentagon for that area, it makes a cut.

And then it doesn't deal with what we call earmarks here, as the President continues his earmarks in his budget. Across the board, from Social Security privatization to health care cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, to also not cutting children from their health care, to raising taxes on the middle class, in time and place, from health care to taxes to supporting our law enforcement community, this budget makes the wrong priorities.

It is time to have a new direction and a change here in the priorities in Washington. In addition to all that, while we have families not being able to get to their homes in the area of Louisiana and Mississippi and the Gulf Coast, the President asked for an additional \$245 billion for Iraq and Afghanistan. In every turn that we can, we have to right this ship that is wrong.

Most importantly, in the area the President's budget has relied on tax increases on middle class families, cuts Medicare and Medicaid, asked for \$245 billion in increased funding for Iraq and Afghanistan, cuts children from their health care, cuts heating assistance from our elderly, also cuts benefits for veterans. Those are not the priorities of the American people.

□ 1445

Every President in the history of the country in a time of war has thought about how to invest in America. Abraham Lincoln, in the height of the Civil War, had the land-grant colleges. Roosevelt, in the height of the final 2 years of World War II, developed the GI Bill of Rights. During the height of the Cold War, Eisenhower saw the interstate system as a way to invest in America. Kennedy, a man on the moon when we were facing down the Soviet Union.

At every critical juncture when America was at war, a President thought about how to invest in America to turn this country's efforts overseas here at home to make this a stronger and better country.

This is the first Presidential budget that in time of war, rather than looking for increases here on how to make America stronger, it looks for cuts in America. It looks for the areas of education, health care, veterans, and law enforcement to sacrifice, while we increase our investments in Iraq and Afghanistan.

If you look at the history of every time there has been a period of America's engagement around the world militarily, every President has looked

to invest here at home to make America stronger. This is the first budget that leaves America weaker in a time of military engagement.

DON'T DO IT, MR. PRESIDENT

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, if the President were to ask me for advice on foreign affairs, this is what I would say: Don't do it, Mr. President. It is a bad idea. There is no need for it. There is great danger in doing it. America is against it, and Congress should be. The United Nations is against it. The Russians, the Chinese, the Indians, the Pakistanis are against it. The whole world is against it. Our allies are against it. Our enemies are against it. The Arabs are against it. The Europeans are against it. The Muslims are against it.

We don't need to do this. The threat is overblown. The plan is a hysterical reaction to a problem that does not yet exist. Hysteria is never a good basis for foreign policy. Don't we ever learn? Have we already forgotten Iraq?

The plan defies common sense. If it is carried out, the Middle East and possibly the world will explode. Oil will soar to over \$100 a barrel, and gasoline will be over \$5 a gallon.

Despite what some think, it won't serve the interests of Israel. Besides, it is illegal. It is unconstitutional. And, Mr. President, you have no moral authority to do it.

We don't need it. We don't want it. So, Mr. President, don't do it. Don't bomb Iran.

The moral of the story, Mr. Speaker, is this: If you don't have a nuclear weapon, we will threaten to attack you. If you do have a nuclear weapon, we will leave you alone. In fact, we will probably subsidize you. What makes us think Iran does not understand this?

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to yield to my friend from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. PAUL for so many years coming down to the floor to defend the Constitution of the United States.

The United States Constitution, article I, Section 8, clause 11, vests in the Congress the exclusive power to declare war. Many of us in the past few days have put in a resolution, H.J. Resolution 14, to say that the President should not go into and bomb Iran unless he comes to the Congress so that the Congress can meet its constitutional responsibility.

James Madison said, "... The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature ... the Executive has no right, in any case, to decide the question, whether there is or is not cause for declaring war."

I want to thank you, RON PAUL, for always being a spokesman and a protector of the Constitution.

Mr. PAUL. I thank you very much for those comments.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to the President.

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ENDING THE IRAQ WAR

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the President has isolated himself from all the evidence, military advice, members of his own party, and the American people. He is not staying the course in Iraq. The President is making matters even worse by escalating the war.

He has ordered at least 21,500 more U.S. soldiers into the middle of a bloody and violent civil war. This President has stepped backward in history. He is making the same tragic mistakes of Vietnam all over again.

The President's speeches won't stop a bullet, and they won't protect soldiers from the tsunami of violence inundating Iraq. Our soldiers don't have enough equipment or support. Soldiers know it, but the White House ignores it.

Some of the best newspapers and magazines in the Nation are reporting the facts, and they are not just repeating the President's spin.

From the McClatchy newspapers, here is a recent headline: "Soldiers in Iraq view troop surge as a lost cause."

From the San Francisco Chronicle: "Corners cut in rush to add troops; shorter training time, lack of equipment hurt readiness, experts say."

And the latest issue of Business Week said: "Military equipment: Missing in action."

I will enter these stories into the RECORD.

[From BusinessWeek]

MILITARY EQUIPMENT: MISSING IN ACTION
A NEW DEFENSE AUDIT SAYS THE PENTAGON HAS FAILED TO PROPERLY EQUIP SOLDIERS IN IRAQ—JUST AS THE PRESIDENT STRUGGLES TO FIND SUPPORT FOR A TROOP INCREASE

(By Dawn Kopecki)

The Inspector General for the Defense Dept. is concerned that the U.S. military has failed to adequately equip soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan, especially for nontraditional duties such as training Iraqi security

forces and handling detainees, according to a summary of a new audit obtained by BusinessWeek.

The findings come as the Pentagon prepares to send another 21,500 troops to Iraq and as Democratic leaders levy threats to restrict funding for a war that's already cost about \$500 billion. The Army alone expects to spend an extra \$70 billion on an additional 65,000 permanent troops from fiscal year 2009 through 2013. According to Army officials, \$18 billion of that will be spent on equipment.

The Inspector General found that the Pentagon hasn't been able to properly equip the soldiers it already has. Many have gone without enough guns, ammunition, and other necessary supplies to "effectively complete their missions" and have had to cancel or postpone some assignments while waiting for the proper gear, according to the report from auditors with the Defense Dept. Inspector General's office. Soldiers have also found themselves short on body armor, armored vehicles, and communications equipment, among other things, auditors found.

"As a result, service members performed missions without the proper equipment, used informal procedures to obtain equipment and sustainment support, and canceled or postponed missions while waiting to receive equipment," reads the executive summary dated Jan. 25. Service members often borrowed or traded with each other to get the needed supplies, according to the summary.

Pentagon officials did not immediately return phone calls seeking comment.

The audit supports news reports and other evidence that U.S. troops have been stretched too thin or have performed tasks for which they were ill-prepared. It is likely to add fuel to the opposition to President George W. Bush's decision to send more troops to Iraq in an effort to quell the violence there.

Already, support for the troop increase is tepid in the Senate, where Democrats are preparing to vote on a nonbinding statement against the President's plan. While lawmakers have threatened to reduce funding for the war, few have publicly committed to using the "power of the purse" to block funding for the troop surge. "The thing we're going to do now is very important, to show the American people that the United States Senate, on a bipartisan basis, does not support an escalation," says Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.). "Even the Republicans are very timid in their support for the President at this stage."

In the summary of the Inspector General's audit, the equipment shortages were attributed to basic management failures among military commanders in Iraq and Afghanistan. U.S. Central Command lacked standard policies for requesting and tracking equipment requirements or for equipping units to perform nontraditional duties. Auditors surveyed 1,100 service members stationed in Iraq and Afghanistan from all four military branches, the National Guard, and Reserves.

The Inspector General recommended that the Pentagon establish new internal controls and policies to address the funding, equipping, and sustaining forces performing nontraditional duties.

[From McClatchy Newspapers]

SOLDIERS IN IRAQ VIEW TROOP SURGE AS A
LOST CAUSE

(By Tom Lasseter)

BAGHDAD, IRAQ.—Army 1st Lt. Antonio Hardy took a slow look around the east Baghdad neighborhood that he and his men were patrolling. He grimaced at the sound of gunshots in the distance. A machine gunner on top of a Humvee scanned the rooftops for

snipers. Some of Hardy's men wondered aloud if they'd get hit by a roadside bomb on the way back to their base. "To be honest, it's going to be like this for a long time to come, no matter what we do," said Hardy, 25, of Atlanta. "I think some people in America don't want to know about all this violence, about all the killings. The people back home are shielded from it; they get it sugar-coated."

While senior military officials and the Bush administration say the president's decision to send more American troops to pacify Baghdad will succeed, many of the soldiers who're already there say it's a lost cause.

"What is victory supposed to look like? Every time we turn around and go in a new area there's somebody new waiting to kill us," said Sgt. 1st Class Herbert Gill, 29, of Pulaski, Tenn., as his Humvee rumbled down a dark Baghdad highway one evening last week. "Sunnis and Shiites have been fighting for thousands of years, and we're not going to change that overnight." "Once more raids start happening, they'll (insurgents) melt away," said Gill, who serves with the 1st Infantry Division in east Baghdad. "And then two or three months later, when we leave and say it was a success, they'll come back."

Soldiers interviewed across east Baghdad, home to more than half the city's 8 million people, said the violence is so out of control that while a surge of 21,500 more American troops may momentarily suppress it, the notion that U.S. forces can bring lasting security to Iraq is misguided.

Lt. Hardy and his men of the 2nd Brigade of the Army's 2nd Infantry Division, from Fort Carson, Colo., patrol an area southeast of Sadr City, the stronghold of radical Shiite cleric Muqtada al-Sadr.

A map in Hardy's company headquarters charts at least 50 roadside bombs since late October, and the lieutenant recently watched in horror as the blast from one killed his Humvee's driver and wounded two other soldiers in a spray of blood and shrapnel.

Soldiers such as Hardy must contend not only with an escalating civil war between Iraq's Sunni and Shiite Muslims, but also with insurgents on both sides who target U.S. forces.

"We can go get into a firefight and empty out ammo, but it doesn't accomplish much," said Pvt. 1st Class Zach Clouser, 19, of York, Pa. "This isn't our war—we're just in the middle."

Almost every foot soldier interviewed during a week of patrols on the streets and alleys of east Baghdad said that Bush's plan would halt the bloodshed only temporarily. The soldiers cited a variety of reasons, including incompetence or corruption among Iraqi troops, the complexities of Iraq's sectarian violence and the lack of Iraqi public support, a cornerstone of counterinsurgency warfare.

"They can keep sending more and more troops over here, but until the people here start working with us, it's not going to change," said Sgt. Chance Oswald, 22, of Tulsa, Okla.

Bush's initiative calls for American soldiers in Baghdad to take positions in outposts throughout the capital, paired up with Iraqi police and soldiers. Few of the U.S. soldiers interviewed, however, said they think Iraqi forces can operate effectively without American help.

Their officers were more optimistic.

If there's enough progress during the next four to six months, "we can look at doing provincial Iraqi control, and we can move U.S. forces to the edge of the city," said Lt. Col. Dean Dunham, the deputy commander

of the 2nd Infantry Division's 2nd Brigade, which oversees most of east Baghdad.

Maj. Christopher Wendland, a senior staff officer for Dunham's brigade, said he thinks there's a good chance that by late 2007 American troops will have handed over most of Baghdad to Iraqi troops.

"I'm actually really positive," said Wendland, 35, of Chicago. "We have an Iraqi army that's actually capable of maintaining once we leave."

If the Iraqi army can control the violence, his thinking goes, economic and political progress will follow in the safest areas, accompanied by infrastructure improvement, then spread outward.

In counterinsurgency circles, that notion is commonly called the "inkblot" approach. It's been relatively successful in some isolated parts of Iraq, such as Tal Afar on the Syrian border, but in most areas it's failed to halt the bloodshed for any length of time.

Across America, the newspapers are filled with stories and editorials about the tragic consequences of this war and the dread over the President's escalation. From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, their editorial published yesterday is titled: "Iraq War: Advice and dissent."

While the President is acting like he can go it alone, the PI correctly places responsibility on the co-equal legislative branch of government: Congress. The PI wrote: "No resolution, however, can absolve Congress of its responsibility to cut off spending on a hopeless occupation."

It is time for Congress to act responsibly by exercising its constitutional responsibility and deny funding for the President's escalation of the Iraq War. The history of the Vietnam War shows us how to deal with the Iraq War, and I am prepared to apply the lessons of history in this Congress.

In 1970, the McGovern-Hatfield amendment was introduced to stop the President from continuing to escalate the Vietnam War. It capped funding for troops for a short period of time, after which money could be used to bring the troops home and for bringing the prisoners home. It didn't pass, but it began a 5-year process that ended the war.

I intend to offer a similar amendment to the first appropriation bill related to Iraq that is introduced in this House. There should be no new funding for any escalation of this war, not one dime, because it only leads to more U.S. casualties. Resolution in Iraq will never come on the bloody streets of Baghdad. It is time for us to act on behalf of the American people and on behalf of our soldiers. They deserve our strong and unwavering support.

We can provide that by passing my amendment to channel our funds to the immediate redeployment of U.S. forces out of Iraq, out of occupation, and out of harm's way. We have waited far too long to act, and our soldiers have paid for our delay with their lives and their limbs.

I believe it is time for Congress to reassure the American people that the President cannot go it alone. It is time for Congress to put an end to the President's reckless disregard of the truth about Iraq.

Those who fail to learn the lessons of history are doomed to repeat them. The President is doing today exactly what happened in Vietnam. On September 1, 1970, George McGovern spoke eloquently on the floor of the other body where he introduced the McGovern-Hatfield amendment.

He said, "It does not take any courage at all for a Congressman or a Senator or a President to wrap himself in the flag and say we are staying in Vietnam, because it is not our blood that is being shed. But we are responsible for those young men" and now young women "and their lives and their hopes. And if we do not end this damnable war, those young men will someday curse us for our pitiful willingness to let the Executive carry the burden that the Constitution places on us."

I believe we must apply the lessons of history, and I urge my colleagues to approve that amendment when it comes up so that we can begin to end a damnable war that never should have been brought in the first place.

COLTS SUPER BOWL XLI VICTORY

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my colleagues who have just spoken here on the floor, but today I am here on some happy news, so I will confine my remarks to what I consider to be a real celebratory event.

Sunday, the day before yesterday, I sat in the rain with 75,000 other Americans cheering the Indianapolis Colts to victory in the Super Bowl, and I want to tell you that it was one of the greatest football games that I have ever seen.

We were very much in favor of the Colts, as you might imagine, and when the kickoff came to the Bears, and Devin Hester ran 92 yards for a touchdown, everybody's heart went down to their feet because we thought it was going to be a real letdown for us.

But Peyton Manning and the Colts came roaring back and won a very convincing victory in the Super Bowl. And after that they had a parade in downtown Indianapolis for the Colts in 8-degree weather. Can you imagine people going out in 8-degree weather to be in a parade? I can't. But the streets were filled by Hoosiers who were celebrating the victory and giving tremendous accolades to the Colts and the coach and Manning and everybody else that made this victory possible.

I would like to just make a couple of comments on what happened. The Colts gained 430 yards in that game against the third strongest defense in the National Football League. Peyton Manning completed 25 of 38 passes for 247 yards and was named the Most Valuable Player. Running back Dominic Rhodes ran for 113 yards against that Bears defense, in driving rain, I might

add. Running back Joseph Addai received 10 passes for 66 yards and ran the ball for 77 more yards in that driving rain.

And the Colts did a tremendous job on defense. Kelvin Hayden intercepted one of the Chicago quarterback's passes and ran it back 56 yards for a Colts touchdown, and the Colts scored in every single quarter in all four playoff games for the first time in playoff history.

So I would just like to congratulate Tony Dungy, the coach of the Colts, one of the most popular people in football and especially in Indianapolis; and we think he is one of the nicest guys you will ever meet. He is only the third person in football history to win a Super Bowl both as a coach and a player.

I want to congratulate my friend Bill Polian, the president of the Indianapolis Colts, who put this team together over the past several years and did an outstanding job. Bill, we are very proud of you.

And I want to congratulate the CEO and owner of the Colts, Jim Irsay, who took control of the team in 1997 and dedicated himself to making us a Super Bowl champion.

It was a great day for Indianapolis. We are very, very proud of the Colts. On behalf of all Hoosiers, we want to say to the Indianapolis Colts, you are the world champions, and we are very proud of each and every one of you.

One more thing I want to mention. The Colts defense was maligned throughout the season. Later in the season, they said the Colts defense was one of the worst in football. In the playoff games, they took on everybody and held them to very, very low yardage. So congratulations to the Colts defense as well as our offense. You did a great job.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, 110TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, pursuant to rule XI, clause 2(a) of the Rules of the House, a copy of the Rules of the Committee on Ways and Means, which were adopted at the organizational meeting of the committee on January 17, 2007.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 110TH CONGRESS

PART I

A. General

RULE 1. APPLICATION OF HOUSE RULES

The rules of the House are the rules of the Committee on Ways and Means and its subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, is a non-debatable motion of high privilege in the Committee.

Each subcommittee of the Committee is part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable. Written rules adopted by the Committee, not inconsistent with the Rules of the House, shall be binding on each subcommittee of the Committee.

The provisions of rule XI of the Rules of the House are incorporated by reference as the rules of the Committee to the extent applicable.

RULE 2. MEETING DATE AND QUORUMS

The regular meeting day of the Committee on Ways and Means shall be on the second Wednesday of each month while the House is in session. However, the Committee shall not meet on the regularly scheduled meeting day if there is no business to be considered.

A majority of the Committee constitutes a quorum for business; provided however, that two Members shall constitute a quorum at any regularly scheduled hearing called for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence. In establishing a quorum for purposes of a public hearing, every effort shall be made to secure the presence of at least one Member each from the majority and the minority.

The Chairman of the Committee may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet pursuant to the call of the Chair.

RULE 3. COMMITTEE BUDGET

For each Congress, the Chairman, in consultation with the Majority Members of the Committee, shall prepare a preliminary budget. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, travel investigation, and other expenses of the Committee. After consultation with the Minority Members, the Chairman shall include an amount budgeted by Minority Members for staff under their direction and supervision.

Thereafter, the Chairman shall combine such proposals into a consolidated Committee budget, and shall present the same to the Committee for its approval or other action. The Chairman shall take whatever action is necessary to have the budget as finally approved by the Committee duly authorized by the House. After said budget shall have been adopted, no substantial change shall be made in such budget unless approved by the Committee.

RULE 4. PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE DOCUMENTS

Any Committee or Subcommittee print, document, or similar material prepared for public distribution shall either be approved by the Committee or Subcommittee prior to

distribution and opportunity afforded for the inclusion of supplemental, minority or additional views, or such document shall contain on its cover the following disclaimer:

Prepared for the use of Members of the Committee on Ways and Means by members of its staff. This document has not been officially approved by the Committee and may not reflect the views of its Members.

Any such print, document, or other material not officially approved by the Committee or Subcommittee shall not include the names of its Members, other than the name of the full Committee Chairman or Subcommittee Chairman under whose authority the document is released. Any such document shall be made available to the full Committee Chairman and Ranking Minority Member not less than 3 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) prior to its public release.

The requirements of this rule shall apply only to the publication of policy-oriented, analytical documents, and not to the publication of public hearings, legislative documents, documents which are administrative in nature or reports which are required to be submitted to the Committee under public law. The appropriate characterization of a document subject to this rule shall be determined after consultation with the Minority.

RULE 5. OFFICIAL TRAVEL

Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolution as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern official travel of Committee Members and Committee staff. Official travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the full Committee for any Member or any Committee staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Official travel may be authorized by the Chairman for any Member and any Committee staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee, its Subcommittees, or any other Committee or Subcommittee of the Congress on matters relevant to the general jurisdiction of the Committee, and meetings, conferences, facility inspections, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter relevant to the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following:

- (1) The purpose of the official travel;
- (2) The dates during which the official travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the official travel is being made;
- (3) The location of the event for which the official travel is to be made; and (4) The names of the Members and Committee staff seeking authorization.

In the case of official travel of Members and staff of a Subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, facility inspections and investigations involving activities or subject matter under the jurisdiction of such Subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the Subcommittee Chairman and the full Committee Chairman. Such prior authorization shall be given by the full Committee Chairman only upon the representation by the applicable Subcommittee Chairman in writing setting forth those items enumerated above.

Within 60 days of the conclusion of any official travel authorized under this rule, there shall be submitted to the full Committee Chairman a written report covering the information gained as a result of the hearing, meeting, conference, facility inspection or investigation attended pursuant to such official travel.

RULE 6. AVAILABILITY OF COMMITTEE RECORDS AND PUBLICATIONS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of Rule VII, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee. The Committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible, make its publications available in electronic form.

RULE 7. COMMITTEE WEBSITE

The Chairman shall maintain an official Committee website for the purpose of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee members and other members of the House. The ranking minority member may maintain a similar website for the same purpose, including communicating information about the activities of the minority to Committee members and other members of the House.

B. Subcommittees

RULE 8. SUBCOMMITTEE RATIOS AND JURISDICTION

All matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means involving revenue measures, except those revenue measures referred to Subcommittees under paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6 shall be considered by the full Committee and not in Subcommittee. There shall be six standing Subcommittees as follows: a Subcommittee on Trade; a Subcommittee on Oversight; a Subcommittee on Health; a Subcommittee on Social Security; a Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support; and a Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures. The ratio of Democrats to Republicans on any Subcommittee of the Committee shall be consistent with the ratio of Democrats to Republicans on the full Committee.

1. The Subcommittee on Trade shall consist of 15 Members, 9 of whom shall be Democrats and 6 of whom shall be Republicans.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Trade shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to customs and customs administration including tariff and import fee structure, classification, valuation of and special rules applying to imports, and special tariff provisions and procedures which relate to customs operation affecting exports and imports; import trade matters, including import impact, industry relief from injurious imports, adjustment assistance and programs to encourage competitive responses to imports, unfair import practices including antidumping and countervailing duty provisions, and import policy which relates to dependence on foreign sources of supply; commodity agreements and reciprocal trade agreements involving multilateral and bilateral trade negotiations and implementation of agreements involving tariff and non-tariff trade barriers to and distortions of international trade; international rules, organizations and institutional aspects of international trade agreements; budget authorizations for the customs revenue functions of the Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. International Trade Commission, and the U.S. Trade Representative; and special trade-related problems involving market access, competitive conditions of specific industries, export policy and promotion, access to materials in short supply, bilateral trade relations including trade with developing

countries, operations of multinational corporations, and trade with non-market economies.

2. The Subcommittee on Oversight shall consist of 13 Members, 8 of whom shall be Democrats and 5 of whom shall be Republicans.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Oversight shall include all matters within the scope of the full Committee's jurisdiction but shall be limited to existing law. Said oversight jurisdiction shall not be exclusive but shall be concurrent with that of the other Subcommittees. With respect to matters involving the Internal Revenue Code and other revenue issues, said concurrent jurisdiction shall be shared with the full Committee. Before undertaking any investigation or hearing, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight shall confer with the Chairman of the full Committee and the Chairman of any other Subcommittee having jurisdiction.

3. The Subcommittee on Health shall consist of 13 Members, 8 of whom shall be Democrats and 5 of whom shall be Republicans.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Health shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to programs providing payments (from any source) for health care, health delivery systems, or health research. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Health shall include bills and matters that relate to the health care programs of the Social Security Act (including titles V, XI (Part B), XVIII, and XIX thereof) and, concurrent with the full Committee, tax credit and deduction provisions of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with health insurance premiums and health care costs.

4. The Subcommittee on Social Security shall consist of 13 Members, 8 of whom shall be Democrats and 5 of whom shall be Republicans.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Social Security shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to the Federal Old Age, Survivors' and Disability Insurance System, the Railroad Retirement System, and employment taxes and trust fund operations relating to those systems. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Social Security shall include bills and matters involving title II of the Social Security Act and Chapter 22 of the Internal Revenue Code (the Railroad Retirement Tax Act), as well as provisions in title VII and title XI of the Act relating to procedure and administration involving the Old Age, Survivors' and Disability Insurance System.

5. The Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support shall consist of 13 Members, 8 of whom shall be Democrats and 5 of whom shall be Republicans.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act, including temporary assistance for needy families, child care, child and family services, child support, foster care, adoption, supplemental security income social services, eligibility of welfare recipients for food stamps, and low-income energy assistance. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support shall include bills and matters relating to titles I, IV, VI, X, XIV, XVI, XVII, XX and related provisions of titles VII and XI of the Social Security Act.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support shall also include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to the Federal-State system of unemploy-

ment compensation, and the financing thereof, including the programs for extended and emergency benefits. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support shall also include all bills and matters pertaining to the programs of unemployment compensation under titles III, IX and XII of the Social Security Act, Chapters 23 and 23A of the Internal Revenue Code, and the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970, and provisions relating thereto.

6. The Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures shall consist of 13 Members, 8 of whom shall be Democrats and 5 of whom shall be Republicans.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures shall consist of those revenue measures that, from time to time, shall be referred to it specifically by the Chairman of the full Committee.

RULE 9. EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS OF SUBCOMMITTEES

The Chairman of the full Committee and the Ranking Minority Member may sit as ex-officio Members of all Subcommittees. They may be counted for purposes of assisting in the establishment of a quorum for a Subcommittee. However, their absence shall not count against the establishment of a quorum by the regular Members of the Subcommittee. Ex-officio Members shall neither vote in the Subcommittee nor be taken into consideration for the purposes of determining the ratio of the Subcommittee.

RULE 10. SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS

Insofar as practicable, meetings of the full Committee and its Subcommittees shall not conflict. Subcommittee Chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman of the full Committee and other Subcommittee Chairmen with a view towards avoiding, wherever possible, simultaneous scheduling of full Committee and Subcommittee meetings or hearings.

RULE 11. REFERENCE OF LEGISLATION AND SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Except for bills or measures retained by the Chairman of the full Committee for full Committee consideration, every bill or other measure referred to the Committee shall be referred by the Chairman of the full Committee to the appropriate Subcommittee in a timely manner. A Subcommittee shall, within three legislative days of the referral, acknowledge same to the full Committee.

After a measure has been pending in a Subcommittee for a reasonable period of time, the Chairman of the full Committee may make a request in writing to the Subcommittee that the Subcommittee forthwith report the measure to the full Committee with its recommendations. If within seven legislative days after the Chairman's written request, the Subcommittee has not so reported the measure, then there shall be in order in the full Committee a motion to discharge the Subcommittee from further consideration of the measure. If such motion is approved by a majority vote of the full Committee, the measure may thereafter be considered only by the full Committee.

No measure reported by a Subcommittee shall be considered by the full Committee unless it has been presented to all Members of the full Committee at least two legislative days prior to the full Committee's meeting, together with a comparison with present law, a section-by-section analysis of the proposed change, a section-by-section justification, and a draft statement of the budget effects of the measure that is consistent with the requirements for reported measures under clause 3(d)(2) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 12. RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Whenever in the legislative process it becomes necessary to appoint conferees, the Chairman of the full Committee shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees the names of those Committee Members as the Chairman may designate. In making recommendations of Minority Members as conferees, the Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

C. Hearings

RULE 13. WITNESSES

In order to assure the most productive use of the limited time available to question hearing witnesses, a witness who is scheduled to appear before the full Committee or a Subcommittee shall file with the Clerk of the Committee at least 48 hours in advance of his or her appearance a written statement of their proposed testimony. In addition, all witnesses shall comply with formatting requirements as specified by the Committee and the Rules of the House. Failure to comply with the 48-hour rule may result in a witness being denied the opportunity to testify in person. Failure to comply with the formatting requirements may result in a witness' statement being rejected for inclusion in the published hearing record. In addition to the requirements of clause 2(g)(4) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House regarding information required of public witnesses, a witness shall limit his or her oral presentation to a summary of their position and shall provide sufficient copies of their written statement to the Clerk for distribution to Members, staff and news media.

A witness appearing at a public hearing, or submitting a statement for the record of a public hearing, or submitting written comments in response to a published request for comments by the Committee must include in their statement or submission, a list of all clients, persons or organizations on whose behalf the witness appears. Oral testimony and statements for the record, or written comments in response to a request for comments by the Committee, will be accepted only from citizens of the United States or corporations or associations organized under the laws of one of the 50 States of the United States or the District of Columbia, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman of the full Committee or Subcommittee involved. Written statements from non-citizens may be considered for acceptance in the record if transmitted to the Committee in writing by Members of Congress.

RULE 14. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

Committee Members may question witnesses only when recognized by the Chairman for that purpose. All Members shall be limited to five minutes on the initial round of questioning. In questioning witnesses under the five minute rule, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member shall be recognized first, after which Members who are in attendance at the beginning of a hearing will be recognized in the order of their seniority on the Committee. Other Members shall be recognized in the order of their appearance at the hearing. In recognizing Members to question witnesses, the Chairman may take into consideration the ratio of Majority Members to Minority Members and the number of Majority and Minority Members present and shall apportion the recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage Members of the majority.

RULE 15. SUBPOENA POWER

The power to authorize and issue subpoenas is delegated to the Chairman of the full Committee, as provided for under clause

2(m)(3)(A)(i) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 16. RECORDS OF HEARINGS

An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of all testimony taken at a public hearing. The staff shall transmit to a witness the transcript of his or her testimony for correction and immediate return to the Committee offices. Only changes in the interest of clarity, accuracy and corrections in transcribing errors will be permitted. Changes that substantially alter the actual testimony will not be permitted. Members shall have the opportunity to correct their own testimony before publication. The Chairman of the full Committee may order the printing of a hearing without the corrections of a witness or Member if he determines that a reasonable time has been afforded to make corrections and that further delay would impede the consideration of the legislation or other measure that is the subject of the hearing.

RULE 17. BROADCASTING OF HEARINGS

The provisions of clause 4(f) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives are specifically made a part of these rules by reference. In addition, the following policy shall apply to media coverage of any meeting of the full Committee or a Subcommittee:

(1) An appropriate area of the Committee's hearing room will be designated for members of the media and their equipment.

(2) No interviews will be allowed in the Committee room while the Committee is in session. Individual interviews must take place before the gavel falls for the convening of a meeting or after the gavel falls for adjournment.

(3) Day-to-day notification of the next day's electronic coverage shall be provided by the media to the Chairman of the full Committee through an appropriate designee.

(4) Still photography during a Committee meeting will not be permitted to disrupt the proceedings or block the vision of Committee Members or witnesses.

(5) Further conditions may be specified by the Chairman.

D. Markups

RULE 18. PREVIOUS QUESTION

The Chairman shall not recognize a Member for the purpose of moving the previous question unless the Member has first advised the Chair and the Committee that this is the purpose for which recognition is being sought.

RULE 19. POSTPONEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS

The Chairman may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment.

The Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time. In exercising postponement authority the Chairman shall take reasonable steps to notify Members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote.

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

RULE 20. MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE

The Chairman is authorized to offer a motion under clause 1 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

RULE 21. OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPTS OF MARKUPS AND OTHER COMMITTEE MEETINGS

An official stenographic transcript shall be kept accurately reflecting all markups and other official meetings of the full Committee

and the Subcommittees, whether they be open or closed to the public. This official transcript, marked as "uncorrected," shall be available for inspection by the public (except for meetings closed pursuant to clause 2(g)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House), by Members of the House, or by Members of the Committee together with their staffs, during normal business hours in the full Committee or Subcommittee office under such controls as the Chairman of the full Committee deems necessary. Official transcripts shall not be removed from the Committee or Subcommittee office.

If, however, (1) in the drafting of a Committee or Subcommittee decision, the Office of the House Legislative Counsel or (2) in the preparation of a Committee report, the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation determines (in consultation with appropriate majority and minority committee staff) that it is necessary to review the official transcript of a markup, such transcript may be released upon the signature and to the custody of an appropriate committee staff person. Such transcript shall be returned immediately after its review in the drafting session.

The official transcript of a markup or Committee meeting other than a public hearing shall not be published or distributed to the public in any way except by a majority vote of the Committee. Before any public release of the uncorrected transcript, Members must be given a reasonable opportunity to correct their remarks. In instances in which a stenographic transcript is kept of a conference committee proceeding, all of the requirements of this rule shall likewise be observed.

RULE 22. PUBLICATION OF DECISIONS AND LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE

A press release describing any tentative or final decision made by the full Committee or a Subcommittee on legislation under consideration shall be made available to each Member of the Committee as soon as possible, but no later than the next day. However, the legislative draft of any tentative or final decision of the full Committee or a Subcommittee shall not be publicly released until such draft is made available to each Member of the Committee.

E. Staff

RULE 23. SUPERVISION OF COMMITTEE STAFF

The staff of the Committee shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman of the full Committee except as provided in clause 9 of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives concerning Committee expenses and staff.

Pursuant to clause 6(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the full Committee, from the funds made available for the appointment of Committee staff pursuant to primary and additional expense resolutions, shall ensure that each Subcommittee receives sufficient staff to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee, and that the minority party is fairly treated in the appointment of such staff.

PART II—SELECTED RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Part II of the Manual of Rules of the Committee on Ways and Means consists of selected Rules of the House of Representatives, which are also part of the Committee's rules and which affect its organization, administration, and operation. The rules cited herein are not exclusive of other rules of the House of Representatives applicable to the Committee, but rather are considered to be some of the more important rules to which frequent reference is made.

RULE VII. RECORDS OF THE HOUSE

Archiving

1. (a) At the end of each Congress, the chairman of each committee shall transfer to the Clerk any noncurrent records of such committee, including the subcommittees thereof.

(b) At the end of each Congress, each officer of the House elected under rule II shall transfer to the Clerk any noncurrent records made or acquired in the course of the duties of such officer.

2. The Clerk shall deliver the records transferred under clause 1, together with any other noncurrent records of the House, to the Archivist of the United States for preservation at the National Archives and Records Administration. Records so delivered are the permanent property of the House and remain subject to this rule and any order of the House.

Public availability

3. (a) The Clerk shall authorize the Archivist to make records delivered under clause 2 available for public use, subject to paragraph (b), clause 4, and any order of the House.

(b)(1) A record shall immediately be made available if it was previously made available for public use by the House or a committee or a subcommittee.

(2) An investigative record that contains personal data relating to a specific living person (the disclosure of which would be an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy), an administrative record relating to personnel, or a record relating to a hearing that was closed under clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI shall be made available if it has been in existence for 50 years.

(3) A record for which a time, schedule, or condition for availability is specified by order of the House shall be made available in accordance with that order. Except as otherwise provided by order of the House, a record of a committee for which a time, schedule, or condition for availability is specified by order of the committee (entered during the Congress in which the record is made or acquired by the committee) shall be made available in accordance with the order of the committee.

(4) A record (other than a record referred to in subparagraph (1), (2), or (3)) shall be made available if it has been in existence for 30 years.

4. (a) A record may not be made available for public use under clause 3 if the Clerk determines that such availability would be detrimental to the public interest or inconsistent with the rights and privileges of the House. The Clerk shall notify in writing the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration of any such determination.

(b) A determination of the Clerk under paragraph (a) is subject to later orders of the House and, in the case of a record of a committee, later orders of the committee.

5. (a) This rule does not supersede rule VIII or clause 11 of rule X and does not authorize the public disclosure of any record if such disclosure is prohibited by law or executive order of the President.

(b) The Committee on House Administration may prescribe guidelines and regulations governing the applicability and implementation of this rule.

(c) A committee may withdraw from the National Archives and Records Administration any record of the committee delivered to the Archivist under this rule. Such a withdrawal shall be on a temporary basis and for official use of the committee.

Definition of record

6. In this rule the term "record" means any official, permanent record of the House

(other than a record of an individual Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner), including—

(a) with respect to a committee, an official, permanent record of the committee (including any record of a legislative, oversight, or other activity of such committee or a subcommittee thereof);

* * * * *

RULE X. ORGANIZATION OF COMMITTEES

Committees and their legislative jurisdictions

1. There shall be in the House the following standing committees, each of which shall have the jurisdiction and related functions assigned by this clause and clauses 2, 3, and 4. All bills, resolutions, and other matters relating to subjects within the jurisdiction of the standing committees listed in this clause shall be referred to those committees, in accordance with clause 2 of rule XII, as follows: * * *

(t) Committee on Ways and Means.

(1) Customs revenue, collection districts, and ports of entry and delivery.

(2) Reciprocal trade agreements.

(3) Revenue measures generally.

(4) Revenue measures relating to insular possessions.

(5) Bonded debt of the United States, subject to the last sentence of clause 4(f).

(6) Deposit of public monies.

(7) Transportation of dutiable goods.

(8) Tax exempt foundations and charitable trusts.

(9) National social security (except health care and facilities programs that are supported from general revenues as opposed to payroll deductions and except work incentive programs).

General oversight responsibilities

2. (a) The various standing committees shall have general oversight responsibilities as provided in paragraph (b) in order to assist the House in—

(1) its analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of—

(A) the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of Federal laws; and

(B) conditions and circumstances that may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation; and

(2) its formulation, consideration, and enactment of changes in Federal laws, and of such additional legislation as may be necessary or appropriate.

(b)(1) In order to determine whether laws and programs addressing subjects within the jurisdiction of a committee are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of Congress and whether they should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated, each standing committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) shall review and study on a continuing basis—

(A) the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of laws and programs addressing subjects within its jurisdiction;

(B) the organization and operation of Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities for the administration and execution of laws and programs addressing subjects within its jurisdiction;

(C) any conditions or circumstances that may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation addressing subjects within its jurisdiction (whether or not a bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto); and

(D) future research and forecasting on subjects within its jurisdiction.

(2) Each committee to which subparagraph (1) applies having more than 20 members shall establish an oversight subcommittee, or require its subcommittees to conduct oversight in their respective jurisdictions, to assist in carrying out its responsibilities

under this clause. The establishment of an oversight subcommittee does not limit the responsibility of a subcommittee with legislative jurisdiction in carrying out its oversight responsibilities.

(c) Each standing committee shall review and study on a continuing basis the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within its jurisdiction as described in clauses 1 and 3.

(d)(1) Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, each standing committee shall, in a meeting that is open to the public and with a quorum present, adopt its oversight plan for that Congress. Such plan shall be submitted simultaneously to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and to the Committee on House Administration. In developing its plan each committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible—

(A) consult with other committees that have jurisdiction over the same or related laws, programs, or agencies within its jurisdiction with the objective of ensuring maximum coordination and cooperation among committees when conducting reviews of such laws, programs, or agencies and include in its plan an explanation of steps that have been or will be taken to ensure such coordination and cooperation;

(B) review specific problems with Federal rules, regulations, statutes, and court decisions that are ambiguous, arbitrary, or nonsensical, or that impose severe financial burdens on individuals;

(C) give priority consideration to including in its plan the review of those laws, programs, or agencies operating under permanent budget authority or permanent statutory authority;

(D) have a view toward ensuring that all significant laws, programs, or agencies within its jurisdiction are subject to review every 10 years; and

(E) have a view toward insuring against duplication of Federal programs.

(2) Not later than March 31 in the first session of a Congress, after consultation with the Speaker, the Majority Leader, and the Minority Leader, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall report to the House the oversight plans submitted by committees together with any recommendations that it, or the House leadership group described above, may make to ensure the most effective coordination of oversight plans and otherwise to achieve the objectives of this clause.

(e) The Speaker, with the approval of the House, may appoint special ad hoc oversight committees for the purpose of reviewing specific matters within the jurisdiction of two or more standing committees.

Special oversight functions

3. * * *

(f) The Committee on Foreign Affairs shall review and study on a continuing basis laws, programs, and Government activities relating to customs administration, intelligence activities relating to foreign policy, international financial and monetary organizations, and international fishing agreements.

* * * * *

Additional functions of committees

4. * * *

(b) The Committee on the Budget shall—

* * *

(6) request and evaluate continuing studies of tax expenditures, devise methods of coordinating tax expenditures, policies, and programs with direct budget outlays, and report the results of such studies to the House on a recurring basis.

* * * * *

Budget Act responsibilities

(f)(1) Each standing committee shall submit to the Committee on the Budget not

later than six weeks after the President submits his budget, or at such time as the Committee on the Budget may request—

(A) its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year that are within its jurisdiction or functions; and

(B) an estimate of the total amounts of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction that it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

(2) The views and estimates submitted by the Committee on Ways and Means under subparagraph (1) shall include a specific recommendation, made after holding public hearings, as to the appropriate level of the public debt that should be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget.

* * * * *

Election and membership of standing committees

5. * * *

(2)(A) The Committee on the Budget shall be composed of members as follows:

(i) Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner who are members of other standing committees, including five who are members of the Committee on Appropriations and five who are members of the Committee on Ways and Means;

* * * * *

Expense resolutions

6. (a) Whenever a committee, commission, or other entity (other than the Committee on Appropriations) is granted authorization for the payment of its expenses (including staff salaries) for a Congress, such authorization initially shall be procured by one primary expense resolution reported by the Committee on House Administration. A primary expense resolution may include a reserve fund for unanticipated expenses of committees.

An amount from such a reserve fund may be allocated to a committee only by the approval of the Committee on House Administration. A primary expense resolution reported to the House may not be considered in the House unless a printed report thereon was available on the previous calendar day. For the information of the House, such report shall—

(1) state the total amount of the funds to be provided to the committee, commission, or other entity under the primary expense resolution for all anticipated activities and programs of the committee, commission, or other entity; and

(2) to the extent practicable, contain such general statements regarding the estimated foreseeable expenditures for the respective anticipated activities and programs of the committee, commission, or other entity as may be appropriate to provide the House with basic estimates of the expenditures contemplated by the primary expense resolution.

(b) After the date of adoption by the House of a primary expense resolution for a committee, commission, or other entity for a Congress, authorization for the payment of additional expenses (including staff salaries) in that Congress may be procured by one or more supplemental expense resolutions reported by the Committee on House Administration, as necessary. A supplemental expense resolution reported to the House may not be considered in the House unless a printed report thereon was available on the previous calendar day. For the information of the House, such report shall—

(1) state the total amount of additional funds to be provided to the committee, commission, or other entity under the supplemental expense resolution and the purposes

for which those additional funds are available; and

(2) state the reasons for the failure to procure the additional funds for the committee, commission, or other entity by means of the primary expense resolution.

(c) The preceding provisions of this clause do not apply to—

(1) a resolution providing for the payment from committee salary and expense accounts of the House of sums necessary to pay compensation for staff services performed for, or to pay other expenses of, a committee, commission, or other entity at any time after the beginning of an odd-numbered year and before the date of adoption by the House of the primary expense resolution described in paragraph (a) for that year; or

(2) a resolution providing each of the standing committees in a Congress additional office equipment, airmail and special-delivery postage stamps, supplies, staff personnel, or any other specific item for the operation of the standing committees, and containing an authorization for the payment from committee salary and expense accounts of the House of the expenses of any of the foregoing items provided by that resolution, subject to and until enactment of the provisions of the resolution as permanent law.

(d) From the funds made available for the appointment of committee staff by a primary or additional expense resolution, the chairman of each committee shall ensure that sufficient staff is made available to each subcommittee to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the committee and that the minority party is treated fairly in the appointment of such staff.

(e) Funds authorized for a committee under this clause and clauses 7 and 8 are for expenses incurred in the activities of the committee.

Interim funding

7. (a) For the period beginning at noon on January 3 and ending at midnight on March 31 in each odd-numbered year, such sums as may be necessary shall be paid out of the committee salary and expense accounts of the House for continuance of necessary investigations and studies by—

(1) each standing and select committee established by these rules; and

(2) except as specified in paragraph (b), each select committee established by resolution.

(b) In the case of the first session of a Congress, amounts shall be made available under this paragraph for a select committee established by resolution in the preceding Congress only if—

(1) a resolution proposing to reestablish such select committee is introduced in the present Congress; and

(2) the House has not adopted a resolution of the preceding Congress providing for termination of funding for investigations and studies by such select committee.

(c) Each committee described in paragraph (a) shall be entitled for each month during the period specified in paragraph (a) to 9 percent (or such lesser percentage as may be determined by the Committee on House Administration) of the total annualized amount made available under expense resolutions for such committee in the preceding session of Congress.

(d) Payments under this paragraph shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of the committee, except as provided in paragraph (e), and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

(e) Notwithstanding any provision of law, rule of the House, or other authority, from noon on January 3 of the first session of a Congress until the election by the House of

the committee concerned in that Congress, payments under this paragraph shall be made on vouchers signed by—

(1) the member of the committee who served as chairman of the committee at the expiration of the preceding Congress; or

(2) if the chairman is not a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in the present Congress, then the ranking member of the committee as it was constituted at the expiration of the preceding Congress who is a member of the majority party in the present Congress.

(f)(1) The authority of a committee to incur expenses under this paragraph shall expire upon adoption by the House of a primary expense resolution for the committee.

(2) Amounts made available under this paragraph shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

(3) This clause shall be effective only insofar as it is not inconsistent with a resolution reported by the Committee on House Administration and adopted by the House after the adoption of these rules.

Travel

8. (a) Local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the committee and its employees engaged in carrying out their official duties outside the United States or its territories or possessions. Appropriated funds, including those authorized under this clause and clauses 6 and 8, may not be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of a committee or its employees in a country where local currencies are available for this purpose.

(b) The following conditions shall apply with respect to travel outside the United States or its territories or possessions:

(1) A member or employee of a committee may not receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in a country for a day at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem set forth in applicable Federal law.

(2) A member or employee shall be reimbursed for his expenses for a day at the lesser of—

(A) the per diem set forth in applicable Federal law; or

(B) the actual, unreimbursed expenses (other than for transportation) he incurred during that day.

(3) Each member or employee of a committee shall make to the chairman of the committee an itemized report showing the dates each country was visited, the amount of per diem furnished, the cost of transportation furnished, and funds expended for any other official purpose and shall summarize in these categories the total foreign currencies or appropriated funds expended. Each report shall be filed with the chairman of the committee not later than 60 days following the completion of travel for use in complying with reporting requirements in applicable Federal law and shall be open for public inspection.

(c)(1) In carrying out the activities of a committee outside the United States in a country where local currencies are unavailable, a member or employee of a committee may not receive reimbursement for expenses (other than for transportation) in excess of the maximum per diem set forth in applicable Federal law.

(2) A member or employee shall be reimbursed for his expenses for a day, at the lesser of—

(A) the per diem set forth in applicable Federal law; or

(B) the actual unreimbursed expenses (other than for transportation) he incurred during that day.

(3) A member or employee of a committee may not receive reimbursement for the cost

of any transportation in connection with travel outside the United States unless the member or employee actually paid for the transportation.

(d) The restrictions respecting travel outside the United States set forth in paragraph (c) also shall apply to travel outside the United States by a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House authorized under any standing rule.

Committee staffs

9. (a)(1) Subject to subparagraph (2) and paragraph (f), each standing committee may appoint, by majority vote, not more than 30 professional staff members to be compensated from the funds provided for the appointment of committee staff by primary and additional expense resolutions. Each professional staff member appointed under this subparagraph shall be assigned to the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee, as the committee considers advisable.

(2) Subject to paragraph (f) whenever a majority of the minority party members of a standing committee (other than the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct or the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence) so request, not more than 10 persons (or one-third of the total professional committee staff appointed under this clause, whichever is fewer) may be selected, by majority vote of the minority party members, for appointment by the committee as professional staff members under subparagraph (1). The committee shall appoint persons so selected whose character and qualifications are acceptable to a majority of the committee. If the committee determines that the character and qualifications of a person so selected are unacceptable, a majority of the minority party members may select another person for appointment by the committee to the professional staff until such appointment is made. Each professional staff member appointed under this subparagraph shall be assigned to such committee business as the minority party members of the committee consider advisable.

(b)(1) The professional staff members each standing committee—

(A) may not engage in any work other than committee business during congressional working hours; and

(B) may not be assigned a duty other than one pertaining to committee business.

(2)(A) Subparagraph (1) does not apply to staff designated by a committee as "associate" or "shared" staff who are not paid exclusively by the committee, provided that the chairman certifies that the compensation paid by the committee for any such staff is commensurate with the work performed for the committee in accordance with clause 8 of rule XXIII.

(B) The use of any "associate" or "shared" staff by a committee other than the Committee on Appropriations shall be subject to the review of, and to any terms, conditions, or limitations established by, the Committee on House Administration in connection with the reporting of any primary or additional expense resolution.

(c) Each employee on the professional or investigative staff of a standing committee shall be entitled to pay at a single gross per annum rate, to be fixed by the chairman and that does not exceed the maximum rate of pay as in effect from time to time under applicable provisions of law.

(d) Subject to appropriations hereby authorized, the Committee on Appropriations may appoint by majority vote such staff as it determines to be necessary (in addition to the clerk of the committee and assistants for the minority). The staff appointed under this

paragraph, other than minority assistants, shall possess such qualifications as the committee may prescribe.

(e) A committee may not appoint to its staff an expert or other personnel detailed or assigned from a department or agency of the Government except with the written permission of the Committee on House Administration.

(f) If a request for the appointment of a minority professional staff member under paragraph (a) is made when no vacancy exists for such an appointment, the committee nevertheless may appoint under paragraph (a) a person selected by the minority and acceptable to the committee. A person so appointed shall serve as an additional member of the professional staff of the committee until such a vacancy occurs (other than a vacancy in the position of head of the professional staff, by whatever title designated), at which time that person is considered as appointed to that vacancy. Such a person shall be paid from the applicable accounts of the House described in clause 1(i)(1) of rule X. If such a vacancy occurs on the professional staff when seven or more persons have been so appointed who are eligible to fill that vacancy, a majority of the minority party members shall designate which of those persons shall fill the vacancy.

(g) Each staff member appointed pursuant to a request by minority party members under paragraph (a), and each staff member appointed to assist minority members of a committee pursuant to an expense resolution described in paragraph (a) of clause 6, shall be accorded equitable treatment with respect to the fixing of the rate of pay, the assignment of work facilities, and the accessibility of committee records.

(h) Paragraph (a) may not be construed to authorize the appointment of additional professional staff members of a committee pursuant to a request under paragraph (a) by the minority party members of that committee if 10 or more professional staff members provided for in paragraph (a)(1) who are satisfactory to a majority of the minority party members are otherwise assigned to assist the minority party members.

(i) Notwithstanding paragraph (a)(2), a committee may employ nonpartisan staff, in lieu of or in addition to committee staff designated exclusively for the majority or minority party, by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the majority party and of a majority of the members of the minority party.

* * * * *

RULE XI. PROCEDURES OF COMMITTEES AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

In general

1. (a)(1)(A) The Rules of the House are the rules of its committees and subcommittees so far as applicable.

(B) Each subcommittee is a part of its committee and is subject to the authority and direction of that committee and to its rules, so far as applicable.

(2)(A) In a committee or subcommittee—

(i) a motion to recess from day to day, or to recess subject to the call of the Chair (within 24 hours), shall be privileged; and

(ii) a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution shall be privileged if printed copies are available.

(B) A motion accorded privilege under this subparagraph shall be decided without debate.

(b)(1) Each committee may conduct at any time such investigations and studies as it considers necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under rule X. Subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 6 of rule X, each

committee may incur expenses, including travel expenses, in connection with such investigations and studies.

(2) A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read in committee if it has been available to the members for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day).

(3) A report of an investigation or study conducted jointly by more than one committee may be filed jointly, provided that each of the committees complies independently with all requirements for approval and filing of the report.

(4) After an adjournment sine die of the last regular session of a Congress, an investigative or oversight report may be filed with the Clerk at any time, provided that a member who gives timely notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views shall be entitled to not less than seven calendar days in which to submit such views for inclusion in the report.

(c) Each committee may have printed and bound such testimony and other data as may be presented at hearings held by the committee or its subcommittees. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with a meeting or hearing of a committee shall be paid from the applicable accounts of the House described in clause 1(i)(1) of rule X.

(d)(1) Each committee shall submit to the House not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year a report on the activities of that committee under this rule and rule X during the Congress ending at noon on January 3 of such year.

(2) Such report shall include separate sections summarizing the legislative and oversight activities of that committee during that Congress.

(3) The oversight section of such report shall include a summary of the oversight plans submitted by the committee under clause 2(d) of rule X, a summary of the actions taken and recommendations made with respect to each such plan, a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by that committee, and any recommendations made or actions taken thereon.

(4) After an adjournment sine die of the last regular session of a Congress, the chairman of a committee may file an activities report under subparagraph (1) with the Clerk at any time and without approval of the committee, provided that—

(A) a copy of the report has been available to each member of the committee for at least seven calendar days; and

(B) the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a member of the committee.

Adoption of written rules

2. (a)(1) Each standing committee shall adopt written rules governing its procedure. Such rules—

(A) shall be adopted in a meeting that is open to the public unless the committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by record vote that all or part of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public;

(B) may not be inconsistent with the Rules of the House or with those provisions of law having the force and effect of Rules of the House; and

(C) shall in any event incorporate all of the succeeding provisions of this clause to the extent applicable.

(2) Each committee shall submit its rules for publication in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

(3) A committee may adopt a rule providing that the chairman be directed to offer

a motion under clause 1 of rule XXII whenever the chairman considers it appropriate.

Regular meeting days

(b) Each standing committee shall establish regular meeting days for the conduct of its business, which shall be not less frequent than monthly. Each such committee shall meet for the consideration of a bill or resolution pending before the committee or the transaction of other committee business on all regular meeting days fixed by the committee unless otherwise provided by written rule adopted by the committee.

Additional and special meetings

(c)(1) The chairman of each standing committee may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional and special meetings of the committee for the consideration of a bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the conduct of other committee business, subject to such rules as the committee may adopt. The committee shall meet for such purpose under that call of the chairman.

(2) Three or more members of a standing committee may file in the offices of the committee a written request that the chairman call a special meeting of the committee. Such request shall specify the measure or matter to be considered. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the clerk of the committee shall notify the chairman of the filing of the request. If the chairman does not call the requested special meeting within three calendar days after the filing of the request (to be held within seven calendar days after the filing of the request) a majority of the members of the committee may file in the offices of the committee their written notice that a special meeting of the committee will be held. The written notice shall specify the date and hour of the special meeting and the measure or matter to be considered. The committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the clerk of the committee shall notify all members of the committee that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered. Only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting.

Temporary absence of chairman

(d) A member of the majority party on each standing committee or subcommittee thereof shall be designated by the chairman of the full committee as the vice chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, and shall preside during the absence of the chairman from any meeting. If the chairman and vice chairman of a committee or subcommittee are not present at any meeting of the committee or subcommittee, the ranking majority member who is present shall preside at that meeting.

Committee records

(e)(1)(A) Each committee shall keep a complete record of all committee action which shall include—

(i) in the case of a meeting or hearing transcript, a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved; and

(ii) a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

(B)(i) Except as provided in subdivision (B)(ii) and subject to paragraph (k)(7), the result of each such record vote shall be made available by the committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in its offices. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each member voting for

and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members of the committee present but not voting.

(ii) The result of any record vote taken in executive session in the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct may not be made available for inspection by the public without an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the committee.

(2)(A) Except as provided in subdivision (B), all committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the member serving as its chairman. Such records shall be the property of the House, and each Member, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner shall have access thereto.

(B) A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, other than members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, may not have access to the records of that committee respecting the conduct of a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House without the specific prior permission of that committee.

(3) Each committee shall include in its rules standards for availability of records of the committee delivered to the Archivist of the United States under rule VII. Such standards shall specify procedures for orders of the committee under clause 3(b)(3) and clause 4(b) of rule VII, including a requirement that nonavailability of a record for a period longer than the period otherwise applicable under that rule shall be approved by vote of the committee.

(4) Each committee shall make its publications available in electronic form to the maximum extent feasible.

Prohibition against proxy voting

(f) A vote by a member of a committee or subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter may not be cast by proxy.

Open meetings and hearings

(g)(1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, by a standing committee or subcommittee thereof (other than the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct or its subcommittee) shall be open to the public, including to radio, television, and still photography coverage, except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be in executive session because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or otherwise would violate a law or rule of the House. Persons, other than members of the committee and such noncommittee Members, Delegates, Resident Commissioner, congressional staff, or departmental representatives as the committee may authorize, may not be present at a business or markup session that is held in executive session. This subparagraph does not apply to open committee hearings, which are governed by clause 4(a)(1) of rule X or by subparagraph (2).

(2)(A) Each hearing conducted by a committee or subcommittee (other than the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct or its subcommittees) shall be open to the public, including to radio, television, and still photography coverage, except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered

would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate a law or rule of the House.

(B) Notwithstanding the requirements of subdivision (A), in the presence of the number of members required under the rules of the committee for the purpose of taking testimony, a majority of those present may—

(i) agree to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate clause 2(k)(5); or

(ii) agree to close the hearing as provided in clause 2(k)(5).

(C) A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may not be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at a hearing of a committee or subcommittee (other than the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct or its subcommittees) unless the House by majority vote authorizes a particular committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner by the same procedures specified in this subparagraph for closing hearings to the public.

(D) The committee or subcommittee may vote by the same procedure described in this subparagraph to close one subsequent day of hearing, except that the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the subcommittees thereof, may vote by the same procedure to close up to five additional, consecutive days of hearings.

(3) The chairman of each committee (other than the Committee on Rules) shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of a committee hearing at least one week before the commencement of the hearing. If the chairman of the committee, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, determines that there is good cause to begin a hearing sooner, or if the committee so determines by majority vote in the presence of the number of members required under the rules of the committee for the transaction of business, the chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. An announcement made under this subparagraph shall be published promptly in the Daily Digest and made available in electronic form.

(4) Each committee shall, to the greatest extent practicable, require witnesses who appear before it to submit in advance written statements of proposed testimony and to limit their initial presentations to the committee to brief summaries thereof. In the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two previous fiscal years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness.

(5)(A) Except as provided in subdivision (B), a point of order does not lie with respect to a measure reported by a committee on the ground that hearings on such measure were not conducted in accordance with this clause.

(B) A point of order on the ground described in subdivision (A) may be made by a member of the committee that reported the measure if such point of order was timely made and improperly disposed of in the committee.

(6) This paragraph does not apply to hearings of the Committee on Appropriations under clause 4(a)(1) of rule X.

Quorum requirements

(h)(1) A measure or recommendation may not be reported by a committee unless a majority of the committee is actually present.

(2) Each committee may fix the number of its members to constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence, which may not be less than two.

(3) Each committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, and the Committee on Ways and Means) may fix the number of its members to constitute a quorum for taking any action other than one for which the presence of a majority of the committee is otherwise required, which may not be less than one-third of the members.

(4)(A) Each committee may adopt a rule authorizing the chairman of a committee or subcommittee—

(i) to postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment; and

(ii) to resume proceedings on a postponed question at any time after reasonable notice.

(B) A rule adopted pursuant to this subparagraph shall provide that when proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

Limitation on committee sittings

(i) A committee may not sit during a joint session of the House and Senate or during a recess when a joint meeting of the House and Senate is in progress.

Calling and questioning of witnesses

(j)(1) Whenever a hearing is conducted by a committee on a measure or matter, the minority members of the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the chairman by a majority of them before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

(2)(A) Subject to subdivisions (B) and (C), each committee shall apply the five-minute rule during the questioning of witnesses in a hearing until such time as each member of the committee who so desires has had an opportunity to question each witness.

(B) A committee may adopt a rule or motion permitting a specified number of its members to question a witness for longer than five minutes. The time for extended questioning of a witness under this subdivision shall be equal for the majority party and the minority party and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(C) A committee may adopt a rule or motion permitting committee staff for its majority and minority party members to question a witness for equal specified periods. The time for extended questioning of a witness under this subdivision shall be equal for the majority party and the minority party and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

Hearing procedures

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

(2) A copy of the committee rules and of this clause shall be made available to each witness on request.

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

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

(5) Whenever it is asserted that the evidence or testimony at an investigative hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at hearing may tend to defame, degrade or incriminate the witness—

(A) notwithstanding paragraph (g)(2), such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session if, in the presence of the number of members required under the rules of the committee for the purpose of taking testimony, the committee determines by vote of a majority of those present that such evidence or testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; and

(B) the committee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the committee, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

In either case the committee shall afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness, and receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.

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

(7) Evidence or testimony taken in executive session, and proceedings conducted in executive session, may be released or used in public sessions only when authorized by the committee, a majority being present.

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

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

Supplemental, minority, or additional views

(1) If at the time of approval of a measure or matter by a committee (other than the Committee on Rules) a member of the committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views for inclusion in the report to the House thereon, that member shall be entitled to not less than two additional calendar days after the day of such notice (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) to file such views, in writing and signed by that member, with the clerk of the committee.

Power to sit and act; subpoena power

(m)(1) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under this rule and rule X (including any matters referred to it under clause 2 of rule XII), a committee or subcommittee is authorized (subject to subparagraph (2)(A))—

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

(B) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it considers necessary.

(2) The chairman of the committee, or a member designated by the chairman, may administer oaths to witnesses.

(3)(A)(i) Except as provided in subdivision (A)(ii), a subpoena may be authorized and issued by a committee or subcommittee under subparagraph (1)(B) in the conduct of an investigation or series of investigations or activities only when authorized by the committee or subcommittee, a majority being present. The power to authorize and issue subpoenas under subparagraph (1)(B) may be delegated to the chairman of the committee under such rules and under such limitations as the committee may prescribe. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the chairman of the committee or by a member designated by the committee.

(ii) In the case of a subcommittee of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, a subpoena may be authorized and issued only by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members.

(B) A subpoena duces tecum may specify terms of return other than at a meeting or hearing of the committee or subcommittee authorizing the subpoena.

(C) Compliance with a subpoena issued by a committee or subcommittee under subparagraph (1)(B) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

* * * * *

Audio and visual coverage of committee proceedings

4. (a) The purpose of this clause is to provide a means, in conformity with acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, and decorum, by which committee hearings or committee meetings that are open to the public may be covered by audio and visual means—

(1) for the education, enlightenment, and information of the general public, on the basis of accurate and impartial news coverage, regarding the operations, procedures, and practices of the House as a legislative and representative body, and regarding the measures, public issues, and other matters before the House and its committees, the consideration thereof, and the action taken thereon; and

(2) for the development of the perspective and understanding of the general public with respect to the role and function of the House under the Constitution as an institution of the Federal Government.

(b) In addition, it is the intent of this clause that radio and television tapes and television film of any coverage under this clause may not be used, or made available for use, as partisan political campaign material to promote or oppose the candidacy of any person for elective public office.

(c) It is, further, the intent of this clause that the general conduct of each meeting (whether of a hearing or otherwise) covered under authority of this clause by audio or visual means, and the personal behavior of the committee members and staff, other Government officials and personnel, witnesses, television, radio, and press media personnel, and the general public at the hearing or other meeting, shall be in strict conformity with and observance of the acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, courtesy, and decorum traditionally observed by the House in its operations, and may not be such as to—

(1) distort the objects and purposes of the hearing or other meeting or the activities of committee members in connection with that hearing or meeting or in connection with the general work of the committee or of the House; or

(2) cast discredit or dishonor on the House, the committee, or a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner or bring the House, the committee, or a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner into disrepute.

(d) The coverage of committee hearings and meetings by audio and visual means

shall be permitted and conducted only in strict conformity with the purposes, provisions, and requirements of this clause.

(e) Whenever a hearing or meeting conducted by a committee or subcommittee is open to the public, those proceedings shall be open to coverage by audio and visual means. A committee or subcommittee chairman may not limit the number of television or still cameras to fewer than two representatives from each medium (except for legitimate space or safety considerations, in which case pool coverage shall be authorized).

(f) Each committee shall adopt written rules to govern its implementation of this clause. Such rules shall contain provisions to the following effect:

(1) If audio or visual coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) The allocation among the television media of the positions or the number of television cameras permitted by a committee or subcommittee chairman in a hearing or meeting room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(3) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between a witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(4) Television cameras shall operate from fixed positions but may not be placed in positions that obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

(5) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media may not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the committee is in session.

(6)(A) Except as provided in subdivision (B), floodlights, spotlights, strobelights, and flashguns may not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting.

(B) The television media may install additional lighting in a hearing or meeting room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in a hearing or meeting room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of a hearing or meeting at the current state of the art of television coverage.

(7) In the allocation of the number of still photographers permitted by a committee or subcommittee chairman in a hearing or meeting room, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos and United Press International Newspictures. If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by a committee or subcommittee chairman for coverage of a hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be permitted on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(8) Photographers may not position themselves between the witness table and the members of the committee at any time during the course of a hearing or meeting.

(9) Photographers may not place themselves in positions that obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(10) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(11) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(12) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

Pay of witnesses

5. Witnesses appearing before the House or any of its committees shall be paid the same per diem rate as established, authorized, and regulated by the Committee on House Administration for Members, Delegates, the Resident Commissioner, and employees of the House, plus actual expenses of travel to or from the place of examination. Such per diem may not be paid when a witness has been summoned at the place of examination.

* * * * *

RULE XIII. CALENDARS AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

Caleendars

1. (a) All business reported by committees shall be referred to one of the following three calendars:

(1) A Calendar of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, to which shall be referred public bills and public resolutions raising revenue, involving a tax or charge on the people, directly or indirectly making appropriations of money or property or requiring such appropriations to be made, authorizing payments out of appropriations already made, releasing any liability to the United States for money or property, or referring a claim to the Court of Claims.

(2) A House Calendar, to which shall be referred all public bills and public resolutions not requiring referral to the Calendar of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

(3) A Private Calendar as provided in clause 5 of rule XV, to which shall be referred all private bills and private resolutions.

(b) There is established a Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees as provided in clause 2 of rule XV.

Filing and printing of reports

2. (a)(1) Except as provided in subparagraph (2), all reports of committees (other than those filed from the floor as privileged) shall be delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar under the direction of the Speaker in accordance with clause 1. The title or subject of each report shall be entered on the Journal and printed in the Congressional Record.

(2) A bill or resolution reported adversely shall be laid on the table unless a committee to which the bill or resolution was referred requests at the time of the report its referral to an appropriate calendar under clause 1 or unless, within three days thereafter, a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner makes such a request.

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

(2) In any event, the report of a committee on a measure that has been approved by the committee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which a written request for the filing of the report, signed by a majority of the members of the committee, has been filed with the clerk of the committee. The clerk of the committee shall immediately notify the chairman of the filing of such a request. This subparagraph does not apply to a report of the Committee on Rules with respect to a rule, joint rule, or order of business of the

House, or to the reporting of a resolution of inquiry addressed to the head of an executive department.

(c) All supplemental, minority, or additional views filed under clause 2(1) of rule XI by one or more members of a committee shall be included in, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the committee with respect to a measure or matter. When time guaranteed by clause 2(1) of rule XI has expired (or, if sooner, when all separate views have been received), the committee may arrange to file its report with the Clerk not later than one hour after the expiration of such time. This clause and provisions of clause 2(1) of rule XI do not preclude the immediate filing or printing of a committee report in the absence of a timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views as provided in clause 2(1) of rule XI.

Content of reports

3. (a)(1) Except as provided in subparagraph (2), the report of a committee on a measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume that—

(A) shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views that have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report; and

(B) shall bear on its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views (and any material submitted under paragraph (c)(3) or (4)) are included as part of the report.

(2) A committee may file a supplemental report for the correction of a technical error in its previous report on a measure or matter. A supplemental report only correcting errors in the depiction of record votes under paragraph (b) may be filed under this subparagraph and shall not be subject to the requirement in clause 4 concerning the availability of reports.

(b) With respect to each record vote on a motion to report a measure or matter of a public nature, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of members voting for and against, shall be included in the committee report. The preceding sentence does not apply to a report by the Committee on Rules on a rule, joint rule, or the order of business or to votes taken in executive session by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

(c) The report of a committee on a measure that has been approved by the committee shall include, separately set out and clearly identified, the following:

(1) Oversight findings and recommendations under clause 2(b)(1) of rule X.

(2) The statement required by section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, except that an estimate of new budget authority shall include, when practicable, a comparison of the total estimated funding level for the relevant programs to the appropriate levels under current law.

(3) An estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if timely submitted to the committee before the filing of the report.

(4) A statement of general performance goals and objectives, including outcome-related goals and objectives, for which the measure authorizes funding.

(d) Each report of a committee on a public bill or public joint resolution shall contain the following:

(1) A statement citing the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution.

(2)(A) An estimate by the committee of the costs that would be incurred in carrying out

the bill or joint resolution in the fiscal year in which it is reported and in each of the five fiscal years following that fiscal year (or for the authorized duration of any program authorized by the bill or joint resolution if less than five years);

(B) A comparison of the estimate of costs described in subdivision (A) made by the committee with any estimate of such costs made by a Government agency and submitted to such committee; and

(C) When practicable, a comparison of the total estimated funding level for the relevant programs with the appropriate levels under current law.

(3)(A) In subparagraph (2) the term "Government agency" includes any department, agency, establishment, wholly owned Government corporation, or instrumentality of the Federal Government or the government of the District of Columbia.

(B) Subparagraph (2) does not apply to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on House Administration, the Committee on Rules, or the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and does not apply when a cost estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 has been included in the report under paragraph (c)(3).

(e)(1) Whenever a committee reports a bill or joint resolution proposing to repeal or amend a statute or part thereof, it shall include in its report or in an accompanying document—

(A) the text of a statute or part thereof that is proposed to be repealed; and

(B) a comparative print of any part of the bill or joint resolution proposing to amend the statute and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions proposed.

(2) If a committee reports a bill or joint resolution proposing to repeal or amend a statute or part thereof with a recommendation that the bill or joint resolution be amended, the comparative print required by subparagraph (1) shall reflect the changes in existing law proposed to be made by the bill or joint resolution as proposed to be amended.

(f)(1) A report of the Committee on Appropriations on a general appropriation bill shall include—

(A) a concise statement describing the effect of any provision of the accompanying bill that directly or indirectly changes the application of existing law; and

(B) a list of all appropriations contained in the bill for expenditures not previously authorized by law for the period concerned (except classified intelligence or national security programs, projects, or activities) along with a statement of the last year for which such expenditures were authorized, the level of expenditures authorized for that year, the actual level of appropriations in the bill for such expenditures.

(2) Whenever the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution including matter specified in clause 1 (b)(2) or (3) of rule X, it shall include—

(A) in the bill or joint resolution, separate headings for "Rescissions" and "Transfers of Unexpended Balances" and

(B) in the report of the committee, a separate section listing such rescissions and transfers.

(g) Whenever the Committee on Rules reports a resolution proposing to repeal or amend a standing rule of the House, it shall include in its report or in an accompanying document—

(1) the text of any rule or part thereof that is proposed to be repealed; and

(2) a comparative print of any part of the resolution proposing to amend the rule and

of the rule or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions proposed.

(h)(1) It shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means that proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 unless—

(A) the report includes a tax complexity analysis prepared by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation in accordance with section 4022(b) of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998; or

(B) the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means causes such a tax complexity analysis to be printed in the Congressional Record before consideration of the bill or joint resolution.

(2)(A) It shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means that proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 unless—

(i) the report includes a macroeconomic impact analysis;

(ii) the report includes a statement from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation explaining why a macroeconomic impact analysis is not calculable; or

(iii) the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means causes a macroeconomic impact analysis to be printed in the Congressional Record before consideration of the bill or joint resolution.

(B) In subdivision (A), the term “macroeconomic impact analysis” means—

(i) an estimate prepared by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation of the changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and tax revenues expected to result from enactment of the proposal; and

(ii) a statement from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation identifying the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

Availability of reports

4. (a)(1) Except as specified in subparagraph (2), it shall not be in order to consider in the House a measure or matter reported by a committee until the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) on which each report of a committee on that measure or matter has been available to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner.

(2) Subparagraph (1) does not apply to—

(A) a resolution providing a rule, joint rule, or order of business reported by the Committee on Rules considered under clause 6;

(B) a resolution providing amounts from the applicable accounts described in clause 1 (i)(1) of rule X reported by the Committee on House Administration considered under clause 6 of rule X;

(C) a resolution presenting a question of the privileges of the House reported by any committee;

(D) a measure for the declaration of war, or the declaration of a national emergency, by Congress; and

(E) a measure providing for the disapproval of a decision, determination, or action by a Government agency that would become, or continue to be, effective unless disapproved or otherwise invalidated by one or both Houses of Congress. In this subdivision the term “Government agency” includes any department, agency, establishment, wholly owned Government corporation, or instrumentality of the Federal Government or of the government of the District of Columbia.

(b) A committee that reports a measure or matter shall make every reasonable effort to

have its hearings thereon (if any) printed and available for distribution to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner before the consideration of the measure or matter in the House.

(c) A general appropriation bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations may not be considered in the House until the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) on which printed hearings of the Committee on Appropriations thereon have been available to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner.

* * * * *

RULE XVI. MOTIONS AND AMENDMENTS

Motions

1. Every motion entertained by the Speaker shall be reduced to writing on the demand of a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner and, unless it is withdrawn the same day, shall be entered on the Journal with the name of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner offering it. A dilatory motion may not be entertained by the Speaker.

Withdrawal

2. When a motion is entertained, the Speaker shall state it or cause it to be read aloud by the Clerk before it is debated. The motion then shall be in the possession of the House but may be withdrawn at any time before a decision or amendment thereon.

Question of consideration

3. When a motion or proposition is entertained, the question, “Will the House now consider it?” may not be put unless demanded by a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner.

Precedence of motions

4. (a) When a question is under debate, only the following motions may be entertained (which shall have precedence in the following order):

- (1) To adjourn.
- (2) To lay on the table.
- (3) For the previous question.
- (4) To postpone to a day certain.
- (5) To refer.
- (6) To amend.
- (7) To postpone indefinitely.

(b) A motion to adjourn, to lay on the table, or for the previous question shall be decided without debate. A motion to postpone to a day certain, to refer, or to postpone indefinitely, being decided, may not be allowed again on the same day at the same stage of the question.

(c)(1) It shall be in order at any time for the Speaker, in his discretion, to entertain a motion—

(A) that the Speaker be authorized to declare a recess; or

(B) that when the House adjourns it stand adjourned to a day and time certain.

(2) Either motion shall be of equal privilege with the motion to adjourn and shall be decided without debate.

Divisibility

5. (a) Except as provided in paragraph (b), a question shall be divided on the demand of a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner before the question is put if it includes propositions so distinct in substance that, one being taken away, a substantive proposition remains.

(b)(1) A motion or resolution to elect members to a standing committee of the House, or to a joint standing committee, is not divisible.

(2) A resolution or order reported by the Committee on Rules providing a special order of business is not divisible.

(c) A motion to strike and insert is not divisible, but rejection of a motion to strike does not preclude another motion to amend.

Amendments

6. When an amendable proposition is under consideration, a motion to amend and a motion to amend that amendment shall be in order, and it also shall be in order to offer a further amendment by way of substitute for the original motion to amend, to which one amendment may be offered but which may not be voted on until the original amendment is perfected. An amendment may be withdrawn in the House at any time before a decision or amendment thereon. An amendment to the title of a bill or resolution shall not be in order until after its passage or adoption and shall be decided without debate.

Germaneness

7. No motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

Readings

8. Bills and joint resolutions are subject to readings as follows:

(a) A first reading is in full when the bill or joint resolution is first considered.

(b) A second reading occurs only when the bill or joint resolution is read for amendment in a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union under clause 5 of rule XVIII.

(c) A third reading precedes passage when the Speaker states the question: “Shall the bill [or joint resolution] be engrossed [when applicable] and read a third time?” If that question is decided in the affirmative, then the bill or joint resolution shall be read the final time by title and then the question shall be put on its passage.

* * * * *

RULE XIX. MOTIONS FOLLOWING THE AMENDMENT STAGE

Previous question

1. (a) There shall be a motion for the previous question, which, being ordered, shall have the effect of cutting off all debate and bringing the House to a direct vote on the immediate question or questions on which it has been ordered. Whenever the previous question has been ordered on an otherwise debatable question on which there has been no debate, it shall be in order to debate that question for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by a proponent of the question and an opponent. The previous question may be moved and ordered on a single question, on a series of questions allowable under the rules, or on an amendment or amendments, or may embrace all authorized motions or amendments and include the bill or resolution to its passage, adoption, or rejection.

(b) Incidental questions of order arising during the pendency of a motion for the previous question shall be decided, whether on appeal or otherwise, without debate.

Recommit

2. (a) After the previous question has been ordered on passage or adoption of a measure, or pending a motion to that end, it shall be in order to move that the House recommit (or commit, as the case may be) the measure, with or without instructions, to a standing or select committee. For such a motion to recommit, the Speaker shall give preference in recognition to a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who is opposed to the measure.

(b) Except as provided in paragraph (c), if a motion that the House recommit a bill or joint resolution on which the previous question has been ordered to passage includes instructions, it shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided between the proponent and an opponent.

(c) On demand of the floor manager for the majority, it shall be in order to debate the

motion for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

Reconsideration

3. When a motion has been carried or lost, it shall be in order on the same or succeeding day for a Member on the prevailing side of the question to enter a motion for the reconsideration thereof. The entry of such a motion shall take precedence over all other questions except the consideration of a conference report or a motion to adjourn, and may not be withdrawn after such succeeding day without the consent of the House. Once entered, a motion may be called up for consideration by any Member. During the last six days of a session of Congress, such a motion shall be disposed of when entered.

4. A bill, petition, memorial, or resolution referred to a committee, or reported therefrom for printing and recommitment, may not be brought back to the House on a motion to reconsider.

* * * * *

RULE XXI. RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN BILLS

Reservation of certain points of order

1. At the time a general appropriation bill is reported, all points of order against provisions therein shall be considered as reserved.

General appropriation bills and amendments

2. (a)(1) An appropriation may not be reported in a general appropriation bill, and may not be in order as an amendment thereto, for an expenditure not previously authorized by law, except to continue appropriations for public works and objects that are already in progress.

(2) A reappropriation of unexpended balances of appropriations may not be reported in a general appropriation bill, and may not be in order as an amendment thereto, except to continue appropriations for public works and objects that are already in progress. This subparagraph does not apply to transfers of unexpended balances within the department or agency for which they were originally appropriated that are reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

(b) A provision changing existing law may not be reported in a general appropriation bill, including a provision making the availability of funds contingent on the receipt or possession of information not required by existing law for the period of the appropriation, except germane provisions that retrench expenditures by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill (which may include those recommended to the Committee on Appropriations by direction of a legislative committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter) and except rescissions of appropriations contained in appropriation Acts.

(c) An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law, including an amendment making the availability of funds contingent on the receipt or possession of information not required by existing law for the period of the appropriation. Except as provided in paragraph (d), an amendment proposing a limitation not specifically contained or authorized in existing law for the period of the limitation shall not be in order during consideration of a general appropriation bill.

(d) After a general appropriation bill has been read for amendment, a motion that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted shall, if offered by the Majority Leader or a designee, have precedence over motions to amend the bill. If such a motion to rise and report is rejected or not offered, amendments proposing limitations not specifically contained or authorized in existing

law for the period of the limitation or proposing germane amendments that retrench expenditures by reductions of amounts of money covered by the bill may be considered.

(e) A provision other than an appropriation designated an emergency under section 251(b)(2) or section 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act, a rescission of budget authority, or a reduction in direct spending or an amount for a designated emergency may not be reported in an appropriation bill or joint resolution containing an emergency designation under section 251(b)(2) or section 252(e) of such Act and may not be in order as an amendment thereto.

(f) During the reading of an appropriation bill for amendment in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, it shall be in order to consider en bloc amendments proposing only to transfer appropriations among objects in the bill without increasing the levels of budget authority or outlays in the bill. When considered en bloc under this paragraph, such amendments may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment (following disposition of any points of order against such portions) and is not subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Transportation obligation limitations

3. It shall not be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that would cause obligation limitations to be below the level for any fiscal year set forth in section 8103 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, as adjusted, for the highway category or the mass transit category, as applicable.

Appropriations on legislative bills

4. A bill or joint resolution carrying an appropriation may not be reported by a committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations, and an amendment proposing an appropriation shall not be in order during the consideration of a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee not having that jurisdiction. A point of order against an appropriation in such a bill, joint resolution, or amendment thereto may be raised at any time during pendency of that measure for amendment.

Tax and tariff measures and amendments

5. (a)(1) A bill or joint resolution carrying a tax or tariff measure may not be reported by a committee not having jurisdiction to report tax or tariff measures, and an amendment in the House or proposed by the Senate carrying a tax or tariff measure shall not be in order during the consideration of bill or joint resolution reported by a committee not having that jurisdiction. A point of order against a tax or tariff measure in such a bill, joint resolution, or amendment thereto may be raised at any time during pendency of that measure for amendment.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), a tax or tariff measure includes an amendment proposing a limitation on funds in a general appropriation bill for the administration of a tax or tariff.

Passage of tax rate increases

(b) A bill or joint resolution, amendment, or conference report carrying a Federal income tax rate increase may not be considered as passed or agreed to unless so determined by a vote of not less than three-fifths of the Members voting, a quorum being present. In this paragraph the term "Federal income tax rate increase" means any amendment to subsection (a), (b), (c), (d), or (e) of section 1, or to section 11(b) or 55(b), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, that imposes a new percentage as a rate of tax and there-

by increases the amount of tax imposed by any such section.

Consideration of retroactive tax rate increases

(c) It shall not be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report carrying a retroactive Federal income tax rate increase. In this paragraph—

(1) the term "Federal income tax rate increase" means any amendment to subsection (a), (b), (c), (d), or (e) of section 1, or to section 11(b) or 55(b), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, that imposes a new percentage as a rate of tax and thereby increases the amount of tax imposed by any such section; and

(2) a Federal income tax rate increase is retroactive if it applies to a period beginning before the enactment of the provision.

Designation of public works

6. It shall not be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for the designation or redesignation of a public work in honor of an individual then serving as a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, or Senator.

Reconciliation

7. It shall not be in order to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget, or an amendment thereto, or a conference report thereon that contains reconciliation directives under section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 that specify changes in law reducing the surplus or increasing the deficit for either the period comprising the current fiscal year and the five fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year that ends in the following calendar year. In determining whether reconciliation directives specify changes in law reducing the surplus or increasing the deficit, the sum of the directives for each reconciliation bill (under section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) envisioned by that measure shall be evaluated.

Applying points of order under Budget Act to bills and joint resolutions considered under special rules

8. With respect to measures considered pursuant to a special order of business, points of order under title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall operate without regard to whether the measure concerned has been reported from committee. Such points of order shall operate with respect to (as the case may be)—

(a) the form of a measure recommended by the reporting committee where the statute uses the term "as reported" (in the case of a measure that has been so reported);

(b) the form of the measure made in order as an original bill or joint resolution for the purpose of amendment; or

(c) the form of the measure on which the previous question is ordered directly to passage.

Point of order against congressional earmarks

9. (a) It shall not be in order to consider—

(1) a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee unless the report includes a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the bill or in the report (and the name of any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who submitted a request to the committee for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits;

(2) a bill or joint resolution not reported by a committee unless the chairman of each committee of initial referral has caused a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the bill (and the name of any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who submitted a

request to the committee for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits to be printed in the Congressional Record prior to its consideration;

(3) an amendment to a bill or joint resolution to be offered at the outset of its consideration for amendment by a member of a committee of initial referral as designated in a report of the Committee on Rules to accompany a resolution prescribing a special order of business unless the proponent has caused a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the amendment (and the name of any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who submitted a request to the proponent for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits to be printed in the Congressional Record prior to its consideration; or

(4) a conference report to accompany a bill or joint resolution unless the joint explanatory statement prepared by the managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate includes a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the conference report or joint statement (and the name of any Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, or Senator who submitted a request to the House or Senate committees of jurisdiction for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits.

(b) It shall not be in order to consider a rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (a). As disposition of a point of order under this paragraph, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (a). The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn.

(c) In order to be cognizable by the Chair, a point of order raised under paragraph (a) may be based only on the failure of a report, submission to the Congressional Record, or joint explanatory statement to include a list required by paragraph (a) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits.

(d) For the purpose of this clause, the term "congressional earmark" means a provision or report language included primarily at the request of a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, or Senator providing, authorizing or recommending a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority for a contract, loan, loan guarantee, grant, loan authority, or other expenditure with or to any entity, or targeted to a specific State, locality or Congressional district, other than through a statutory or administrative formula-driven or competitive award process.

(e) For the purpose of this clause, the term "limited tax benefit" means—

(1) any revenue-losing provision that—
(A) provides a Federal tax deduction, credit, exclusion, or preference to 10 or fewer beneficiaries under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and

(B) contains eligibility criteria that are not uniform in application with respect to potential beneficiaries of such provision; or

(2) any Federal tax provision which provides one beneficiary temporary or perma-

nent transition relief from a change to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(f) For the purpose of this clause, the term "limited tariff benefit" means a provision modifying the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States in a manner that benefits 10 or fewer entities.

10. It shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report if the provisions of such measure affecting direct spending and revenues have the net effect of increasing the deficit or reducing the surplus for either the period comprising the current fiscal year and the five fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year that ends in the following calendar year or the period comprising the current fiscal year and the ten fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year that ends in the following calendar year. The effect of such measure on the deficit or surplus shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget relative to—

(a) the most recent baseline estimates supplied by the Congressional Budget Office consistent with section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 used in considering a concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(b) after the beginning of a new calendar year and before consideration of a concurrent resolution on the budget, the most recent baseline estimates supplied by the Congressional Budget Office consistent with section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RULE XXII. HOUSE AND SENATE RELATIONS

* * * * *

11. It shall not be in order to consider a conference report to accompany a bill or joint resolution that proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 unless—

(a) the joint explanatory statement of the managers includes a tax complexity analysis prepared by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation in accordance with section 4022(b) of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998; or

(b) the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means causes such a tax complexity analysis to be printed in the Congressional Record before consideration of the conference report.

12. (a)(1) Subject to subparagraph (2), a meeting of each conference committee shall be open to the public.

(2) In open session of the House, a motion that managers on the part of the House be permitted to close to the public a meeting or meetings of their conference committee shall be privileged, shall be decided without debate, and shall be decided by a record vote.

(b) A point of order that a conference committee failed to comply with paragraph (a) may be raised immediately after the conference report is read or considered as read. If such a point of order is sustained, the conference report shall be considered as rejected, the House shall be considered to have insisted on its amendments or on disagreement to the Senate amendments, as the case may be, and to have requested a further conference with the Senate, and the Speaker may appoint new conferees without intervening motion.

(3) In conducting conferences with the Senate, managers on the part of the House should endeavor to ensure—

(A) that meetings for the resolution of differences between the two Houses occur only under circumstances in which every manager on the part of the House has notice of the meeting and a reasonable opportunity to attend;

(B) that all provisions on which the two Houses disagree are considered as open to discussion at any meeting of a conference committee; and

(C) that papers reflecting a conference agreement are held inviolate to change without renewal of the opportunity of all managers on the part of the House to reconsider their decisions to sign or not to sign the agreement.

(4) Managers on the part of the House shall be provided a unitary time and place with access to at least one complete copy of the final conference agreement for the purpose of recording their approval (or not) of the final conference agreement by placing their signatures (or not) on the sheets prepared to accompany the conference report and joint explanatory statement of the managers.

13. It shall not be in order to consider a conference report the text of which differs in any way, other than clerical, from the text that reflects the action of the conferees on all of the differences between the two Houses, as recorded by their placement of their signatures (or not) on the sheets prepared to accompany the conference report and joint explanatory statement of the managers.

RULE XXVII. STATUTORY LIMIT ON PUBLIC DEBT

1. Upon adoption by Congress of a concurrent resolution on the budget under section 301 or 304 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 that sets forth, as the appropriate level of the public debt for the period to which the concurrent resolution relates, an amount that is different from the amount of the statutory limit on the public debt that otherwise would be in effect for that period, the Clerk shall prepare an engrossment of a joint resolution increasing or decreasing, as the case may be, the statutory limit on the public debt in the form prescribed in clause 2. Upon engrossment of the joint resolution, the vote by which the concurrent resolution on the budget was finally agreed to in the House shall also be considered as a vote on passage of the joint resolution in the House, and the joint resolution shall be considered as passed by the House and duly certified and examined. The engrossed copy shall be signed by the Clerk and transmitted to the Senate for further legislative action.

2. The matter after the resolving clause in a joint resolution described in clause 1 shall be as follows: "That subsection (b) of section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking out the dollar limitation contained in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof '\$___', with the blank being filled with a dollar limitation equal to the appropriate level of the public debt set forth pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in the relevant concurrent resolution described in clause 1. If an adopted concurrent resolution under clause 1 sets forth different appropriate levels of the public debt for separate periods, only one engrossed joint resolution shall be prepared under clause 1; and the blank referred to in the preceding sentence shall be filled with the limitation that is to apply for each period.

3. (a) The report of the Committee on the Budget on a concurrent resolution described in clause 1 and the joint explanatory statement of the managers on a conference report to accompany such a concurrent resolution each shall contain a clear statement of the effect the eventual enactment of a joint resolution engrossed under this rule would have on the statutory limit on the public debt.

(b) It shall not be in order for the House to consider a concurrent resolution described in clause 1, or a conference report thereon, unless the report of the Committee on the Budget or the joint explanatory statement of the managers complies with paragraph a).

4. Nothing in this rule shall be construed as limiting or otherwise affecting—

(a) the power of the House or the Senate to consider and pass bills or joint resolutions,

without regard to the procedures under clause 1, that would change the statutory limit on the public debt; or

(b) the rights of Members, Delegates, the Resident Commissioner, or committees with respect to the introduction, consideration, and reporting of such bills or joint resolutions.

5. In this rule the term "statutory limit on the public debt" means the maximum face amount of obligations issued under authority of chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, and obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States (except such guaranteed obligations as may be held by the Secretary of the Treasury), as determined under section 3101(b) of such title after the application of section 3101(a) of such title, that may be outstanding at any one time.

* * * * *

□ 1500

OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) works very hard on organizing our Truth Squad and making sure that we are getting the word out about what needs to be gotten out in terms of the issues that are important, I think, to the American people. We are going to talk about the economy and what is happening to the economy in the United States, and I want to talk a little bit about that to begin with until Mr. PRICE gets here, and I probably will recognize my colleague from Tennessee, who is also here to speak on this issue, and ask him if he would share some comments.

The first thing I want to say is that our economy is in wonderful, wonderful shape. It is the best economy that we have had in this country for many, many years. Now, a major reason that the economy is in such great shape is because of the tax cuts of 2001 and 2003. I was not here when those tax cuts were passed, but I am very pleased that they were passed and that they brought about such a positive economy for this country. We have the lowest unemployment rate that we have had in 50 years. We have growth in all sectors. We have more people owning their homes than have ever owned them before. Incomes are up and revenues are up.

And I want to say something about revenues, using some information from the Heritage Foundation. Tax revenues in 2006 were 18.4 percent of gross domestic product, which is above the 20-year, 40-year and 60-year historical averages. The inflation-adjusted 20 percent tax revenue increase between 2004 and 2006 represents the largest 2-year revenue surge since 1965 and 1967.

There is a myth out there that tax revenues are low. Tax revenues are actually above the historical average, even after the tax cuts. We know that

tax cuts are good for this economy; they are always good for the economy. The more money that we leave in the hands and the pockets of our taxpayers, the better off we are. When the government appropriates that money and spends it, the government is very inefficient in its spending of that money, and that does not grow the economy, contrary to what many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like to say.

We are going to talk again more and more about the economy and the fact that it is in very good shape. And it is very unfortunate that the economy doesn't get the positive press that the economy has gotten under Democratic Presidents, when in fact most of the time the results of the good economy are coming from a Republican Congress, which knows how to do things in terms of growing the economy.

I would like to recognize now my colleague from Tennessee, who is here to make a presentation on this issue, also. I know that he will bring some enlightened points to the discussion.

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Thank you, Ms. FOXX. I appreciate your leadership and your friendship just across the mountain in North Carolina from Tennessee. And thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to speak today.

It is an interesting time in America; things are going well in the economy. It is going well because Americans are working hard. I grew up in an era of politics looking back at Ronald Reagan, who was a great President. And as we all know, his birthday is today. If you go back 96 years ago was the date of his birth. And one of his quotes was, We don't have a trillion dollar debt because we haven't taxed enough, we have a trillion dollar debt because we spend too much. And I think that is a good starting point as we look towards our economy and how we run this Congress and how we work for the people across America.

Revenues are coming in at a record pace. If we continue the pace that we are at now, we will actually be able to balance our budget by the year 2012 without raising taxes; and I think that is exactly what the American people would like to see. I think they want us to hold the line on spending, I think they want a pro-growth economy, and they want a good, sound financial policy.

If you look at the Congressional Budget Office, the CBO, which is non-partisan, it confirmed just last week that tax cuts of 2003 have helped boost our Federal revenues by 68 percent. That is good news. There are other signals that keeping taxes low, coupled with fiscal restraint and economic growth, help move us forward and help us balance our budget; and we can do that and take care of that deficit that we have.

If you look at some other statistics that are vitally important, our economy has grown for 21 straight quarters.

That is rather impressive. And in the period between 2004 and 2006, Federal tax revenues rose the largest margin in nearly 40 years, not because we had raised taxes, but because we had lowered taxes. In addition to that, the deficit has been cut in half 2 years early, or ahead of schedule. That is good news for Americans. I think that is the type of leadership that America is looking for.

If you look at the way you balance a budget, like a small business does back in east Tennessee, or a family sitting around the kitchen table, and they have a small budget, their budget is tight, they are trying to decide what they need to do, they have to decide, do you cut what you spend or do you bring in additional revenue. And most people understand, as they sit around their kitchen table, you have to hold the line on spending; you can't spend more than you make, unlike government.

I am excited about a good starting point that we see from the President in his budget. It calls for making the 2001-2003 tax relief provisions permanent. I think that is exactly what the American people want. And if we do that, the administration projects total revenue to grow an average of 5.4 percent per year. The way we maintain this healthy economy that we have today is keep tax cuts permanent; that is what the American people want us to do.

We really have a simple choice, Mr. Speaker: we have the choice between a bigger economy or bigger government. And I really believe that if we look forward, what the American people want is us to hold the line on spending, hold the line on increasing the taxes and allow the economy to work the way it has worked in the past and the way it is working today.

We also need to work very hard to make sure that we hold the line not only on spending, but we need to take a good strong look in a bipartisan way at reducing earmarks. I think we need to pass the line item veto. And if we do that, it will allow the President to have better control of how tax dollars are spent.

I would also like to see a biennial budget process where we can actually sit back and let this House and this Congress take a breathing period from every other year and to find out if what we are doing works. And back in Tennessee, as State legislature, I was a State representative for 8 years, we had a balanced budget amendment in our constitution. We couldn't spend more than we brought in. And I signed on as a cosponsor to House Joint Resolution 1, which calls for a balanced budget amendment right here at the Federal level. I think that is exactly what the American people are looking for.

And, again, going back to what Ronald Reagan had to say, just to reiterate, President Reagan said: "We don't have a trillion dollar debt because we haven't taxed enough, we have a trillion dollar debt because we

spend too much." And if we can remember that in this body and over in the Senate and we pass a good balanced budget that would take care of the deficit without raising taxes, I think the American people would be very pleased.

Ms. FOXX. I thank Mr. DAVIS, the gentleman from Tennessee, for his remarks. And I appreciate his being involved and sharing some information with us that is so important. This is his first term, and he has done a wonderful job.

He is my neighbor to the west. His district in Tennessee joins the 5th District in North Carolina. We both live in a wonderful, wonderful place. Every time somebody speaks to me about where I live, they say, what a beautiful place you live in, and I feel that way about it. And I want to say that it is a great honor to serve in Congress, but I can tell you that my feet are planted very firmly on the ground in the 5th District of North Carolina, and I don't ever forget where I came from and the people that I represent.

I want to talk a little bit on this issue about the economy that Mr. PRICE set up today for the Truth Squad. And I know he is going to be here probably very shortly, and when he does I am going to yield back to the Chair and hope that the Chair will recognize him so that he can continue this discussion.

I want to talk a little bit today about the economy and an egregious situation that we are facing here in the Congress as it deals with unions. I have come to the floor several times in this session and talked about what I consider the hypocrisy that is going on in this Congress by the majority party. We are having black called white and white called black in terms of pieces of things on the paper. It is astonishing to me the hypocrisy that is going on. And I think there is probably no more greater piece of hypocrisy than this so-called Employee Free Choice Act which has been introduced by the Democrats. It deals with the ability for unions to twist people's arms to get them into unions.

The unions have been steadily losing ground in this country for many, many years. My understanding is that the percentage and number of U.S. workers that belong to unions declined again in 2006, after having stabilized a little bit in 2005. BLS data show that only 13 percent of all construction workers were members of building trade unions, and that is down from 18 percent in 2001.

There is a steady erosion in the percentage of construction workers represented by unions in the past 23 years. What is happening is because the unions are losing membership, they want to take away the secret ballot.

I am going to enter into the RECORD today several different pieces which I have in front of me that I am quoting from. I am going to quote from a Wall Street Journal article of February 2, and from some other information

which I will enter into the RECORD. But I want to read the beginning of this article from the Wall Street Journal because I think it is so pertinent. It says: "Why is the new Congress in such a hurry to take away workers' right to vote?" It seems extraordinary, but the so-called Employee Free Choice Act is right there near the top of the Democrats' agenda. This legislation replaces government-sponsored secret ballot elections for union representation with a public card-signing system.

One of the reasons that union membership is down so much in this country is because of the abuses of the unions, and also because our economy is so good. And, again, I think that Representative PRICE is going to talk more about the economy. I mentioned earlier that it is the best that it has ever been in terms of wages, in terms of income and wages and homeownership and the burden that we place on the American people from the government. But people don't need to join unions like they needed to 125 years ago or so. We did have abuses in this country by employers, and I am very sorry about that, but those abuses don't go on anymore, and people are finding out they don't have to belong to unions.

But the Democrats, who are so beholden to unions, want to take the right of a secret ballot, which is so fundamental to us in this country, and which they argue for on this floor for voters, and they want to take it away from union members or people who are thinking about forming a union. And I, again, want to make some quotes, because this article is so excellent.

Most important, it is totally unreasonable to deny all 140 million American workers the right to a secret ballot election because some employers break the law. Yes, occasionally somebody may not do what they are supposed to do. Not only is such a remedy disproportionate, it is counterproductive. If one goal is worker empowerment, how can a worker be better off if both his employer and his prospective union boss know his views on the union when the secret ballot is replaced with a public card signing? For the worker, it is the ultimate example of being caught between a rock and a hard place.

□ 1515

Mr. EDWARDS, who is running for President, has said that if you can join the Republican Party, you should be able to join a union by simply signing a card. But Mr. EDWARDS' analogy is a very false one, because signing a card to join the Republican Party does not oblige you to vote for the Republican ticket in a secret ballot election. And I quote again from the article from the Wall Street Journal: "The Employee Free Choice Act would take care of that by abolishing such elections. If the Edwards principle was applied to the political process in the 28 non-right to work States, Karl Rove and Repub-

lican Party organizers could force all Democrats and Independents to become Republicans and pay dues to the party if a majority of voters signed Republican cards. That's free choice?"

The final proof that this bill is about union power and not worker choice is revealed by its treatment of the flip side of unionization: decertification elections. These are secret ballot elections in which workers get to decide that they have had enough of the union. Under the Employee Free Choice, can a majority of workers decertify the union by signing a card? Not on your life. Here, unions want the chance to engage in a campaign to give workers both sides of the story and maybe do a better job of representing them before the union's fate is decided by a secret ballot vote.

Again, the hypocrisy is absolutely mind-boggling, and is just one more example. We have bills called one thing and they do another. It just goes on and on and on. But I think it is very important that we point out this particular hypocrisy, because the title of this bill, the Employee Free Choice Act, is I think particularly egregious in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

[From the Wall Street Journal Online, Feb. 2, 2007]

ABROGATING WORKERS' RIGHTS

(By Lawrence B. Lindsey)

Why is the new Congress in such a hurry to take away workers' right to vote? It seems extraordinary, but the so-called "Employee Free Choice Act" is right there near the top of the Democrats' agenda. This legislation replaces government-sponsored secret ballot elections for union representation with a public card-signing system.

Under the act, once a union gets a majority of the workers to sign a card expressing a desire for a union, that union is automatically certified as the bargaining representative of, and empowered to negotiate on behalf of, all workers. In the 28 states that do not have right-to-work laws, all employees would typically end up having to join the union or pay the equivalent of union dues whether or not they signed the card. Moreover, under the act, the bargaining process would be shortened, with mandatory use of the Federal Mediation service after 90 days and an imposed contract through binding arbitration 30 days after that.

I am sympathetic to the argument that strengthening the negotiating position of workers is good public policy, and that expanding the choices available to them is the best way to accomplish that. So, for example, pension portability unlocks the golden handcuffs that financially bind workers to jobs they may become dissatisfied with after they have become vested. Health savings accounts are an important first step to liberating people from jobs they put up with only because they fear a disruption in health-care coverage.

When it comes to unions, it doesn't take a very deep appreciation of game theory to understand that a worker's best position comes when a nonunion company has a union knocking on the door. Indeed, one allegation about "union busting" by supporters of the bill is that, during union certification elections, one employer in five "gave illegal previously unscheduled wage increases while a similar number made some kind of illegal unilateral change in benefits or working conditions."

In other words, they made workers better off. But, never fear, the Employee Free Choice Act will limit these unconscionable increases in pay, benefits and working conditions by imposing fines of up to \$20,000 against employers who make such “unilateral changes.” Similar penalties will be assessed against employers who caution that unionization may cause them to shut down or move production elsewhere.

Sometimes the interests of workers and unions coincide, sometimes they do not. The chief complaint by the bill’s sponsors is that unions only win secret-ballot elections half of the time. Apparently workers, after they think things over and when neither the union nor the company knows how they vote, often decide they are better-off without the union. The solution of the Employee Free Choice Act is to do away with such elections. It is hard to see how that “empowers” workers. And it is hard not to conclude that this bill has little to do with employee choice or maximizing employee leverage, and everything to do with empowering union bosses and organizers.

The unions allege that companies use unfair election campaign tactics and that a pro-employer National Labor Relations Board doesn’t punish them. But statistics cited by the leftwing Web site, Daily Kos, on behalf of this allegation come from 1998 and 1999—when the entire NLRB had been appointed by President Clinton. In any event, roughly half the injunctions brought against companies by the NLRB were overturned by federal courts: This does not suggest underenforcement of the law by the NLRB.

All of this does not mean that there are no legitimate complaints about the union certification process. Companies have been found that fired workers for union organizing activities. One careful examination of NLRB data found that there were 62 such cases in fiscal 2005. This is not a large number in a work force of 140 million, or in a year where there were more than 2,300 certification elections. But it is 62 too many, and it would be reasonable to stiffen the penalties for employers who break the law. But it is hard to think of offering more pay or better worker conditions as something that should be punished with draconian penalties, as the Employee Free Choice Act does.

Most important, it is totally unreasonable to deny all 140 million American workers the right to a secret ballot election because some employers break the law. Not only is such a remedy disproportionate, it is counterproductive—if one’s goal is worker empowerment. How can a worker be better off if both his employer and his prospective union boss know his views on the union when the secret ballot is replaced with a public card signing? For the worker it is the ultimate example of being caught between a rock and a hard place.

The political rhetoric in support of this bill is a willful exercise in obfuscation. For example, on the presidential campaign stump John Edwards says, “if you can join the Republican Party by just signing a card, you should be able to join a union by just signing a card.” The fact is, you—and everyone else—can join any union you want by just signing a card, and paying union dues and meeting any other obligations imposed by the union. But, under this bill, contrary to Mr. Edwards’s false analogy, signing a card to join the Republican Party does not oblige you to vote for the Republican ticket in a secret ballot election. The Employee Free Choice Act would take care of that by abolishing such elections. If the Edwards principle was applied to the political process in the 28 non-right-to-work states, Karl Rove and Republican Party organizers could force all Democrats and independents to become

Republicans and pay dues to the party if a majority of voters signed Republican Party cards. That is free choice?

The final proof that this bill is about union power, and not worker choice, is revealed by its treatment of the flip side of unionization: decertification elections. These are secret ballot elections in which workers get to decide that they have had enough of the union. So under the Employee Free Choice Act can a majority of workers decertify the union by signing a card? Not on your life. Here unions want the chance to engage in a campaign to give workers both sides of the story—and maybe do a better job of representing them—before the union’s fate is decided, by a secret-ballot vote.

No one has ever argued that secret-ballot elections are a perfect mechanism, either in politics or in deciding unionization. But they are far and away the best mechanism we have devised to minimize intimidation and maximize the power of the people to really matter, whether citizen or worker. Congress should think a lot harder before it decides to do away with workers’ right to vote.

[From the Coalition for a Democratic Workplace]

THE SO-CALLED “EMPLOYEE FREE CHOICE ACT” UNION LEADERS’ RHETORIC VS. THE FACTS

Union Rhetoric: Secret ballot elections take too long and delays of months or years are common.

Facts: The average time for an election to be held is just 39 days and 94 percent of elections are held within 56 days. The rare exceptions that take longer hardly justify abandoning the entire secret ballot election process.

Union Rhetoric: Card check procedures are the most effective way to determine the wishes of a majority of employees.

Facts: Federal courts have repeatedly ruled that secret ballot elections are the most foolproof method of ascertaining whether a union has the support of a majority of employees, noting that, workers sometimes sign cards not because they intend to vote for the union in an election, but to avoid offending the person who asks them to sign (often a fellow worker), or simply to get the person off their back.

Union Rhetoric: Employers illegally fire employees in 25 to 30 percent of all organizing drives.

Facts: Those who falsely claim employers illegally fire a large number of employees during organizing drives cite to two studies, one by Cornell professor Kate Bronfenbrenner and another commissioned by the pro-union group American Rights at Work. Unfortunately, these reports are in fact surveys of uncorroborated reports of union organizers—hardly an unbiased source. National Labor Relations Board statistics show that employees are illegally fired in just over one in 100 (1 percent) organizing drives. Furthermore, if the NLRB finds that an employer illegally fired workers during an organizing drive it has the power to order the employer to recognize and bargain with the union, even if the union lost the election.

Union Rhetoric: The secret ballot election process enables employers to wage bitter anti-union campaigns.

Facts: In almost nine out of ten cases the employer and union reach agreement on the most contentious issues surrounding union elections: the scope of the bargaining unit (who is eligible to vote), and the date and time of the election.

Union Rhetoric: In an election, management has total access to the list of employees at all times, while union supporters may have access very late in the process to a list that is often inaccurate.

Facts: Employers are required to submit complete and accurate lists of employees within one week of the determination that an election will be held. The list is then provided to the union. If the employer fails to provide the list or the list is inaccurate, the Board can set aside the election and order another, especially if errors involve a determinative number of voters.

Union Rhetoric: The Employee Free Choice Act gives employees the option of using a card-check system; it does not replace the secret ballot election. Employees are still free to choose a secret ballot process.

Facts: The card-check process does not give employees a choice at all. Instead, it gives union organizers the choice of whether to organize through a card check process. If the union chose to submit authorization cards, workers would be barred from seeking an election. In addition, the card check process can cut up to almost half of all employees out of the organizing process because the union only needs signatures from a simple majority in order to gain collective bargaining rights. During the card-check process, those employees who do not want a union do not have a voice and are in effect removed from the process of making decisions about their own jobs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for the remaining time as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor again today and appreciate the confidence of my leadership in allowing me to organize this hour and come chat a little bit with our Members here and to point out some interesting information in another edition of the Official Truth Squad.

The Official Truth Squad is a group of individuals who try to come to the floor on this side of the aisle at least once a week in an effort to bring some truths and some facts to the items that we talk about on this floor. I know it won’t surprise you, Mr. Speaker, but oftentimes some of the things we hear on this floor aren’t necessarily the truth. So what we try to do is to point out items that are of importance in terms of information to the American people and how we on this floor ought to be making decisions on their behalf.

And in so doing, we have a number of individuals we like to point to as kind of leaders in the public arena, both present and past, who have had as one of their hallmarks making certain that they discussed truth and made certain that they used facts in developing their positions.

One of my favorite quotes comes from Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, former United States Senator from New York, and he had a quote that said: “Everyone is entitled to their own opinion but not their own facts.” I think that is incredibly important as we talk about this issue that we are discussing today, the economy and the budget and issues that relate to how Washington spends hard-earned taxpayer money.

One of the most important facts is it is the taxpayers’ money, it is not the

government's. And there are many people who are here in Washington who believe that somehow, just by some miraculous nature, when the money is sent to Washington that somehow it becomes the government's money. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would hope you would agree with me that in fact it is the taxpayers' money and we need to spend it very, very wisely.

One of the other relative issues that I think has seen a lot of naysayers and a lot of misinformation is the state of our economy right now. If you ask folks, most people across this Nation will say that their own economic situation is pretty good and they feel pretty good about the future. If you ask them how the economy in the Nation is going, the majority of them say that it is not going well at all. And that, I believe, to be in large part due to much of the messaging that comes out of Washington. Our good friends on the other side of the aisle have been down-talking this economy for years, literally years.

So I was curious that over the weekend the Wall Street Journal had an editorial that they entitled: "The Current 'Depression,'" and they used "depression" in quotes, because if you really look at the numbers, if you look at the facts, Mr. Speaker, they kind of belie the naysayers in what they have been saying: 110,000 new jobs in January, 41 straight months of job growth in this Nation. The average job growth in 2006 was 187,000 jobs; 2.2 million new jobs in 2006, and 7.4 million new jobs since 2003; 7.4 million new jobs since 2003.

When you compare this expansion to the expansion that all sorts of folks talk about as being the be-all and the end-all, and that is with the expansion of the 1990s, when you compare this expansion, the expansion that we are currently in, the economic success that we are currently in is better when you look at many, many parameters.

Unemployment, for example. The first six years of the 1990s, 1991 through 1996, had an average unemployment rate of 6.4 percent. The average unemployment rate for the first 6 years of this decade: 5.4 percent. And as you know, Mr. Speaker, that unemployment rate is at 4.6 percent. And the last time I looked, if the average unemployment rate is 4.6 percent, it means that 95.4 percent of folks are working.

Real wage growth. Our friends on the other side of the aisle often talk about, well, this is a recovery, an economy that isn't resulting in real jobs; the wage growth isn't occurring, people's wages aren't increasing. Well, if you compare it to the vaunted years of the early 1990s, real wage growth for those first 6 years averaged 0.6 percent per year increase. 2001 through 2006, real wage growth in this Nation up 1.5 percent, and last year it was 1.7 percent increase. And that is accounting for inflation. It is accounting for inflation, Mr. Speaker.

Now, one might want to ask, given the success of the current economy,

how did that happen? What happened? How did that occur? How are we seeing the kind of results in the economy, the good news that we are currently seeing?

And I am fond of using charts because I think that they paint a picture that is oftentimes, at least for me, easier to comprehend and easier to get my arms around. This is a chart that runs from 2000 through 2006, and we are going to update the numbers for this most recent quarter. But what it shows here on this vertical line, this dotted green vertical line is when we began this remarkable expansion. And what occurred on that at that point was, you guessed it, Mr. Speaker, appropriate tax reductions for the American people. So when you decrease taxes, what happens is that the blue line, you get more jobs; the red line, you get increasing business investment; and, lo and behold, something that President Kennedy knew and President Reagan knew, when you decrease taxes, which occurred at the nadir of this graph here, what happens is that you increase government revenue.

It sounds counterintuitive, but in fact it isn't. If you decrease taxes, if you allow individuals to have more of their hard-earned money, what happens is that the economy grows and, because of that, tax revenue flows to the Federal Government.

Now, an individual who is joining us today for this edition of the Official Truth Squad, an individual who is a new member of our conference from California who knows a lot about taxes and a lot about the issue of taxes and how they affect us on a daily basis, I am pleased to ask my friend Kevin McCarthy from California to join us and give us some insight into exactly where those taxes come from and how often we are taxed. I think that is the kind of truth and facts you would like to bring to us today.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

I do come from California and I am a new Member, and I think as is only fitting we are talking about how letting people keep their hard-earned money, how jobs grow, revenue grows, and individuals can spend the money on what they desire, like putting their kids through college. But we would be remiss if we didn't mention this day, because I think it is rather ironic. Today is the 96th birthday of Ronald Reagan, and nobody finer than that talked about taxes and talked about which way they went. And President Ronald Reagan was actually Governor of California at one time. That is where I come from prior to serving in this House; I served in the State assembly. And when I got elected to the State assembly, we had a \$36 billion deficit.

And much like the other side of the aisle here, the other side of the aisle there, their answer was to raise taxes. We sat down, the Republicans, and crafted a bill that actually proposed a

budget that didn't raise taxes. It gave incentives that let people keep more of what they earned. We have seen revenues continue to grow. We are now about out of our deficit, which was fundamentally the biggest one they have ever had, and it has continued to move forward that we were able to bring more revenues in.

But I want to put forth really the graphs you have been talking about, put it into everyday life, put it into where people understand it. Where you saw that graph continue to take off, that is when the tax cut happened.

Now, what does that mean to the millions of Americans? Well, more than 100 million Americans have now had more than \$2,200 of tax relief. That may not sound like a lot of money to Washington where they spend trillions of dollars, but that is \$180 a month. Do you know what that means? That means day care, that means you can take your kids maybe to Disneyland, that means you can go and invest for your kids' college future. That is what it means when you send more than \$1 trillion back to the taxpayers that actually earned the money.

Now, to put it in a much broader perspective where a person can understand day-to-day life, I always like to see what I did today and what did it mean about taxes and what did it take out of my pocket on my money.

When I woke up this morning, I took a shower. Do you know what? I paid a tax on that water. When I got out, a friend of mine needed a cup of coffee, I bought a cup of coffee. I paid a tax on that. We had to stop at the gas station and put gas in the car. We paid a tax there. When we got to work, most Americans work the first 3 hours just paying the taxes before they earn any money. When I go home, I am going to turn on the TV. Hopefully, I made C-SPAN. I am going to pay a cable tax just to watch the government at work. Then when I go out, somebody is going to have to travel for their work. They are going to buy an airline ticket; they are going to pay a tax on the ticket. They are going to rent a car; they are going to pay a tax on the car.

They check into the hotel; they are going to pay an occupancy tax. And, God forbid, if the other side of the aisle gets their way and we are successful in individuals earning money, the death tax is going to come back. We are taxed from the morning we wake up to take a shower to the night we go to sleep. It is tax, tax, tax.

And I am here to say, just like Ronald Reagan said: "We don't have a tax issue when it comes to that, we have a spending problem."

Our revenues are coming in and coming in very strong. So I would proclaim and what I would like to see happen is we actually reform so that we can compete. I will tell you, I have two small kids, Connor and Megan who are just 12 and 10, and every day I call home when I'm back here and we talk about their education, we talk about if they have

done their home work. Because I am not concerned with my kids from Bakersfield, California competing with kids with Sacramento, California or even competing with kids from Georgia. Do you know who I am concerned with my children competing with when they grow up? Kids from China and India. And we need a system that allows us to be competitive. We need a tax system that creates jobs, we need a tax system that creates entrepreneurs. And the way we do that is let taxpayers keep more of what they earned.

That is why I applaud you today for your truth, and I applaud you for coming down and doing this work.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for coming and joining us today and helping out and bringing truth and facts to the issue of the economy and especially taxation, because oftentimes people don't think about the times that they do indeed pay tax.

I try to visit as many schools as I can in my district back in Georgia, and when I am in front of student groups, I oftentimes ask them, Do you pay any tax? And of course most often they say, Oh, no. We don't pay any tax. Our parents pay some tax, but we don't pay any tax. Then you ask them, Did you buy a pack of gum? Paid for any of your shoes lately? Have you bought any food? Anything that you buy, anything that you buy has taxes on it. So any consumable product whatsoever has taxes on it. So everybody contributes into it. And when individuals are able to keep more of their own money, what happens is that the economy is able to flourish to a much greater degree. So I appreciate the information that you brought about taxes.

I also want to point out that you mentioned that our good friends on the other side of the aisle seem to be moving in the direction of allowing the appropriate tax reductions that resulted in this success, to allow those tax reductions to go away, which means a tax increase for the vast majority of Americans all across this Nation. And if they do what they have basically said they are planning on doing, and that is allow those tax reductions to expire, allow taxes to go up, the marginal tax rate, that is the rate, the percentage of income that each and every American pays to government to run the services, will be over 50 percent for the first time since the late 1970s. And, Mr. Speaker, some of our Members may not remember the late 1970s, but I remember it and I know that my good friends here remember it, and that is that we had something called the misery index.

□ 1530

It was the last time that inflation and unemployment were just skyrocketing, both of them because of poor programs of the Federal Government.

So I fear that what will happen if our good friends on the other side of the aisle get their way is that we will re-

visit the misery index. So we are here to try to bring truth and fact and light to the issue of the economy and taxation and the budget.

I am so pleased to be joined by my good friend from Tennessee, the congresswoman MARSHA BLACKBURN, who understands business, understands the economy and budgetary issues as well or better than the vast majority of folks in this Chamber. I look forward to your comments today as we talk about budget, economy and taxes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia; and I was so pleased that the gentleman from California mentioned Ronald Reagan and his birthday and brought up the Ronald Reagan quote that government does not have a revenue problem; government has a spending problem. This is something that we all know and we all realize and certainly because of the tax reductions that were put in place, and the gentleman from Georgia showed us the charts that showed how the tax reductions went into place in 2003, and we have seen not only growth in our GDP, not only jobs growth but a reduction in the deficit and record revenues for the Federal Government. Because when those rates of taxation go down, we know that revenues to the government go up.

I was listening to the gentleman from California, and I recalled a conversation with one of my constituents this weekend. He came to me and he said, MARSHA, look at this here in the paper. It was a note that on February 3, 1913, is when the Federal income tax went into place. So here we are at a time when that is being remembered. February 3, 1913, a 1 percent temporary tax, only on the wealthiest, went into place to pay for a war.

And look at what we have got now: an IRS that is big and is bloated and is cumbersome and wants more and more and more, a government that wants more and more and more of the dollar that the taxpayer earns. It is like another saying that Ronald Reagan had: The closest thing to eternal life on earth is a Federal Government program.

1913, a tax was put in place to pay for a war, to fund a defense effort; and today it is bigger than ever and is still in place.

So how appropriate that we come this week and we talk about the budget and we talk about what the President is bringing forth and we talk about the Tax Code and the changes that should be made and the changes that ought to be made and the steps that we should be taking to be certain that the American people retain more of their paycheck. It is an important thing to do.

As I was looking through the President's budget that he is offering forth this week, one of the things that caught my eye and that I was pleased to see is that he is recommending the elimination of 141 programs that maybe have outlived their usefulness,

that need to be revisited, that the duties could be shuffled to another one, that could be merged with another program so that services are delivered more effectively and more efficiently. I was very pleased to see that because, as I said earlier, we know that there is a spending problem in Washington, DC.

We have had our focus on addressing that; and what we want to do is reduce that spending, eliminate programs that have outlived their usefulness and make certain that we do not raise taxes. It is important that we move forward balancing the budget. It is important that we get the fiscal house in order. It is imperative that we do it without raising taxes.

So I am looking forward to working to make certain that we focus on waste, fraud and abuse, working to make certain, Mr. Speaker, that we eliminate those programs and, Mr. Speaker, working to make certain that we keep the commitment to the American people that their tax bill is not going to go up, that their tax bill is going to be going down.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank you so much for joining us again today and bringing light and truth to an issue that is so remarkably important because it gets to the bottom line for each and every American and each and every American family.

What we do at home, when we have discussions about our family budget, is that we determine how much money we have to spend and then we determine what our priorities are. Depending on what those priorities are, that is how we allocate money, and we try to make certain that we set aside some savings as well for a rainy day, for a difficult time. That ought to be what the Federal Government does, as you well know, but, sadly, that appears to be not the plan of the new majority here.

So it is important that we talk about family budgets, about how family budgets ought to parallel Federal budgets, government budgets.

I would be pleased to yield if you have a comment.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

One of my constituents this weekend was talking about this very issue, and he was very concerned. He had been reading some of the reports, hearing some of the things about the tax reductions that had been put in place in 2003 may be allowed to expire; and he said, MARSH, you know, it is all too often that I have got too much month left over at the end of my money.

His point to me and his admonition was the time has come to achieve greater efficiencies. Every one of our constituents can go through their district and see any number of Federal agencies, State agencies, local agencies that are wasting taxpayer money. They know they cannot do that in their family budget. They know that they cannot do that in their small business

budget. As we have said time and again, this is the hold-on-to-your-wallet Congress. They are determined to get more of the taxpayer money, and we are going to stand solid with the taxpayers to make certain that we help protect those pocketbooks.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments and for again pointing out how important it is to have our budget here at the Federal level compare or track what we do at home.

In fact, what we do at the State level, virtually every single State has a balanced budget because they cannot do what Washington does, and that is print money. Having served in the State legislature, we would spend days and weeks and months sometimes dealing with the hard-earned taxpayer money, again not government money, but hard-earned taxpayer money and make certain that our budget was balanced at the State level.

In fact, in Washington I am distressed that is not exactly what occurs. I am a strong supporter of a balanced budget, and what you will see on some of the charts and information that we currently have is that the tax policies that have been put in place and the program changes that have been put in place, something that is not well-known, is that the nondefense discretionary money, which is about 16 to 17 percent of our overall budget right now, has been actually decreasing as it relates to inflation. So Congress has been trying diligently to try to make certain that it reins in costs and spending. Because, Lord knows, we have not got a revenue problem; we have got a spending problem.

If you track out the budget itself, and this is with Congressional Budget Office numbers, they are not the kind of numbers that I think demonstrate the upside that we receive from tax reductions, but, in any event, what they do show is that at about 2011 the budget is balanced. The budget is balanced, and that is if we keep our current programs in place. Now, we can get to that point a lot sooner if we get more responsible on the spending side.

Now, my good friends on the other side of the aisle will tell you, well, we are going to balance the budget, too, and they can do that if they just left things alone. We would get to a balanced budget. But what they will tell you is we need to spend more in other areas, and so we need to tax Americans more. We are going to balance the budget, yes, but we are going to do it by taxing the American people more, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is not the way in which we need to move forward.

We will talk about some other revenue items and some other aspects of a balanced budget, but I want to address what has been termed by many myths, 10, 12 number of myths about President Bush's tax reductions. These are the tax reductions, appropriate tax reductions, that our friends on the other side

of the aisle say they have to end. They have to increase taxes on the American people.

The Democrat majority has to write a budget. They have to write a budget. Each year, the majority party has to write a budget, and the House has to pass a budget.

The new majority, the Democrat majority, has three options in that budget as to how they are going to deal with these appropriate tax reductions that were put in place earlier in this decade. They can extend them. They can continue the appropriate tax reductions, something that I and the vast majority of folks on our side of the aisle believe ought to occur. They could allow them to expire. Virtually all of them are slated to expire in 2011.

So, if no action is taken, then the other side will, in fact, increase taxes, or they can repeal them. They could increase taxes right way. So they have the responsibility of determining exactly what they are going to do with those appropriate tax reductions.

There are a number of myths that have grown up around these tax reductions that I would like to highlight. One is that the tax reductions themselves or the tax revenues themselves remain low. In fact, Mr. Speaker, as I have on a previous chart shown, the tax revenues are above the historical average, even after these appropriate tax reductions.

Tax reductions in 2006 were about 18.4 percent of the gross domestic product, which is actually above the 20-year, 40-year and 60-year historical averages. Now the inflation-adjusted 20 percent tax revenue increase between 2004 and 2006 represents the largest 2-year surge in tax revenue since 1965 and 1967. Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. The revenue to the Federal Government increased 20 percent over a 2-year period between 2004 and 2006, which is the largest increase in revenue to the Federal Government since 1965 and 1967. So claims that Americans and the American people are undertaxed according to history are simply patently false, absolutely untrue, and so it is important to remember that tax revenues are up because of a decrease in taxes, decrease in liability to the American people.

When you compare the tax revenues in the fourth fiscal year after each of the past recessions, it shows that the tax revenues were basically the same. So, in 1987, tax revenues were about 1.4 percent of gross domestic product; 1995, 18.5 percent; and 2006, 18.4 percent.

All of that is to say, Mr. Speaker, that when you decrease taxes, the revenue that comes into the Federal Government stays about the same as a percentage of the overall economy, but you decrease the number for each and every American because the economy is increasing and the revenue increases to the Federal Government. So tax reductions are good for the government. Tax reductions are good for the American people.

The second myth that I want to talk about and discuss as it relates to the appropriate tax reductions that were adopted by this Congress back in 2001 and in 2003, the myth that is out there is that these tax reductions substantially reduced 2006 revenues and expanded the budget deficit. Well, the fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that nearly all of the 2006 budget deficit resulted from additional spending above the baseline.

I am the first to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government, Washington, has been spending too much money, too much of hard-earned taxpayer money. That being said, I think it is important that our friends on the other side of the aisle, who say that they want to balance the budget, do so by doing the responsible thing and that is decreasing spending and not increasing taxes.

In the first place, if you increase taxes, what you do is, over the long term, you get less revenue to the Federal Government, but in terms of budget deficit, what you see is that you will decrease the deficit more rapidly by decreasing taxes and by decreasing spending.

□ 1545

Now critics tirelessly contend that America's swing from budget surpluses in 1998 through 2001 to a \$247 billion budget deficit in 2006 resulted chiefly from what they call "irresponsible" tax reductions. This argument, however, ignores the historic spending increases that pushed Federal spending up from 18.5 percent of GDP in 2001 to 20.2 percent of spending in 2006.

Furthermore, tax revenues in 2006 were actually above the levels projected. We have talked about that before. They were above the levels that were projected before the 2003 tax cuts.

Now, immediately before the 2003 tax cuts, the Congressional Budget Office projected that the 2006 budget deficit would be \$57 billion. Yet the final 2006 budget deficit was \$247 billion. Now, the \$190 billion deficit increase resulted from Federal spending, resulted from Federal spending that was \$237 billion more than projected. So revenues were actually \$47 billion above projections even after the \$75 billion in tax cuts that the other side says hurt, hurt the bottom line and hurt the deficits.

So these myths, I think, are important to correct to point out the factual nature of what is going on as opposed to just flying by the seat of your pants, which is not the way folks do their family budget and certainly ought not to be the way that we do our Federal budget.

The next myth I want to talk about is the capital gains taxes; tax cuts do not pay for themselves. There is kind of this sense that folks say, well, if you keep capital gains low, those are the taxes that people pay on the profits that they made on investments.

I am in favor of doing away with them all together. But if you keep

them low, what happens is you don't get the same amount of revenue into the Federal Government. Well, the fact of the matter is that capital gains tax revenues doubled, doubled following the 2003 tax cut.

Did you hear that? Capital gains tax revenues doubled following the 2003 tax cut.

Now, whether a tax cut pays for itself depends on how much people alter their behavior in response to that policy. Investors have shown to be the most sensitive to tax policy because capital gains tax cuts encourage new investment to more than offset the lower tax rate.

This chart here is a demonstration of exactly that. What we see here is a chart that shows capital gains tax revenues that doubled following the 2003 tax cut. The yellow line here projected from 2003 through 2006, the yellow line demonstrates what the Congressional Budget Office said would be the taxes gained from capital gains tax revenue. The blue line which you see is significantly higher than that are the actual revenues that came into the Federal Government following the 2003 capital gains tax reduction.

So in 2003 capitalize gains tax rates were reduced from 20 percent to 10 percent, depending on income, to 15 percent and 5 percent. Now, rather than expand by 36 percent from the current \$50 billion level to \$68 billion in 2006, as the CBO projected, capitalize gains revenue more than doubled \$103 billion, \$103 billion, more than twice what was projected. Past capital gains cuts have shown similar results as well.

The fact of the matter is, remember, you can have your own opinions as you walk through this discussion of the economy and of tax policy and of budget policy, but it is important that we look at facts so that we are making appropriate decisions here on behalf of the American people.

The fact of the matter is that when you decrease capital gains taxes you increase investment in America and you increase the revenue to the Federal Government, which is demonstrated clearly by this chart that we see right here.

Another myth that I want to talk about is the myth that says that the tax deductions are to blame for the long-term budget deficits. In fact, that isn't true at all. Projections show that entitlement or automatic spending, automatic costs, will dwarf the projected large revenue increases of the current tax reductions. As you remember, the graph that I had up here had revenue to the Federal Government increasing because of the appropriate reductions in taxes to the American people.

However, those increases will all be eaten up by automatic spending that occurs here in Washington. Some folks call these programs entitlement programs. They are primarily Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security.

These are the automatic programs where the spending continues to increase based upon a formula.

I have a chart that I would like to share with you that demonstrates clearly the challenge and the problem that confront not just those of us representing Americans but all of America. These are three pie charts that demonstrate the mandatory or automatic spending that occurs, primarily again in Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. This is 1995. Those programs comprised approximately half of the Federal budget, 48.7 percent of the Federal budget.

Now, the percent of the Federal budget that was utilized at that time for interest on the debt was 15.3 percent, a point much greater than current, and then discretionary spending where we have all of the Federal programs that people think about in terms of transportation, national park programs, all of those kinds of things, in addition to defense, that portion, in 1995, was 36 percent.

Again, about 48.7 percent was the mandatory portion of the budget. In 2005, just 2 years ago, that portion had grown from 48.7 percent to 53.4 percent. Again, Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, there were automatic spending increases over a period of time with those three specific programs.

If you track out to 2016, you get to 63.9 percent of the Federal budget. So those are the automatic programs that are in place, the automatic spending programs that are in place. This is clearly, clearly unsustainable. Spending of the entire GDP has kind of hovered around 20 percent for the past half century.

However, with the retirement of the baby boomers, this is the first year that baby boomers will begin to receive Social Security. Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid will see significant increases in the amount of revenue projected to increase over 10.5 percent over the next 10 years. What you see is an increase to 63.9 percent by 2016.

Clearly, clearly, these French-style spending increases, not tax policy, are the problem. In Washington, lawmakers, all of us, all of us have a responsibility and should focus on getting these entitlements under control, as opposed to raising taxes on the American people. That not only will not work, they may be good bumper sticker politics, but they will not work to solve the problem. This is hard work, significant challenges that confront all of us.

Next myth I would like to address very briefly is that raising tax rates is the best way to raise revenue. There is kind of this general belief on the other side of the aisle that all you have to do to get more money is to raise more taxes.

As you know, tax revenues themselves correlate with economic growth, not with tax rates, so that as the government increases its revenue as the economy grows, many of those who de-

sire additional tax revenues regularly call on Congress to raise taxes. But tax revenues are a function basically of two variables. One is tax rates and two is the tax base.

Since 1952, the highest marginal income tax rate has dropped from 92 percent to 35 percent, dropped from 92 percent to 35 percent. At the same time, tax revenues have grown in inflation-adjusted terms while remaining basically a constant percent of GDP. They are basically a perfect correlation between those two.

I think it is exceedingly important for all of us here and the American people to realize and appreciate that raising taxes doesn't raise tax revenue. In fact, as we saw from the previous charts, it is decreasing taxes that increase tax revenue.

One other myth that I would like to talk about very briefly is that there is this myth that reversing the upper income tax reductions, the upper income tax cuts, would raise substantial revenues. In fact, the lower income tax cuts reduced tax revenue more than the high income tax reductions.

I have a chart that will show that as well. This chart oftentimes comes as a real eye opener for the American people and for so many of my colleagues here, as a matter of fact. This chart shows the share of individual income taxes that are paid by different portions of our society, and I would like to just point to the last two bars, the last two bar graphs down there.

This one, the larger one, that demonstrates that over 96 percent of all tax revenue comes from folks in the upper half of the income bracket of this Nation, and that the bottom 50 percent, the lower 50 percent pay less than 4 percent of the tax revenue that comes into the United States.

Now, that is important because if you try to concentrate on just the middle-income folks, in fact, you will not generate the kind of money that you are talking about or that you need, and you also will significantly depress the economy.

Again, it is important to talk about facts. It is important to talk about truth as we talk about making certain that we have the right policy here at the Federal Government.

Finally, there is a myth out there that these reductions, tax reductions, haven't helped the economy. In fact, the economy has responded to the 2003 tax reductions in remarkable ways, as we have already pointed out. GDP grew at an annual rate of 1.7 percent in the six quarters before the tax reductions. The six quarters that followed the tax reductions, it grew at 4.1 percent; 1.7 percent before, 4.1 percent afterward. It is a fact.

Nonresidential fixed investment declined for 13 consecutive quarters before the 2003 tax reductions. Since then, it has expanded for 14 consecutive quarters. Down 13 quarters before, up 14 quarters afterward. It is a fact, not an opinion.

Standard & Poor's 500 dropped 18 percent in the six quarters before the 2003 tax cuts. After, increased 32 percent over the next six quarters; before, down 18 percent; after, up 32 percent. That is a fact, not an opinion.

The economy, six quarters before the 2003 tax cuts lost 267,000 jobs. In the six quarters after, increased 307,000 jobs, and, as you well know, since then we have burgeoned by having 7.3 million new jobs since the middle of 2003.

What we have tried to do today is try to bring to the American people some truth, some facts as we talk about the budget that will have to be laid out here over the next month to 6 weeks, pointing out the remarkable fallacy of so many of the arguments that are used on the floor of this House to say that, well, we have just got to raise taxes. You have heard some of the Presidential candidates out there on the stump, saying, we have just got to raise taxes. In fact, some of my good friends on the other side of the aisle say just that, nothing we can do except raise taxes.

You know and I know that the truth of the matter is that when you look at how the economy operates, how the Federal Government gains revenue, that, in fact, decreasing taxes, maintaining the appropriate tax reductions, allowing the American people to keep more of their hard-earned money is exactly what is the prescription that is necessary for America and for the economy to continue to flourish.

So I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I look forward to a spirited debate. I think the question really is, when you get right down to it, the question becomes who ought to decide; who should decide how the American people spend their hard-earned money. Should it be the government? Should it be more government programs? Regardless of whatever area of the society you want to talk about, is it the Federal Government and State governments that ought to be making those decisions?

Or should it be, as I and so many of my friends on this side of the aisle believe, that those decisions are better left to individual Americans? They make better decisions about what to do with their hard-earned money when they are allowed to keep their hard-earned money and not have it rolled into the Federal Government as tax revenue.

I am pleased to be able to provide hopefully a bit of light, a bit of truth, a bit of fact for this Chamber, and deal with the issues that are coming before us over the next 4 to 6 weeks. I look forward to this discussion on this debate.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Bush sent us his budget request for Fiscal Year 2008. This request includes his spending priorities for each federal agency.

I applaud his efforts to balance the budget by the end of the decade, and to do so without raising taxes on American families. I also

applaud his recent efforts to reduce the burden of agency guidance documents through the Final Bulletin for Agency Good Guidance Practices that was published on January 25th.

In addition to federal regulations, which are burdensome enough, the past decade has seen an explosion in "guidance documents" that are not legislated but have the same effect as regulation on American employers and can stifle their growth. As OMB itself noted:

The phenomenon we see in this case is familiar. Congress passes a broadly worded statute. The agency follows with regulations containing broad language, open-ended phrases, ambiguous standards and the like. Then as years pass, the agency issues circulars or guidance or memoranda, explaining, interpreting, defining and often expanding the commands in regulations. One guidance document may yield another and then another and so on. Several words in a regulation may spawn hundreds of pages of text as the agency offers more and more detail regarding what its regulations demand of regulated entities. Law is made, without notice and comment, without public participation, and without publication in the Federal Register or the Code of Federal Regulations.

In this spirit, I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to examine the agency budget requests not only with regard to fiscal matters but also with regards to how spending priorities affect our economic competitiveness.

Taxpayer dollars should be used to benefit the public good. Unfortunately, we have seen over and over again that—often with good intention—agencies instead use taxpayer money to impose and enforce regulations that literally strangle businesses and impede job growth.

Regulation imposes its heaviest burden on small and medium sized businesses because it is harder for them to handle the necessary overhead costs of paperwork, staff time and attorney and accountant fees.

Richard Vedder, an economist at the Center for the Study of American Business, finds that federal regulations cause \$1.3 trillion in economic output to be lost each year. This is roughly equivalent to the entire economic output of the mid-Atlantic region.

I have to imagine that processing this paperwork also requires a lot of agency time and reduces their ability to clean up the environment, provide better health care, improve labor conditions, make our transport systems more efficient, etc. If the government instead worked with employers to create a better work environment and a cleaner and safer nation, both sides could better accomplish their goals. The real winner would be the American people.

As we go through the budget and appropriations process, I hope that we do so with an eye towards keeping our nation economically competitive now and in the future. We should look for ways in which the government can better work with employers, and also for the best programs to fund to train our children and children's children for the 21st Century economy.

□ 1600

NO BLANK CHECK FOR THE
PENTAGON

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, in an interview published yesterday by the McClatchy newspaper chain, Dick Arme, our former Republican majority leader, said he felt really bad about voting to go to war in Iraq. Mr. Arme said, "Had I been more true to myself and the principles I believed in at the time, I would have openly opposed the whole adventure vocally and aggressively."

It takes a big man to admit something like that. Chris Matthews on MSNBC on election night said, "The decision to go to work in Iraq was not a conservative decision historically" and said the President asked Republicans "to behave like a different people than they intrinsically are."

In 2004, William F. Buckley, Jr., often called the godfather of conservatism, wrote that if he knew in 2002 what he knew by 2004 he would have opposed going to war in Iraq.

Today, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee held a hearing on the subject of waste, fraud and abuse in Iraq. A couple of years ago the same committee, then under Republican leadership, held a similar hearing.

David Walker, now head of the GAO but then Inspector General of the Defense Department, testified at that time that \$35 billion had been lost in Iraq due to waste, fraud and abuse and another \$9 billion had just been lost and could not be accounted for at all.

I heard a talk by Charlie Cook, the very respected political analyst, who said people could not really comprehend anything over \$1 billion. But \$44 billion is an awful lot of money in anybody's book.

A Foreign Service Officer told me last year, a few months after he had left Iraq, that he sometimes saw SUVs there filled with cash with barely enough room for the driver.

Conservatives have traditionally been the strongest opponents and biggest critics of Federal waste, fraud and abuse. Conservatives have traditionally been the strongest opponents and biggest critics of wasteful, lavish and ridiculous Federal contracts. Conservatives, especially fiscal conservatives, should not feel any obligation to defend wasteful spending or lavish Federal contracts just because they are taking place in Iraq.

Ivan Eland, in the January 15 issue of the American Conservative Magazine, wrote this. He said, "Many conservatives who regularly gripe about the Federal Government's ineffective and inefficient use of taxpayer dollars give the Pentagon a free ride on their profligate spending habits."

Conservatives admire, respect and appreciate the people in the military as much or more than anyone. Conservatives believe national defense is one of the few legitimate functions of the Federal Government and one of its most important. However, this does not mean we should just routinely give the Pentagon everything it wants or

turn a blind eye to waste in the Defense Department.

The Defense Department is a gigantic bureaucracy, in fact, the biggest bureaucracy in the world. It has the same problems and inefficiencies of any giant bureaucracy; and conservatives, especially fiscal conservatives, should not give a free ride to waste, fraud and abuse just because it is done by the Defense Department.

Counting our regular defense appropriations bill, plus emergency and supplemental appropriations bills, plus the military construction appropriations bill, plus the end-of-the-year omnibus appropriations bills, we spend more on defense than all of the other Nations of the world combined. Yet the military, like all other bureaucracies, always wants more money.

Well, at some point, we are going to have to decide, do we want national defense for our own people, or are we going to be the policeman of the world and provide international defense for all countries that claim to be our allies?

With a national debt of almost \$9 trillion and unfunded future pension liabilities of many trillions more, I believe it is both unaffordable and unconstitutional for us to try to be the policeman of the world. We will soon not be able to pay Social Security and veterans' pensions with money that means anything, and all of the other things the Federal Government is doing, if we try to maintain an empire around the world.

Conservatives have traditionally been the biggest critics of interventionist foreign policies because they create so much resentment for us around the world.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, conservatives have traditionally been the biggest critics of nation building, as President Bush was when he ran for the White House in 2000. We need the more humble foreign policy he advocated then, or we need to tell the people to forget about their Social Security because we are giving blank checks to the Pentagon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. 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 subject of my Special Order today.

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

There was no objection.

BLUE DOG COALITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I rise on behalf of the 44-member-strong, fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, as we demand from this Government fiscal accountability as well as fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, as you walk the halls of Congress, it is easy to know when you are walking by the door of a fellow fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition member, because you will see this poster as a welcome mat to his or her office to remind Members of Congress, to remind you, Mr. Speaker, to remind me, and to remind the American people and all of those who walk the halls of Congress, that the U.S. national debt today is \$8,696,414,214,377.65.

For every man, woman and child in America, their share, our share, my share of the national debt is \$28,900.92. That is a big number.

A lot of people think, well, it really does not matter what the debt is, our Government can simply print more money. I wish it was that simple.

Our Nation today is spending the first half a billion dollars it collects in taxes not to improve veterans' health care, to protect our troops, to build roads, to fund health care, to protect Social Security and Medicare, to ensure the 47 million folks without health insurance have access to it. No. The first half a billion dollars that we collect every day in taxes from the hard-working people in this country go to simply pay interest, not principal but interest, on this number, the national debt.

And those which should be America's priorities will continue to go unmet until we get our Nation's fiscal house in order. This is something that affects every man, woman and child in America. We have a plan, a 12-point plan for budget reform to ensure that we can live within our means, that we can pay down this debt and restore fiscal discipline and common sense to our Government.

One of those 12 points, by the way, Mr. Speaker, is what we referred to as PAYGO rules, which means pay as you go. And I am real proud that the leadership under this Democratic Caucus in the first 24 hours, not 100 hours, but the first 24 hours, the Democratic leadership reinstated PAYGO rules on the floor of the House. Which means, quite simply, if you want to fund a new program, you got to show us where the money is coming from.

Now the Republicans tend to think that that means that to fund new programs you raise taxes. I find it quite interesting that the Republicans think that PAYGO, pay as you go, means raise taxes to pay for new spending. It does not mean that. It means cut programs. It means make the tough choices to put an end to the waste in Government.

I got some 8,000 brand new, fully furnished mobile homes sitting at the airport in Hope, Arkansas, that were des-

tined for Hurricane Katrina storm victims but never reached them. That is \$400 million right there.

We are not talking about raising taxes to pay for a new program. But I can tell you what we are talking about, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about putting an end to the days of the Republican leadership borrowing money from China to fund a new program creating this large number, making it go up daily. It is still going up nearly a billion dollars a day under the Republican budget that was approved last year.

No more of that, Mr. Speaker. No more borrowing money from China to build a rain forest in Iowa. We are demanding that you show us how you pay for your projects and your programs. We are going to restore fiscal discipline and accountability to our Government.

This week, the President came out with his budget; and we will be visiting more about the President's budget during this hour.

But another thing that the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition is doing is we have gotten together and we have written and endorsed what is referred to as House Resolution 97. And House Resolution 97, we have 39 cosponsors. It is providing for Operation Iraq Freedom cost accountability.

Put quite simply, we are demanding accountability on how your tax money, Mr. Speaker, and the tax money of the hard-working people of this country is being spent in Iraq. You ask 100 different people what they think about this Iraq policy, you will get about 100 different answers. You will find some Members of the Blue Dog Coalition that are for the surge, some are against. I am against the surge. I think the American people want us to go in a different direction in Iraq.

But one of the things that unites us as a coalition and the things that we have endorsed and that we have written and we are trying to put in place is House Resolution 97, which has four crucial points that demand fiscal responsibility in Iraq.

Point number one, a call for transparency on how Iraq war funds are spent. The American people are sending some \$9 billion a month to Iraq. That is about \$12 million an hour. And the American people in this country that work hard and pay taxes deserve to know how their money is being spent in Iraq.

Number two is the creation of a Truman Commission to investigate the awarding of contracts. It is time, Mr. Speaker, to put an end to war profiteering in Iraq.

Number three, a need to fund the Iraq war through the normal appropriations process. Play by the rules. No more of this so-called emergency supplemental appropriations to hide from the American people the true cost of the war.

Finally, number four, use American resources. This is America. We are the leader of the free world, and we should

be using our resources to improve Iraqi assumption of internal policing operations. In other words, it is time for the Iraqi people to step up to the plate and buy into this and take more responsibility and accountability.

I am joined this hour by a number of my Blue Dog colleagues, Mr. Speaker. At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CHANDLER).

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate all that the gentleman from Arkansas is doing to bring these issues to the forefront, to the American people, because I believe they are extremely important and I know all Members of the Blue Dog Coalition believe that accountability and responsibility to the people of our Nation is of the utmost importance.

Mr. Speaker, the President sent a \$2.9 trillion budget to Congress yesterday. That is quite a lot of money. And you would think that among those trillions of hard-earned tax dollars the President would find resources for the most essential services like education for our kids and health care for our veterans. But, once again, those who need our help the most are the very people who have been pushed aside.

If we follow this budget, Medicaid and Medicare will be cut by \$101 billion over the next 5 years; health care for our veterans will be slashed by \$3.5 billion over 5 years; Perkins loan funds for our college students will be recalled; and No Child Left Behind will be underfunded by some \$15 billion. The President, in addition, would have us cut State preparedness training programs and firefighter and law enforcement grants, depriving our first responders of the funds necessary to operate in this post-9/11 world.

These policies make no sense. They rob our children of opportunity, make our communities less safe, and dishonor those who have sacrificed while wearing our Nation's uniform. I could understand some of these cuts if they were being made in the name of fiscal responsibility, but they are not.

If we were truly making an effort to reduce our public debt, I could, and I believe the American people could, accept some pain. Because the cause that we would be fighting in that case would be a good one, and it would be about our future.

But that is not the case. This budget is not trying to reduce the debt. The President's budget will drag us even deeper into debt, to the tune of \$3.2 trillion over the next 10 years. Trillion. That is a lot of money. Burdening future generations with mountains of debt, not of their own making.

Mr. Speaker, when I talk with my constituents back home in communities rich in values and common sense, they ask me a simple question over and over again.

□ 1615

Where is their tax money going?

If we are cutting all of these programs, yet going deeper into debt,

what value are we getting for our tax dollar?

We owe it to our constituents to answer these questions. And it starts with ending the black hole of waste, fraud and abuse that is plaguing our reconstruction efforts in Iraq.

Here are the facts: we have already budgeted some \$108 billion on reconstruction. Yet, the Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction is telling us that we haven't come close to recovering the level of basic services that Iraqis enjoyed under Saddam Hussein.

Here is the return Americans are getting on their over \$100 billion tax investment: only 25 percent of Iraqis have access to clean water; access to modern sewer facilities remains an incredible problem for most Iraqi families; Iraqis now have electricity for only 4.3 hours per day; and oil production is down almost one million barrels a day since the levels before the war.

How long are we going to let this farce continue?

We can argue all day about spending priorities. But can we not at least agree to make sure that our tax dollars are being efficiently spent to accomplish good? Because right now the only thing I see these tax dollars are doing efficiently is lining the pockets of government contractors.

How many reports of jobs being billed that were never authorized; jobs being started without permission; individuals admitting to stealing millions of reconstruction dollars, and private contractors, such as Halliburton, being awarded unprecedented numbers of no-bid government contracts do we have to put up with before we do something about it?

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is my belief and the belief of the Blue Dog Coalition that we must demand accountability. The President, with his proposed budget, is telling our seniors, our students, our veterans, and our working families that our country doesn't have the money to help pay for their health care or for their education.

I say we will come closer to having the money for health care and education if we stop mismanaging funds in Iraq and greasing the pockets of contractors who are failing, in many instances, to get the job done. That is why our coalition, the Blue Dog Coalition, has introduced the House resolution for the Operation Iraqi Freedom Cost Accountability.

In the spirit of the Truman Committee, which defeated so much corruption and saved our country in excess of \$15 billion during World War II, this resolution outlines the critical steps this body must take to hold the administration accountable for its neglect of taxpayer dollars.

It is our constitutional obligation, as Members of this body, to provide oversight for war spending. And Congress has neglected this duty for far too long. We owe it to the taxpayers of this country, to the troops who are fighting this war, and, yes, we owe it to future

generations who are going to be financing this war for many, many, many years to come to stop the wasteful spending of this administration and war profiteering by contractors.

We need a modern-day Truman Committee. And we need transparency on how Iraq war funds are being spent. The days of offering the President a blank check are over. We need to ask the tough questions, and we need to send a message that waste, fraud and abuse in Iraq reconstruction just simply will not be tolerated.

I thank all of my fellow Blue Dogs for the work that they are doing on this issue, for continuing to raise awareness, and I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join forces to restore fiscal integrity to this war.

Thank you, Mr. ROSS. I appreciate the time. I appreciate the job that you are doing.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his valued insight into H.R. 97, which is the Blue Dog-endorsed House resolution to demand accountability and fiscal responsibility in how tax money is being spent in Iraq, some \$9 billion a month; put another way, some \$12 million an hour.

Let me be clear that as members of the Blue Dog Coalition, we support our troops 110, 120, 130 percent. We can't do enough for our troops. And as long as we have troops in harm's way, we are going to be there to ensure they have what they need to get the job done and to get it done as safely as possible, and hopefully get on back home to their families.

This has impacted every family in America in one way or another. My brother-in-law is in Kyrgyzstan now, which is the entry point for Afghanistan, just as Kuwait is oftentimes the entry point for Iraq. My first cousin was in Iraq when his wife gave birth to their first child.

Before coming down here today, I visited with a Ms. Watson in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, whose son, and she is so very proud of him and I am too, Lt. Colonel Watson, continues to serve us today in Baghdad. We thank him. We thank all soldiers for their dedicated service to our country.

This is about accountability. This is about having responsibility and oversight on how our tax money is being spent in Iraq.

Not only that, but this hour is dedicated to talking about this new Bush budget that was delivered to Capitol Hill yesterday. Thank goodness that, as Members of Congress, we get a vote on this budget, that we can ensure that funding is there for education and for our veterans. And, yes, we are creating a new generation of veterans in Afghanistan and Iraq today. And we have got to be there for them.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, a former cochair of the Blue Dogs for policy, Mr. COOPER.

Mr. COOPER. I thank my good friend from Arkansas, and I thank my Blue Dog colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus for a minute on the release of the President's budget. As has been mentioned, it just came out yesterday, and today, as a member of the Budget Committee, we had our first hearing with Rob Portman, the director of the Office of Management and Budget and former trade ambassador and former Member of this House.

This is what a part the budget looks like. It is available online. It is about 150, 200 pages. This looks like a very credible document. But that is what I would like to discuss today.

One of the first claims in this budget is in the second paragraph, it says: "The budget I am presenting achieves balance by 2012." Hallelujah. Wouldn't that be nice, if it were true.

Now, if you look deeper in the budget, you will see that they claim, after years of deficits in the Bush administration, remember, we had a surplus in the last 3 years of the Clinton administration, but after years of Bush deficits, they claim that by mid-term of the next President, we will have a surplus. Well, that would be good news if it were true. They claim that the surplus in that year will be \$61 billion. And I hope that a number like that would be true.

But if you look at page 168 of their document, you will see that that \$61 billion surplus is really a \$187 billion deficit disguised by borrowing \$248 billion from the Social Security trust fund. In other words, we would have a sizeable, large deficit if it weren't for the money they are planning on taking from the Social Security trust fund in that year.

And this isn't just a once-a-year practice. They are planning on doing it every year between now and then. In 2007 they took \$183 billion from Social Security. In 2008 they are taking \$212 billion from Social Security. In 2009 they are taking \$226 billion from Social Security. In 2010, \$245 billion from Social Security. And in 2011, \$264 billion.

So, basically, what this budget says, although it looks very respectable and credible, it says we are going to take over \$1 trillion, close to \$1.25 trillion from Social Security so we can disguise the budget deficit and make it look like a surplus 5 years from now. Mr. Speaker, that doesn't sound like honest budgeting to me.

But don't take my word for it. Look at this other document. This came out about a month ago. This is from the U.S. Treasury Department. This uses a different and better method of accounting to tell us where we are financially in this country. And it says, basically, we are at deficits as far as the eye can see. And the deficits are far, far larger than what the President admits to in this document.

But even if you don't believe any of these government documents, either the President's or the Treasury Department's, look at a private sector organization called Standard & Poor's. They are on Wall Street. They are probably

the top credit analyst agency in the world. They projected this last summer that the U.S. Treasury Bond, the most important financial instrument on the planet, would lose its triple A credit rating by the year 2012, just 5 years from now.

So in other words, S&P, the leading credit analyst, said that although this document says we are going to have a surplus then, they say we are going to have continuing deficits as far as the eye can see, in fact, deficits that damage and possibly destroy America's credit rating.

Standard & Poor's went on to say in their analysis, they said that by the year 2025 the U.S. Treasury Bond wouldn't have just lost its triple A credit rating. They say that the U.S. Treasury Bond would actually become junk debt by the year 2025. Below investment grade. That would be a true tragedy for our Nation. We cannot let that happen. And that is why we need to examine the credibility of the numbers in this document. We need to make sure that they are correct.

And if you look at the assumptions in this document, you will see not only trouble with the terrific borrowing they are planning on doing from the Social Security surplus; you will see trouble in the fact that they are planning on the AMT tax taking a bigger and bigger bite out of the middle class in America for the next 4 or 5 years. They do nothing to remedy that in this document.

There are so many other features of this document that make it almost completely unrealistic as a starting point for our budget debates.

Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of work to do. It is not easy putting together budgets. I have done it because I had the privilege of serving back in the majority days, over 12 years ago here. It is a very difficult process to come up with a proper budget. But that must begin now. And I would just wish that the President's offering were going to be of more help to us. It is not all bad. There are some good elements of the President's budget. But if you look at the overall promise of a balanced budget by 2012, I am not sure anyone in the administration really believes that. It is here on paper, and it sounds mighty good. But if you look at the assumptions underneath it, whether it is borrowing from Social Security or whether it is taking the big bite out of the middle class with the AMT tax, it looks like the President's budget is not standing up to scrutiny.

But I thank my friend from Arkansas. I thank my Blue Dog colleagues. This is the day that we start the budget debates. Over the next 2 months we will be trying to bring this to a conclusion.

I hope that all Americans will download these documents off the Internet, will participate in the debate, and let me and other Blue Dogs know your opinions on what we should do on those budget matters.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) for his valued input and insight into this budget process. The President has done the annual ceremoniously bringing of the budget, if you will, to Capitol Hill. And, in fact, Mr. Speaker, here is a copy of it. This is the budget of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2008 from the Office of Management and Budget. And it is quite a lengthy document.

□ 1630

But if you read over it, you will learn that the budget submitted this week continues the same policies that helped create the fiscal mess now facing our government.

While the administration's budget claims to reach balance in 2012, unfortunately, this budget is in deficit every year under realistic Bush policy assumptions. The budget continues to make the wrong choices for the American people. It proposes substantial cuts to programs that benefits seniors, working families and children, all to help pay for an extensive tax cut for folks earning over \$400,000 a year. It is about priorities, Mr. Speaker; and the priorities found in this budget, this budget as delivered this week by President Bush, are misplaced.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you very much, Mr. ROSS. It is always a pleasure to be on the floor with you.

There is so much we need to cover. Sometimes, you wonder where to really begin. But I think today we need to begin with what the President brought over here in his budget. I have had a chance to look at it, to go through it, and I am just astounded. I truly am astounded at the recklessness of the President's budget, at the irresponsibility of the President's budget.

Here we are at a time when this country is crying out for very serious attention in health care, especially health care for those at the lower income end and the middle class, and what do we get in the President's budget but a tax increase for the middle class in health care. What we get in this budget is a slash to Medicare and to Medicaid.

I want to go through it just very quickly so the American people and our colleagues who might not have had a chance to really get into this budget can see how surprisingly irresponsible this budget is.

The President's budget that he just sent to us slashes Medicare and Medicaid by about \$300 billion, at a time when Medicare and Medicaid are in greatest need, to slash those programs by \$300 billion over the next 10 years, with legislative and regulatory Medicaid cuts totaling about \$50 billion and Medicare cuts totaling \$252 billion.

And rather than using these monies to reverse the growing number of uninsured Americans, and, indeed, listen to this startling statistic, since President

Bush took office in the last 6 years, we have added an additional 6.8 million uninsured Americans. This is not a time to cut the basic government safety net program for insuring Americans when we are having more. This is why I say it is reckless. This is why I say it is irresponsible. And these monies are being offset, in his mind, by tax cuts to millionaires. It is totally out of sync.

The Medicare cuts include premium increases for millions of beneficiaries totaling \$10 million over the next 10 years. And at the same time the budget slashes Medicare funding, it protects special interests. Here is how: It leaves untouched massive overpayments by Medicare to HMOs under the GOP 2003 Medicare Modernization Act. And many of the Federal Medicaid cuts will simply increase State costs or lead to further restrictions in Medicaid benefits. Thus, instead of assisting State efforts to reduce the number of uninsured, the Bush budget will impede those efforts.

But in the area of health care, and I mentioned at the outset that there would be in here this hidden tax increase for the middle class. Here is where we find it. Under the President's budget, employee health benefits would, for the first time, be treated as income and would be subject to income and payroll taxes, just like wages. This is new, for the first time.

Listen carefully. At the same time, the President would create a tax deduction for health insurance of \$15,000 for families and \$7,500 for individuals. This proposal would fail to reduce the number of uninsured, and it would also mean a tax increase for millions of middle-class families who have employer-sponsored health insurance worth more than \$15,000. You have to really look at the fine print.

And also, because the new deduction would reduce taxable income, people's future Social Security benefits would be reduced as well; and, as many health experts have pointed out, the President's proposal would undermine employer-provided health insurance and would push people into the individual health insurance market, a market where insurers are able to refuse coverage to workers based on their health.

As Karen Davis, who is head of the nonpartisan Commonwealth Fund, pointed out about the President's proposal, it is not solving the uninsured problem and it is not solving the cost problem, so it is not really advancing what we need to have happen.

Here at the most basic need, where government and people need the help, soaring high health care costs, this budget not only fails but, to add insult to injury, adds a tax increase to the middle class in the process.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, a very active member of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, Mr. SCOTT. I hope he will stay for the remainder of this hour as we discuss the President's budget for fiscal year 2008, as well as

the Blue Dog Coalition-endorsed House Resolution 97 to demand accountability on how the hardworking people of this country's tax money is being spent in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, in the 6 years of the Bush Administration, the government has posted the highest deficits in the Nation's history. The administration has squandered the budget surplus it inherited, transforming a \$5.6 trillion projected 10-year surplus into a deficit of some \$2.9 trillion over the same period, a swing of \$8.4 trillion, based on realistic estimates of the cost of the President's policies. The President's new budget calls for a deficit of \$244 billion for 2007, and \$239 billion for 2008, marking 6 years in a row of deficits of more than \$200 billion.

This budget that the President delivered to Capitol Hill this week includes \$244 billion worth of hot checks for fiscal year 2008 and \$239 billion worth of hot checks for fiscal year 2009. Unbelievable, Mr. Speaker. That means that this Nation will continue to borrow about a half a billion dollars a day every day, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday. Every day, under the Bush budget, we will borrow over a half a billion dollars, and that is before we spend a half a billion dollars each day paying interest on the debt we have already got.

America's priorities will continue to go unmet until we get our Nation's fiscal house in order. Meanwhile, this budget continues to climb the climb of decline of our Nation's debt, which has already grown by \$3 trillion during this administration.

Put another way, this President, this administration has borrowed more money from foreign lenders, foreign central banks than the previous 42 Presidents combined. In fact, we had only borrowed \$623.3 billion in foreign holdings in 1993. Today, foreign lenders currently hold a total of about \$2.199 trillion of our public debt.

I was with the President at a meeting Saturday morning. The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) asked him about whether he believed borrowing so much money from foreign central banks and foreign investors was a security threat to our country. His response was that he didn't know how much money we had borrowed from foreigners.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope the President is listening to us today, because, Mr. Speaker, I want to share with you, Mr. Speaker, what I refer to as the top 10 list. This is the top 10 list of the 10 countries that we have borrowed the most money from: Japan, \$637.4 billion; China, \$346.5 billion; the United Kingdom, \$223.5 billion.

Can I go back to China for a moment? You know, we don't do business with Cuba because they are Communist, and yet we do business with Communist China out of a spirit of international relations. And while we are all focused on the Middle East and what is going on in Iraq and Afghani-

stan, Cuba has hired China to drill for oil on their behalf 55 miles from Key West, Florida, when the United States does not allow drilling within 100 miles of Key West. Can you imagine that? And yet we have borrowed \$346.5 billion from China to give folks who live in this country who earn over \$400,000 a year a tax cut and to leave our children and our grandchildren with the bill.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield just a moment?

On the issue of China and our lending, we are now in debt to China well over \$350 billion. Now just to show you why this debt in the hands of foreign governments is such a threat to our national security, just this example. China is now engaged with Iran in building a, supposedly building, a gas pipeline from China to Iran. The United States, in its efforts to tighten certain screws, economic and political, on Iran, in addition to the saber rattling we are doing, has begun to ask China if they would desist from that relationship. To this point, China has stonewalled; and in large measure it is because we don't have the leverage. If you owe me \$360 billion, that weakens my position.

The other area, in terms of our national security, is the situation in Iran as we are dealing with it, because that is in the news now. There are all kinds of questions and issues now of whether or not we are going to attack Iran, which is why we have got to hurry up and get our resolution passed and make sure that the President understands what article I, section 8 of our Constitution gives the Congress the extreme role, the exclusive role in determining the funding and the declaration of war in that regard.

But the whole reason why this whole funding operation puts us in a weakening position from our lending and our debt with our foreign countries is this: Iran has to depend upon a tremendous amount of lending from other countries to support them. It puts our Treasury Department, our Secretary of Treasury, our Secretary of State, and I plan to ask Ms. Condoleezza Rice tomorrow, we will have an opportunity to meet with her, this specific question. The fact that we need our partners, who we are working with, to stop lending to Iran, if we tighten that financial economic screw, that is how you avoid this unfortunate military clash that might be pending.

But the point I wanted to make is, as long as we are so overly dependent and have this indebtedness in the hands of the foreign governments, we lose the leverage we need to secure our Nation and to secure a better peace in the world.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia. Point well taken. Thanks for sharing that with us.

Let me just round out the top 10 current lenders. These are the countries the United States of America is borrowing money from in order to provide

tax cuts for folks in this country earning over \$400,000 a year. That is in the President's budget. That is what he is proposing to do. Here is what he has done already.

In the past 6 years, our Nation has borrowed more money from foreigners than the previous 42 Presidents combined. Again, Japan \$637.4 billion; China, \$346.5 billion; the United Kingdom, \$223.5 billion. OPEC. And we wonder why gas was approaching 3 bucks a gallon in August. Our Nation has borrowed \$97.1 billion from OPEC to give folks who live in this country a \$400,000 tax cut.

□ 1645

That is exactly what the President is proposing to continue. Mr. Speaker, I dare say that in this new Democratic majority, we will stop that.

Korea, \$67.7 billion. Taiwan, \$63.2 billion. If China decides to invade Taiwan, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. TANNER, has made this point before, our country and our fiscal house is in such a mess that if China decides to invade Taiwan, we will have to borrow more money from China to be able to afford to go assist and defend Taiwan.

The Caribbean banking center, \$63.6 billion. Hong Kong, \$51 billion. Germany, \$52.1 billion. A lot of discussion about our border, and I believe we must secure our border, but are you ready for this: the United States of America has borrowed \$38.2 billion from Mexico in the past 6 years to fund tax cuts for people who live here earning over \$400,000 a year, leaving our children and grandchildren with the bill, which is the very reason why our Nation today is in debt \$3,696,414,214,377.

That is a big number. How do you explain it? If you divide it by everybody that lives in America, some 300 million of us, every one of us owes \$28,900. I don't know about you, Mr. Speaker, but I can't afford to write a check for \$28,900 to the government. It is what we call the debt tax, D-E-B-T, and it is one tax that can't go away until we get our fiscal house in order and begin to meet America's priorities again.

Today, the money is going to pay interest on the debt, and it is going to borrow more money to fund the war that is costing us \$9 billion a month, again, a big number, break it down, \$12 million an hour. \$12 million an hour.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. ROSS, and thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak on the budget that has been sent to us just as recently as yesterday.

I was elected by the people of eastern Ohio and sent to Washington to try to bring a commonsense approach to what is going on down here. I must say that the budget that we received yesterday and have looked through today making different points, it is astonishing, the math that is used. The budget doesn't add up, the numbers don't fit together, the lack of real fiscal responsibility,

the tax increases on the middle class, the continued cutting of programs that are good for people, the lack of oversight over our war that is going on right now. It is frightening. It is frightening for everybody. There are several things that are wrong, though, that I would like to talk about.

As I said, the numbers don't add up; they just don't come together. There are assumptions that are made that are unrealistic, and it provides us with an opportunity for real failure, more so than we have now.

As Mr. ROSS recently indicated, we are near \$9 trillion right now in debt, and with everyone's share, with 300 million residents of America, we are looking at \$29,000 per person. That is man, woman, child.

Looking at this, it is unfortunate that under this budget proposal there are crucial investments that have been cut to programs that are important to people. For example, they are cutting commodities for seniors and people with low incomes and people who have disabilities, but yet we are making real strong assumptions on the scenario of what can happen for the right things to give more tax breaks.

I did an interview today, Mr. Speaker, with a newspaper in Ohio, and was asked, how will you pay to restore the commonsense benefits that are in this budget? Well, one of the ways would be to eliminate some of the tax breaks for the people who need them least, and this would certainly be a thing that we as the Democratic Blue Dog Coalition would be supportive of.

We need to look at common sense. We need to find ways, such as PAYGO, which we are putting forward, to say that no program goes forward for more spending, Mr. Speaker, without eliminating a program that is costing us in the present time. This is what PAYGO is about. It is a direction that our country needs. PAYGO stands for common sense, and that is really what we are trying to do.

When we look at this budget, we say that in the President's budget this time for the 2008 series, it is more of the same, that there has been no change. It takes many, many assumptions that it is going to be a best-case scenario. But when you really look at the numbers, Mr. Speaker, it winds up quite bad again.

We are moving in the wrong direction, doing the wrong things. The unbid contracts in the war, the situation that we have where money is being drained on a daily basis out of America, I can't help but wonder all the good that could be done if we had fiscal responsibility, if we had people that were looking at the realities of what this budget could do.

So I am confident as a new Democrat in this Congress that we are going to work hard to try to bring common sense to the budget to try to benefit the American people. This best-case scenario assumption is just not a fair way to go. It hasn't proven good in the

last 6 years, and I doubt very much it is going to prove good in the next 2 years.

I am happy to be part of the Blue Dog Coalition, to look for fiscal responsibility and fight for the rights of what should be done in America.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for joining us during this Special Order to discuss the President's budget, which has been delivered to Congress this week, as well as to talk about the War Accountability Act, House Resolution 97, to demand transparency, accountability and just good government, Mr. Speaker, in how we are spending the hardworking people of this country's tax money in Iraq.

There are a lot of misplaced priorities in this enormous budget. Here is the top ten list:

Number one, it includes tax increases for middle-class families.

Number two, it has cuts in it to health care and to seniors.

Number three, while it is very cold outside right now, while much of the country is frozen, if you will, Mr. Speaker, it cuts home energy assistance for those who need help the most with finding the money to afford to heat their home in the winter months.

After 5 years following 9/11, it has devastating cuts to police and firefighters.

In direct opposition to the wishes of the people of this country, here it comes again, it has a plan to privatize Social Security.

The President's budget includes cuts to veterans health care. At a time when we are creating a new generation of veterans coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan, the President's budget includes cuts to our veterans. We need to ensure that our veterans receive the health care they so desperately need.

I don't know about you, Mr. Speaker, but I get letter after letter and call after call from veterans who have to wait in line weeks and months at a time to be able to see a doctor. That is not the kind of health care we promised America's veterans. We should honor them by properly caring for them.

It includes cuts to education and cuts to housing assistance. And with Iraq veterans returning with devastating injuries, it includes cuts to the brain trauma research that is so desperately needed by many of these returning veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan.

President Bush's budget says a lot, but it does very little. It is filled with misplaced priorities. I will challenge you, Mr. Speaker, to read it for yourself, make your own decision.

As members of the Blue Dog Coalition, we are not here to beat up the President. He can't even run again. We are here to reach out across that aisle and work with him and work with the Republican Members of Congress, because the American people have sent a message very loud and clear, they want us to work together. That is what the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue

Dog Coalition is all about. We want to work in a bipartisan manner to put this Nation on a track toward a balanced budget, to pay down the debt, and to restore some fiscal discipline and common sense to our Nation's government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS.

(Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we often hear from our friends on the right that when the Democrats question the war or the strategy in Iraq, we are disheartening our troops and emboldening the enemy. I guess it doesn't matter that there are many Republicans who also ask the same questions about the war. This attempt by the right to use fear and shame to quiet the administration's critics is distasteful and, I believe, hurts America.

Those on the right who take the argument further, suggesting that folks who don't agree with the administration's policies and don't keep their views to themselves are being un-American, really saddens me. It saddens me because it seems like those on the right are trying to discourage the very actions that led to the founding of our Nation, the very actions that allowed the United States to continue evolving toward the never-ending goal of a more perfect Union.

Our country derives its strength from the diversity of views and ideas that come from its people. If one idea isn't working, then someone has the freedom to suggest another idea that is different and might yield different results. In my opinion, the ability of the American people to discuss differing ideas gives our Nation great strength.

Additionally, I believe that when Iraqi people see Americans exercising their right to freedom of speech, the Iraqi people are not disenchanted by their prospects, but rather they are inspired to have a country as free as ours. They see our freedom as a beacon of hope for what their nation could become some day.

Frankly, it is the freedom we enjoy here that scares the enemy over there so much, because they know that once the people taste freedom, they will demand it for eternity for themselves. So we should not stifle our freedom here for fear that it may be negatively impacting the war over there, which I seriously doubt it is.

Furthermore, if the actions of Senators of both parties and House Members of both parties embolden the enemy, then doesn't public opinion also embolden the enemy? Since polls show a large majority of Americans disagreeing with the administration's policy in Iraq, not the war, the administration's policy in Iraq, if this is the case, then why don't we see those on the right condemning the American people for expressing their views and emboldening the enemy? It is because

probably politically they know they can't criticize the American public. It is because it is easier to take pot shots at politicians than at everyday men and women in American society.

Additionally, if the actions of the Senate and the House and American public embolden the enemy, then I think we need to take a look at the administration. I quote: "Such statements give a morale boost to the terrorists," Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Malaki, on remarks of the Bush administration describing the Iraqi Government as being on "borrowed time." In essence, the Prime Minister of Iraq is accusing our President of emboldening the enemy by making such a statement.

I contend that the American people love America, that Democrats love America, that Republicans love America and that President Bush loves America. I contend that we all love America, and that the discussion everyone is having on Iraq right now is not an extension of their love for America, because we all want what we think is best for the country. We want success and we want security. If only we also wanted civility in Washington.

I know that once folks cross into the District of Columbia or read about something in Washington, it seems there is something triggered in their brains and our rhetoric is raised to a sensational point. We need to stop and ask ourselves, is this rhetoric helpful to the end goal, or just hurtful?

There certainly have been plenty of failures in Iraq and there is plenty of blame to spread. We should have sent in more troops, some say. We should have not disbanded the Iraqi Army. We should have kept better track of how our taxpayer dollars were being spent. We should have squashed the militias before they built a strong following, some say, and on and on.

□ 1700

I will tell you who has not failed: Our soldiers on the ground. The American soldiers won in Iraq. They defeated Saddam's Army, deposed a dictator and tore down the statue. They gave the country to the Iraqis.

Sadly, in my opinion and many others, the leaders in Washington have failed our soldiers because those in charge of Iraqi policy have been weak in dealing with the new Iraqi government, have not pushed them to find political solutions to the problems they face. The lack of political structure in Iraq falls squarely on the shoulders of the war planners, and I for one will not let the reputation of our fighting men and women be tarnished by the miscalculations of those in charge.

The question now must be, what are the next steps to bring success and security? That is our goal, is success and security.

The Blue Dog Coalition has drafted a resolution that can help us along our goals towards success and security. House Resolution 97 would improve our

accountability in Iraq so we can make sure our taxpayer dollars are being spent wisely and going where they are needed to achieve success.

In my opinion, this resolution is the first step of many steps down the path to stability and success in Iraq. I, for one, stand with our military men and women, ready and able to walk down the path of success with them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee, an active member of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition.

And the gentleman is exactly right. As members of the Blue Dog Coalition, we are sick and tired of all the partisan bickering that goes on in Washington. As members of the Blue Dog Coalition, we don't care if it is a Democratic idea or a Republican idea. All we care about is, is it a commonsense idea, and does it make sense for the people who sent us here to be their voice? That is really what the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition is all about: restoring fiscal discipline, accountability and common sense to our government.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. I thank you, Mr. Ross.

I just want to make clear, as colleagues are saying, and I want to make sure that this debate is within the right frame of mind. This is not a debate that is personally against the President. The President is a likeable person. It is just his policies. His policies are wrong for the American people. Even the American people are rising up and saying so.

We have, as Congress, the responsibility to respectfully disagree with the President. That is what we are doing. We are simply saying it is wrong to cut veterans', it is wrong to cut seniors' programs, it is wrong to cut education, it is wrong to cut the COPS program out, from getting folks in to be employed for first responders. It is wrong to cut homeland security. It is wrong to cut every single basic domestic program that is cut in this budget. It is wrong to do that.

It is wrong also for the President to say on the one hand that he is going to have a surge of 21,500 more troops, when, in fact, we now know that it is not 21,500. It is more like 48,000, according to the CBO that has just corrected that.

So when we have these kinds of situations, this is what makes this government what it is. This is what makes us the envy of the world. This is why we have this House. This is why we run every other year, why people hold us accountable, to come and to make sure that the voters and the people of America and their tax dollars, that we are good stewards of them. That is our responsibility.

And we have a right, more than that, we have a duty, to raise the tough questions and to hold the President's

feet to the fire when he comes with such a wrong-headed budget as this that goes right to the heart of where America is hurting. This is why we are here today, and this is why the Blue Dogs are offering this. This is why the Blue Dogs are also offering Resolution 98, to bring this fiscal accountability and financial accountability, to stop war profiteering, and to make sure the money goes to the soldiers so that we can take care of them while they are on the battlefield and to make sure we restore these cuts to make sure we take care of them when they come home. This budget doesn't do it, and it is our obligation to raise these questions and to make sure that this budget responds appropriately.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, if you have any comments or questions or concerns, you can e-mail us at BlueDog@mail.house.gov.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee. I so often hear that cut and run is a strategy from Democrats. That is not the case. When we finished the war in 1945, military bases were established in western Europe, in Turkey and other places throughout the world. They are still there. As we finished our endeavors, as many people thought during the Korean War, our military bases are still located in South Korea.

We will never leave the Middle East, if the American people think that is the case. What we are talking about is being able to redeploy and do certain other endeavors that have not been done to make sure we win this war, win the peace, and have success in Iraq. We will be in the Middle East for a long, long time. My great-grandchildren will still see us be there. That is an area in which we have to defend America's freedom and liberty.

But we have got to take another look at having success, because what we are doing now is not having the success the American people demand, expect and we should have for them, and our troops deserve better than that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remaining portion of my time.

PEAK OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, there are three different groups in our country and indeed worldwide at least for some of these issues that have common cause in campaigning for a reduction in the use of fossil fuels. These three groups come from very different perspectives, but as you will see from our discussions this evening they really do have common cause. Because to solve the problems

that brings them to this dialogue, all three of these groups are advocating essentially the same thing. That is, a reduction in our use of fossil fuels.

The first of these groups is a very large group which has genuine concern about national security interests. Probably 2 years ago now, or nearly that, 30 of our prominent Americans, Boyden Gray, McFarland, Jim Woolsey and 27 others, some of them senior retired military people, wrote a letter to the President saying: Mr. President, the fact that in our country we have only 2 percent of the known reserves of world oil and we use 25 percent of the world's oil, importing almost two-thirds of what we use, represents a totally unacceptable national security risk.

The President himself recognized this in his State of the Union a year ago when he noted that we get some of this oil from countries, as he said, that don't even like us very much. That is a bit of an understatement for some of those countries.

The next chart shows a recognition of this on the part of our Secretary of State. This was April 5 of last year. We do have to do something about the energy problem.

I can tell you that nothing has really taken me aback more as Secretary of State than the way that the politics of energy is, I will use the word, "warping" diplomacy around the world. We have simply got to do something about the warping now of diplomatic effort by the all-out rush for energy supply.

I am sure that in her head she had a mental picture of this really interesting map of the world. This shows what our world would look like if the size of each country was determined by its reserves of oil. And you can see how in America right here, tiny on this map of the world, we represent about less than 5 percent of the people of the world and we have only about 2 percent of the oil in the world, but we are using 25 percent of the oil.

Look how small we are. We would fit many times in Saudi Arabia. We are about the size of Qatar here. We would fit four times in Kuwait, if the size of Kuwait, if the land mass of Kuwait was relative to how much oil they have.

Russia up there, they are a big exporter now, but they can be a big exporter because they aren't using anywhere near as much as we have. You see Russia is two or three times as large as we are.

Well, that large community in our country which is genuinely concerned about national security interests understands our problems that come from this distribution of oil. Many of these oil reserves are in countries that, what we call the royal families. They are really dictatorships, aren't they? And Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia. And then in Iran, that is run as a theocracy pretty much totally controlled by the Mullahs. And here we have Venezuela, a Communist state.

The President very wisely said in that State of the Union message a year ago that we are getting oil, many of the reserves are in countries that don't even like us very much.

Now, fortunately, our imported oil doesn't come from the mix as we see it here, because we are getting oil where it is cheaper to ship it and so forth. So a lot of our oil comes from Canada. They are pretty tiny in terms of total reserves, but there aren't many people there, so they are an exporter. We get oil from Mexico, and we get oil from Venezuela simply because of economics. It is just cheaper to ship it the short distances around the world.

So this is one group that has common cause in wanting to reduce our consumption of fossil fuels, particularly oil, because we are so dependent on the rest of the world which, as Condoleezza Rice says, presents a very real national security problem.

A second group that is interested in reducing our use of these fossil fuels, particularly oil, is the group that believes that, whereas the United States reached its maximum production of oil in 1970, that the world is about to approach that point now. And if you aren't concerned about national security risks and if you aren't concerned about climate change, which is going to be the third one that we talk about, you would really be concerned about oil if you recognized that there is not going to be enough of it in the future. It is going to be a real economic problem.

What we have here, it says here, the United States production Hubbert versus Actual. This is a report from CERA, the Cambridge Energy Research Associates, who were trying to point out that M. King Hubbert was not very accurate in his prediction of what the United States would do, and therefore you shouldn't take him very seriously when he predicted the world would be peaking about now.

The average person looking at this would say that they were kind of nitpicking, because this is the Hubbert's Lower 48 Projection, this yellow line here, and the red is the actual. And of course added to the Lower 48 was our big discovery in Dead Horse and Prudhoe Bay, Alaska, and our oil discoveries in the Gulf of Mexico. Well, I think that these two curves here run pretty darned close together; and for that growing community of people that have a genuine concern about the availability of oil in the future, this chart has real meaning.

I might look at the next chart here before we move to those who are concerned about climate change. This is a chart which presents the challenge that we face from what is called peak oil, and these bars here represent the discoveries of oil. You note that the big discoveries were back in the 1960s and 1970s; and ever since 1980, on average, the discoveries have been reducing, going down, down, down.

Now, anyone who has had any math and charting and so forth in school

knows that if you draw a smooth curve over this, the area under the curve will represent the total amount of oil that we have found. Indeed, each of these represents a reservoir of oil. If you add up all these little bars, why you have the total; and that is what you do when you smooth them out. You, in effect, add them all up.

The solid dark line here represents the amount of oil that we have been using. We started out really rich, didn't we? We found this much oil, and we are just using this tiny bit down here.

□ 1715

It looked like oil was going to be forever. When would it run out? Look at how little we are using and how much there is out there.

But now look what happened. We continued to use more and more as the industrial revolution grew and as our population grew and we found more ways to use energy to make our lives comfortable. The use continued to grow and grow, but the discovery started falling off.

In 1965 or so, they started falling off, down, down, down, and that is in spite of ever better techniques for finding oil, computer modeling, 3-D seismic and so forth. We now have a pretty good idea of what the geology of the world looks like, and we will find gas and oil in only very unique geological formations. Maybe a little later this evening we will have a little chance to talk about those so you have some expectation of what we might find in the future.

Here we are now, and this is about 2007, and we have been using more oil ever since about 1980 than we have been finding. Of course, we have had lots of reserve, and we have been eating up that reserve now, until we have taken some of this to fill in this space.

Now you look to the future, and what does the future look like? We have some options of what the future looks like. One of the options we do not have, though, is pumping oil we have not found. So unless you think we are going to find more oil than this chart indicates, and of course it will not be a smooth, down curve like that. It will be up and down but generally it will be down most people recognize. Well, we can use all sorts of enhanced oil recovery techniques and pump it sooner, and you may get a little more from those enhanced recovery techniques, but you cannot pump what you have not found.

So this shows you very graphically. If you had only one graph to look at to help you understand what we are facing in terms of peak oil, this would be the graph. So you understand now why this second group is really concerned about our use of fossil fuels, particularly oil, because it is very probable that the world is going to reach its maximum production of oil, maybe has already, but if not now, very soon, and the demand for oil, which has been going up at a roughly 2 percent per

year growth is going to continue. So it is going to be an ever increasing difference between the available oil and the demand for oil.

Of course, when that happens, of course when demand exceeds supply, price goes up, and we have seen oil prices go up relatively few years ago from \$10 a barrel to \$60 a barrel now. It was just a few months ago \$78 a barrel. Kind of fear factor in that way, it went away, and it dropped very quickly \$18 a barrel. But very volatile market, up and down \$1 or more a day. Another fear factor, it could jump another \$18.

The next chart I have here is one that shows the concerns that this third group has, and that is those who are concerned about climate change. I have something I want to read here. This chart comes from this document by the way, "Stern Review: The Economics of Climate Change." It says here, "The scientific evidence is now overwhelming: climate change presents very serious global risks, and it demands an urgent global response.

"Climate change is global in its causes and consequences, and international collective action will be critical in driving an effective, efficient and equitable response on the scale required."

This international cooperation reminds me of a visit we just made. I came back just about a month ago from China. Nine of us, nine Members of Congress went over and the primary reason of the trip was to talk to them about energy. I was surprised and pleased when they began their discussion of energy by talking about post-oil. Gee, I says, they get it. Somehow a civilization that was a golden civilization when my Fore Fathers were barbarians running around Europe has a longer view of things than we seem to have. We have trouble seeing beyond the next quarterly report in our industry. We have real trouble here seeing beyond the next election. But they are looking post-oil they say. They recognize that there will be a post-oil period.

A thousand years of recorded history, we have been in the age of oil about 100, 150 years. If it is half gone and if it follows a bell curve, as it did in our country and it probably will in the world, you have probably got another 100, 150 years of oil, with ever increasing costs and ever decreasing amounts as we get the oil, which is harder and harder to get.

Climate change presents a unique challenge for economics. It is the greatest and widest ranging market failure ever seen. The benefits of strong, early action on climate change outweigh the costs they say.

So this is a little chart that shows where these gases come from. Just a moment of explanation as to why the use of oil and so forth produces climate change.

When you go out into your car this evening, if you go out, if it is parked outside and the sun is shining in, and if you go out before dark, your car will be

very much warmer inside than it is outside, and we call that the greenhouse effect. What happens is the light from the sun comes in in a very broad wavelength spectrum from very long waves to very short waves, and they go easily through your car, most of them through the car window, and then that sun heats up the material inside your car, and that reradiates in the infrared. Well, the glass is relatively impervious to infrared so it simply reflects it back, and that is called the greenhouse effect, and your car then gets warmer and warmer. You see it especially on a summer day when it may be 80 outside and 120 inside your car which is why you should not leave your children and animals inside the car when you leave it.

Well, there are gases in the atmosphere that essentially do the same thing as the glass in your automobile. You may remember riding in the airplane and you are very comfortable sitting in there at 38, 40,000 feet and the pilot tells you it is minus 40 degrees centigrade outside. That is really cold. The reason you could be so warm down here and you are so cold up here is the reflection of all this heat which is radiated back from the earth, long infrared rays, and they are reflected back. One of the things that reflects them back are gases up in the atmosphere. There a number of those gases, methane, and carbon dioxide is one of the major ones.

Of course, carbon dioxide, absolutely essential for plant life, and they are so efficient. Our oxygen is about 21 percent. We can do with maybe half of that. If you are at 18,000 feet, that is all you have got because of the atmospheric pressure there. But these plants make due on .04 percent. Do you not wish you could be as efficient as these plants? You could get by on the top of Mt. Everest very easily. You would not need to pressurize the cockpit in the aircraft you are riding in.

What stunned me in this report was when I read that our earth now is only 5 degrees centigrade, that is 9 degrees Fahrenheit, warmer than it was in the last ice age. Wow, what a huge change in climate, a relatively small change in temperature makes, just 9 degrees cooler Fahrenheit, and we had glaciers that came down to southeast Ohio. They came down that far, scooping up the dirt and from it you can see where it melted and left the mounds of gravel and dirt there where they came down that far.

Well, I am very pleased to be joined by one of the Nation's leading voices and authorities on climate change, my colleague, also from the great State of Maryland, Congressman GILCHREST.

Mr. GILCHREST. I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) for yielding and for having this time we can discuss these issues of energy, its ramifications to national security, the environment and to the economy. I would like to reiterate some of the comments that Congressman BARTLETT has made as far as energy use, and it is

a single issue, energy use, the ramifications of our energy use now is to our economy, to our national security and to our environment.

Our energy use is dependent on fossil fuel, and our whole economy then is dependent on fossil fuel. Our national security to a great extent is the ramifications of national security are as a result of where we get our fossil fuel sources from throughout the world, and fossil fuel burning has a pretty big impact on the environment. So our energy policy affects our economy, affects our national security and affects our environment.

Each of these, because it is fossil fuel, because like Mr. BARTLETT said, two-thirds of our energy sources for oil come from foreign sources, that makes our economy fragile. That makes our national security much more difficult, and the ramifications to our environment is that it degrades our environment.

What I would like to discuss here is the legacy of oil to our environment, and the environment, in particular, is our climate. The air, sea and land, upon which life exists on the planet depends to a great extent on the atmosphere, and the atmosphere, in order to support life as we know it, as Mr. BARTLETT described, has a certain heat balance to it in order for life to exist.

That heat balance that we talk about is the greenhouse effect which keeps the planet and its heat at a certain temperature in order for us to live, vegetation to grow, life in the sea to exist and life on the land.

The greenhouse effect is as a result of the chemistry of the atmosphere and the chemistry of the atmosphere, whether it is carbon, whether it is methane, whether it is oxygen or whether it is water vapor, does hold the heat of the sun's rays enough for us to have life the way we know it, the greenhouse effect.

The greenhouse effect has had huge fluctuations over the eons of time that the earth has existed. We have ice ages, we have warming trends. So throughout earth's history we have had a natural range of fluctuation to the temperature, to CO₂, to other greenhouse gases. That is a natural range. No huge rapid fluctuations in that natural range of chemicals that make up the atmosphere to hold on to the greenhouse effect.

The question is, when we debate this issue in Congress or in other political situations, are humans impacting the climate? Are humans the cause of a warming trend?

Well, let us take a look at that. Right now, is there a warming trend? I would say that every single scientist in the United States, throughout the planet who is a meteorologist or an atmospheric chemist or anybody in that scientific community, every single one of them will say that, yes, we are in a warming trend and we have been in a warming trend for the past 10,000 years.

If you could go back 10,000 years using ice cores drilled into the glaciers

in Greenland or the Antarctic, then you could see that 10,000 years ago, as Mr. BARTLETT mentioned earlier, the temperature of the planet was about 5 degrees centigrade cooler than it is now, and the value assessment of that is evaluated by the makeup of the chemistry of the atmosphere 10,000 years ago.

One of those elements in the atmosphere was carbon dioxide. If you look at carbon dioxide, you would see that 10,000 years ago, there was about 180 parts per million of CO₂ in the atmosphere.

Now let us come ahead almost 10,000 years to 1890 or 1900 and you evaluate CO₂ in the atmosphere at that point. You would see that in 10,000 years, you increased the amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere from 180 parts per million to 280 parts per million. It took the earth in its natural range of fluctuation 10,000 years to increase 100 parts per million of CO₂.

Now, let us project the next 100 years, which is essentially the industrial age. We have increased another 100 parts per million. We are now at 380 parts per million. So what took the natural forces in a natural range of fluctuation over a period of 10,000 years to increase 100 parts per million, in the industrial age we have done it in 100 years.

Now some people will say that has nothing to do with human activity, that is volcanoes, that is the natural decaying of matters, that is nature producing that 100 parts per million. The answer to that is this. You can distinguish between the kind of CO₂ that comes from volcanoes or forest fires or other natural sources from burning fossil fuel. Every human being has their own DNA marker.

□ 1730

You can tell one human being from another human being by their DNA. Carbon dioxide has a DNA; it has a marker. It is a radioactive isotope, so you can determine where this CO₂ in the atmosphere comes from. Is it coming from your automobile, or is it coming from a volcano in southeast Asia, or is it coming from a forest fire in California or Brazil?

The radioactive isotopes are markers for CO₂. It is very easily discerned that an extreme increase in CO₂ has come from human activity. What do we see as a result?

We see warmer air temperatures and warmer sea temperatures. What are some of the results of that? Sea water is warming; the atmosphere is warming. Fuel for hurricanes is warm air and warm sea water. So we are seeing a fairly dramatic increase in stronger hurricanes.

What are some of the other implications of increasing temperatures as a result of burning fossil fuel, human activity? That is sea level rise.

Sea level rise from the melting of the Arctic ice, Arctic glacier such as Greenland and the Antarctic has the

potential, in this century, to raise sea levels by 3 feet. What will that do to New York or Baltimore or Miami or all the other low-lying communities throughout the world, the Thames River in London? Sea level rise would flood the City of London. Coastal erosion, coastal communities. The insurance industry in the United States, as a result of climate change, global warming and potential increasing violent storms and sea level rise, and the insurance companies in the United States are beginning to stop their homeowners insurance coverage for these communities at risk along the gulf and Atlantic Coast. The insurance companies of the United States and Lloyd's of London, the only reinsurance company that I know of in the world that is continuing to cover these homeowners, have doubled, tripled and quadrupled their premiums to look at the risk.

The other problem with increasing CO₂ and other greenhouse gases is what it does to the actual chemical make-up of our oceans. Our oceans have a certain balance in their Ph. It is just a little bit above 7, and it has been that way for aeons of time. How long have the sharks been in the ocean? You hear on shows in television that sharks have been around for millions of years. Other creatures on our planet have been around for millions of years.

Some of the best habitat in the world for ocean creatures are coral reefs. Increasing CO₂ into the atmosphere and the world's oceans have absorbed fully half of the CO₂ that we have put into the atmosphere. The result of that, the legacy of oil, burning fossil fuel, is it makes the oceans more acidic. Ocean chemistry would change, be more acidic and more corrosive. It could destroy the vast resources we get from coral reefs by destroying the very fabric of the beginning of the ecology of the world's oceans.

Warmer temperatures we have already begun to see cause more forest fires, more infestations, more problems with agriculture. Weather patterns become more violent in some places. They become more unpredictable. The storm cycles are more violent and unpredictable. Shifting vegetation zones, we have already talked about sea level rise, habitat loss.

The Arctic ice cap at the top of the world in the last 50 years has lost 40 percent of its ice volume, 40 percent. The list of dramatic ramifications of not addressing one of the problems of the legacy of oil and our dependence on it is climate change, is global warming.

What are some of the answers to this? Well, Mr. BARTLETT has made some comments about this, but we have a bill on the Senate side, on the House side. Mr. BARTLETT is a cosponsor. JOHN OLVER from Massachusetts is a cosponsor. A number of our colleagues have gotten on this bill to try to understand the nature of this problem, at least part of our dependence on fossil fuel, which is global warming, climate change.

We think the debate is over. The debate is over because the science is clear that human activity is causing the climate to change and all those other problems or ramifications of increasing carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. We need to take action now to stop global warming. We subject our economy, our national security, our way of life to great risk and catastrophic harm. We have a bipartisan bill that will reduce the Nation's greenhouse gas emissions substantially and in a timely fashion.

We have a series of Fortune 500 companies from Alcoa to BP to Caterpillar at Duke Energy to DuPont to a number of environmental groups that support the Federal Government making a goal of reducing greenhouse gases by the year 2050 to 70 percent below 1990 levels, creating a regulatory structure to do that.

Then these companies that I just read say that the market can resolve the issue. It would create a cap and trade program with large tax incentives to unleash the ingenuity of the American free marketplace to capture the technology, which will make us much more economically viable to use efficiency, technological advances, alternative fuels. This will reduce over a period of decades not only our dependence on fossil fuel from foreign sources, not only improve our economy, not only improve our national security situation with the rest of the world, but drastically begin to improve our environment. The U.S. can take the lead in finding solutions to this seemingly intractable problem.

The Federal Government sets a goal with the regulatory structure, the market produces the results, and human ingenuity, once again, solves some of the problems. I want to thank Congressman BARTLETT for the time and for his enormous interest in this issue and his skill and expertise.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. I want to thank my colleague very much for joining us here. Congressman GILCREST mentioned market forces. They are, indeed, very powerful. They have served us very well in this country. They have provided for us the highest quality of life of any place in the world. But market forces are limited. They cannot do what they cannot do.

As I noted somewhat humorously, there are even some things that God cannot do. God can't make a square circle, for instance. The market forces are very powerful. As long as there are unlimited forces, market forces will work. I remember mentioning to one of our very high government officials the problem of limited oil supply in the future. The response was, gee, I guess the market will take care of that.

I guess when oil gets more expensive, we will use less of it, and then we will find alternatives. That is true. When oil prices get higher, we will use less of it, and we will look for alternatives.

But when you look at the potential for exploiting these alternatives, you

see that a large amount of time and energy must be invested in these alternatives before they yield any meaningful amount of replacement for the fossil fuels, which are so abundant and so energy rich.

Let me give you just one little example of some of the unintended consequences of trying to do this. This is a big push to make ethanol from corn in our country. We have noted that the Brazilians are making ethanol from sugar cane, and they now don't have to import any oil. We would like to emulate them and make enough ethanol from corn that we will not have to import oil. That, by the way, is the impossible dream. That will not happen.

With the relatively small amount of ethanol that we are now making, and there aren't very many E-85 pumps or blends of ethanol in gasoline in this part of the country, there are in the Midwest, but with the relatively small amount of ethanol that we are making, the demand for corn raised the price of corn from \$2.11 a bushel in September to \$4.08 in December. That is causing a huge problem for our people that raise animals.

We are having a meeting in a few days with a number of our dairy people from Maryland. Unless milk goes up to more, I think it is about \$14 per 100, now it needs to be at least \$18 before they can break even.

With this kind of a price for food for their animals, they will go bankrupt. So the relatively small demand for corn to make the relatively small amount of ethanol that we are making now has essentially doubled the price of corn.

What this does is to reflect the enormous amount of energy that is in these fossil fuels. There they are really energy dense. This chart shows something about what has happened to our world as a result of the incredible energy density in these fossil fuels.

Hyman Rickover, and let me get a copy of his paper, it was not really a paper, it was a talk that he gave to a group of physicians 50 years ago. The anniversary of that will be May 14 of this year, and that was at a banquet of the annual scientific assembly of the Minnesota State Medical Association. This talk had nothing to do with medicine. He apologized for that at the beginning of his talk. But he thought that the physicians might enjoy some diversion.

He was talking about the enormous fossil energy in these fuels. Hyman Rickover, of course, is the father of our nuclear submarine. I had no idea that he had given this talk. It just appeared in the Energy Bulletin December 2 of last year, 2006. So it has only been out in the general public for these couple of months.

I noted this the other night that we need to hear this again, because this is just so revealing as to what this energy has done for us. With high energy consumption goes a high standard of living. Does the enormous fossil fuel en-

ergy in this country which we control feed machines which makes each of us a master of an army of mechanical slaves? Now at that time we didn't import any, so he could say we controlled it. Now we import almost two-thirds of what we use.

Another writer has indicated the incredible amount of energy in fossil fuels in oil. Let me give you the analogies he uses, and then I will read the ones that Hyman Rickover gave in that speech 50 years ago. One barrel of oil produces the energy equivalent of 12 men working all year for you.

If you figure the price that you could hire a man, the equivalent a man to work for you, by buying \$10 of fossil fuel, of oil, it will work a full year for you. Now let me read what Hyman Rickover said 50 years ago and more so today. Man's muscle power is rated at 35 watts continuously, $\frac{1}{20}$ of a horse power. That is 24/7. You can do a little better than that when you are working, but you have to eat, sleep, so forth.

Machines, therefore, furnish every American and industrial worker with energy equivalent to that of 244 men. Wow. How many man-months of work without any energy from fossil fuels would it have taken to build your automobile?

While at least 2,000 men push his automobile along the road and his family is supplied with 33 faithful household helpers. Each locomotive engineer, he says, controls energy equivalent to that of 100,000 men. Each jet pilot of 700,000 men.

You know, thinking of that jet pilot in that plane up there just the other day, and I look at those contrails and sometimes they are the only cloud-like things in the sky, it finally occurred to me the dynamics of this CO₂ thing that Congressman GILCREST was talking about, carbon; and that is what is in these fuels, is largely carbon and hydrogen.

Carbon has a molecular weight of 12, and hydrogen has a molecular weight of 1. It is the lightest element in the universe. When you burn this carbon, it combines with oxygen, one molecule of carbon with two molecules of oxygen. Oxygen weighs 16. So what that says is, Congressman GILCREST, that if you weigh the gasoline that goes in your car, you produce three times that weight in carbon dioxide. That is incredible.

Now, all of that carbon dioxide was taken out of the atmosphere a very long time ago. I didn't know, as a little boy, where oil came from; but I did know where coal came from, because we had a coal furnace in our house, and I would have to break those big lumps of coal. We bought it just as it came out of the mine.

□ 1745

When I would break a lump of coal open, there would be a fern leaf. Nobody had to tell me where coal came from. I knew very well where it came from. It came from plants that grew a

very long time ago, they fell over under pressure and in time and they became coal.

So we were releasing incredible amounts of carbon dioxide, which is a greenhouse gas, which will change the acidity of the ocean. Fortunately carbon dioxide is very soluble in water. But it still changes the pH of the water because it forms a very weak acid, carbonic acid, when it gets in the water.

Truly, the humblest American, Admiral Rickover says, enjoys the services of more slaves than were once owned by the richest nobles, and live better than most ancient kings. In retrospect and despite wars, revolutions and disasters, the 100 years just gone by, that was 1950, that is right here, the 100 years just gone by, may well seem like a Golden Age.

And what this chart shows here is the history of the world, energy wise, for only about 400 years out of that 8,000 years that Admiral Rickover talks about. And the industrial revolution began with wood, the brown curve here, and it did not produce very many quadrillion Btus of energy, and then coal, and boy did the economy grow with coal and trains and so forth. But then look what happened. It exploded when we found gas and oil. And that is because gas and oil are so easy to change into compounds that we can readily get energy from.

And they are much more adaptable and flexible than coal. Although you can get gas and oil from coal. Hitler had to do that when we cut off his oil supplies, and under embargoes South Africa had to do that. We may be turning to that again shortly.

As I mentioned, Madam Speaker, there are three groups that really have common cause in talking about the use of these fossil fuels. One is that very large and growing group of people, including our Secretary of State, who are concerned that our growing dependence on foreign oil is a very serious national security risk.

Well, what do we do? We obviously need to use less of it. The President says we are hooked on it, we need to use less of it. And we can use less of it two ways. One. We can simply conserve and be more efficient. And we have done some of that. We can do a great deal more of that.

The second thing that we can do is to get energy from alternatives. As this chart shows, and as Dr. Rickover mentioned, there will come a time when the world will be getting less and less energy from fossil fuels, and finally at some point in history down the road, we will be getting essentially no energy from fossil fuels, because obviously they are not infinite in their supply and they will not last forever.

In 8,000 years of recorded history, the Age of Oil will represent but a blip in terms of energy production, a pretty big blip. But we are probably about halfway through the age of oil. In another 100, 150 years if M. King Hubbert is correct and we are now at the peak,

and it will be tailing off and going down the other side of what is commonly called Hubbert's Peak, oil will be ever more difficult to get and ever more costly.

In another 100, 150 years we will have transition to renewables, we will be steady-state, having used up the coal we have, having gotten all of the energy we can from these unconventional oil sources, like the tar sands of Canada and the oil shales of the United States.

The next chart looks at what obviously we need to be about. And that is addressing this problem. Now, whether you believe that we need to reduce our use of fossil fuels because it is a national security problem, whether you believe we need to reduce our use of fossil fuels because it is causing climate change, or whether you believe we need to reduce the use of fossil fuels because they are just not going to be there in the quantities that we are using today in the future, you still must do the same things.

Well, the first thing that you need to do is to buy some time. We now, knowing that we should have known at least by 1980 that we were going to be here today, because we were already 10 years down the other side of our Hubbert's Peak in this country, and M. King Hubbert had already predicted that the world would be peaking about now.

For these last 27 years, we should have been addressing this problem and investing energy and time in alternatives. Unfortunately, we in large measure have not done that. And so today we are faced with a problem. We have no excess oil, no excess oil energy to invest in alternatives. If there were any excess it would not be \$55, \$60 a barrel. And we have essentially run out of time.

Now, we can buy some time and free up some oil with an aggressive program in conservation. And you really can do that. Europe is using half the energy that we use. It would be hard to argue that they do not live as comfortably as we do. The average Californian uses 65 percent of the electricity that we use. And there are 50 some of those in our Congress. I doubt that any would agree that they live less well than we do, and they still use a lot less energy than we use.

What we need to do then is use it wisely. What will we do with this energy that we freed up and the time that we have bought by this aggressive conservation program? We have to invest that wisely in alternatives.

Now whichever of these camps that you come from, whether it is the climate change camp, or the camp that is concerned that we are too dependent on foreign oils, that is going to be a big national security risk, or whether you believe that we need to move from fossil fuels to alternatives simply because there are going to be less and less, and more and more expensive fossil fuels in the future, you still want to do essentially the same thing.

Enormous benefits can accrue from this. Congressman GILCHREST mentioned the enormous creativity and entrepreneurship of our people. We put a man on the moon in less than a decade. When you realize where we started from, that was a really big feat. We can do this. We were challenged to do that.

Today, the average American does not know that oil is probably limited in its future supply. They probably are unaware, today is an interesting day to talk about the potential for global warming, because it is the coldest day that we have had this winter. But I understand it is 20 degree above normal in Alaska and 20 degrees above normal today in Russia.

I just wanted to make a comment about some of the potentially unexpected consequences of this climate change. If you look at a globe, you will see that England is way up there, about mid Canada. And I had to stop for a refueling flight in Ireland. That really is the Emerald Isle, it is so green. And that has a climate like, what, South Carolina. How can you have a climate like South Carolina at a latitude of central Canada?

The reason for that is a huge conveyor belt that carries heat from the tropics to the British Isles and Europe. And that huge conveyor belt is called the Gulf Stream. And the Gulf Stream picks up heat in the Gulf area near the equator, and it then carries that like a giant conveyor belt up to the British Isles and Europe.

They have a very moderate climate compared to what they would have in the absence of the Gulf Stream. Now, water is not piling up there around Europe and England, so it is obvious that if it flows up there and carries that heat up there, it has got to come back.

It comes back by going down. And why does it go down? We will talk about that in just a moment. Then it comes back flowing in just a large as volume and just as fast, it comes back to the lower part of this big conveyor belt. Again in the tropics, picking up more heat, and continues this transfer of heat to the British Isles and England.

Well, a very interesting thing is happening to this conveyor belt. The waters as they flow north, they are warm. And the sun shines on them, and water evaporates. And when the water evaporates, it leaves the salt there. And that makes the water more salty and heavier. And of course that is what produces the rains that then drops in our mountains and produces the indirect solar energy from the waterfalls that we use the turbines in to produce electricity.

Well, two things are happening. A major one is the fact that the polar ice cap is melting. And a lot of that fresh water, water without saline in it, very light compared to this heavy water, it is in addition to the general global warming of the oceans, it is the effect of this polar ice cap melting. And

strangely the melting of the polar ice cap may so dilute the waters in the Gulf Stream that they do not become dense enough to drop down to continue this conveyor belt on back down to the tropics.

The Gulf Stream could stop. If the Gulf Stream slows down appreciably, or if it stopped, the climate in the British Isles and in Europe would be very, very different than it is today.

Now, if we were in Siberia talking about global warming and so forth, we may have a very different view of it. It might be hard to convince me that a little global warming might not be good if I lived in Siberia. But noting that just this 9-degree Fahrenheit, 5 degrees Centigrade change from the Ice Age has produced the incredible climate changes that we see from that time to this, you see the potential for really devastating climate changes as a result of very modest changes in temperature. Congressman GILCHREST.

Mr. GILCHREST. If the gentleman would yield just for a second on the issue of the Gulf Stream and the conveyor belt. As Mr. BARTLETT described the conveyor belt, it is part of this whole system of the climate that we are used to, because it creates this heat balance that humans over the last thousands of years have become used to in North America and especially Europe and England.

Mr. BARTLETT talked about Ireland being just about on the same latitude as northern Labrador, but has a much warmer climate. That is partly based on the fact that ocean currents bring warm air to that particular region.

With global warming, the ice cap on Greenland, which is about 600,000 square miles. The ice cap about 20 years ago was melting at a rate of about 20 cubic miles on an annual basis. About 5 years ago, it was melting at the rate of about 50 some cubic miles.

Today, it is 80 cubic miles of free water flowing into the northern part of the north Atlantic Ocean, putting what Mr. BARTLETT described, more fresh water, less likely to sink or drop and create the pump that drives the conveyor belt.

So the unexpected climate changes, instead of the potential for a much warmer climate in Europe, especially northern Europe, there is a slight chance because of global warming that you could have a much colder climate in northern Europe, the British Isles as a result of the fresh water pouring into the north Atlantic from the melting of the glaciers to stop this conveyor belt from functioning, the unpredictability of this climate change as a result of our dependence on foreign sources of oil and burning fossil fuel.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, Congressman GILCHREST and I have both been twice to Antarctica. One of those trips we made together. We are on the Science Committee. We have a large experiment station down there right at the pole. When you go to

Antarctica, that is a continent that nobody owns. I think Argentina claims they own it, and Russia claims they own it, but nobody honors those statements. It is an international area.

It has got ice piled nearly 2 miles high. So high and so heavy that it has actually pushed the continent down a little bit under it. 90 percent of all the world's ice is in Antarctica, and 70 percent of all the world's fresh water. You take our Great Lakes and all of the relatively thin ice at the North Pole and Greenland, that is relatively thin compared to nearly 2 miles in Antarctica.

So we have 90 percent of the ice down there and 70 percent of the fresh water. And Congressman GILCHREST mentioned that the oceans would rise maybe 3 feet with the melting of the glacial cap in Greenland and so forth and in the Arctic. If all of the ice melted, that would take a very long time, that is not going to happen tomorrow because there is a whole lot of it there.

But if all of the ice melted in Antarctica, I am told that the oceans would rise 200 feet.

□ 1800

Now, that would really, really change our world because I don't know what percent of our population lives within 200 feet altitude of the ocean. I suspect it is more than 50 percent, if you look around the world of the people that live at less than 200 feet altitude.

Now, there is an interesting ocean current that goes around Antarctica, talking about ocean currents and their affect on climates, that is the circumpolar current. And what it does is it keeps the, like our gulf stream, it will either let the cold air down if it is further south or keep it from coming down if it is further north. This circumpolar stream around the Pole keeps the northern, down there, of course, it is northern waters that are warm, it keeps the northern waters from coming down into Antarctica. And if something happened that stopped that circumpolar stream, the Antarctica polar ice cap might melt much more quickly than we anticipate that it might melt.

As an indication of how much these ocean currents affect climate, about 5 years ago, I guess it was, an iceberg broke off down in Antarctica, which was the size of Delaware. And in spite of the circumpolar current, some northern warm waters do get through it and down there to temper the climate a little, and that usually melts the sea ice enough so that they could get a boat in that is full of diesel fuel to McMurdo, which is where the main station is. You fly from there to the Pole. And because that big iceberg the size of Delaware blocked the flow of this water that year, and that was 4 years ago, it was so cold there that the sea ice didn't melt, and the closest they could get, with the help, by the way, of a Russian ice-breaker, the closest they could get was 3 miles out, so they laid a hose 3 miles across the ice to fill their tanks at McMurdo.

By the way, Congressman, one of the things that amazed me there, when I was down there the sun was shining all day long and the wind blew incessantly. I didn't see any solar panels down there, and I didn't see any wind machines down there. In the summer down there, in their summer, our winter, they could clearly make all of their energy from the wind and from solar. It just reflects the President's wise observation that we are hooked on oil. We are so hooked on oil that we are really quite irrational in our use of it. You had a comment?

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. BARTLETT and I have been down there twice, the first time I went was probably about 10 years ago, and the supply ship to get to McMurdo station had to break ice. I believe it was about 12 miles from open water to McMurdo. And then after the ice shelf or that huge chunk of the glacier broke off about the size of Delaware, it was close to 30-something miles that they had to break that ice from open water all the way to McMurdo station. So a few degrees, a few changes have some pretty significant dramatic events.

On just a lighter note, on one of those trips, I can't remember which one it was, we went to watch the penguins. The first time I was in the Antarctic they didn't have that far to go to get to open water. The Adelie penguins, the second time, as a result of the increasing ice because it was blocked, had to go miles and miles and miles, and unfortunately it really reduced the population of those Adelie penguins in that part of the Ross ice shelf.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. They have a very interesting rookery down there; we enjoyed seeing it. Both times I was down we went out to the rookery to see the penguins. The big Emperor penguins, they didn't like us; they waddled off. And they scoot along on their bellies when they are moving fast, by the way, rather than marching.

I am very pleased to have been joined by Congressman GILCHREST. And again I want to emphasize that we have three groups that have a common cause: those that are concerned about oil and national security, those that are concerned about the excessive use of fossil fuels and the climate change that may very well result from that, and those of us, and I am with all of those groups actually, but I am particularly concerned about the fact that we may muddle through the national security thing and somehow God may save us from the global warming, but nothing is going to save us if there really is a limited supply of oil.

So, I am very pleased to be joined by my colleague, and I join all of those in these three camps. We really do have common cause. Please join and help us do the right thing.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LAMPSON (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. ROYCE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCDERMOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SPRATT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PAUL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, today and February 7.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 7, 2007, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

510. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

511. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

512. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report including matters relating to the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2291-4; (H. Doc. No. 110-12); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

513. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-677, "D.C. Housing Authority Rent Supplement Temporary Amendment Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

514. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-676, "School Without Walls Development Project Temporary Amendment Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

515. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-674, "National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Grant Authority Temporary Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

516. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-675, "Fiscal Year 2007 Operating Cash Reserve and Revised Revenue December Allocation Temporary Act of 2007," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

517. A letter from the Deputy Archivist, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Use of NARA Facilities [NARA-06-0005] (RIN: 3095-AB55) received December 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

518. A letter from the Director, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, transmitting pursuant to the requirements of Section 4 of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, the Office's annual Performance and Accountability Report for FY 2006; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

519. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Implementation of Title II of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 — Reporting & Best Practices (RIN: 3206-AK55) received December 22, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

520. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Awards (RIN: 3206-AL06) received January 9, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

521. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Amendment [USCG-2001-10881] (RIN: 1625-AA36) received January 29, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

522. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report entitled, "Fundamental Properties of Asphalts and Modified Asphalts-II" submitted in accordance with Section 6016(e) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA), Pub. L. 102-240, and Section 5117(b)(5) of the Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century (TEA-21) and the extension of those provisions through FY 2006; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

523. A letter from the American Legion, transmitting the financial statement and independent audit of The American Legion proceedings of the 88th annual National Convention of the American Legion, held in Salt Lake City, Utah from August 25-31, 2006 and a report on the Organization's activities for the year preceding the Convention, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 49; (H. Doc. No. 110-10); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky (for himself, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky):

H.R. 833. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income interest received on loans secured by agricultural real estate and rural housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELLESER:

H.R. 834. A bill to provide permanent relief from the marriage penalty under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 835. A bill to reauthorize the programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for housing assistance for Native Hawaiians; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GALLEGLEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. PENCE):

H.R. 836. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to better assure cyber-security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GALLEGLEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. PENCE):

H.R. 837. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect youth from exploitation by adults using the Internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself and Mr. CANNON):

H.R. 838. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Bureau of Land Management parcels known as the White Acre and Gambel Oak properties and related real property to Park City, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 839. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility of enlarging the Arthur V. Watkins Dam Weber Basin Project, Utah, to provide additional water for the Weber Basin Project to fulfill the purposes for which that project was authorized; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. CARSON (for herself, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. LEE, and Mr. RENZI):

H.R. 840. A bill to amend the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to consolidate the housing assistance programs for homeless persons under title IV of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 841. A bill to amend the Federal charter of the Military Order of the Purple Heart of the United States of America, Incorporated, to authorize the corporation to extend eligibility for associate membership in the corporation to the spouse and siblings of a recipient of the Purple Heart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORWOOD:

H.R. 842. A bill to provide for enhanced Federal, State, and local assistance in the enforcement of the immigration laws, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, to authorize appropriations to carry out the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 843. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide to employers a tax credit for compensation paid during the period employees are performing service as members of the Ready Reserve or the National Guard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 844. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to employers for the value of the service not performed during the period employees are performing service as members of the Ready Reserve or the National Guard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. PENCE):

H.R. 845. A bill to improve and consolidate the law relating to restitution in criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. PENCE):

H.R. 846. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraud in connection with major disaster or emergency funds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 847. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that amounts paid for employer-provided coverage under accident or health plans be included on W-2 Forms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORTUÑO:

H.R. 848. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize assistance to combat HIV/AIDS in certain countries of the Caribbean region; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 849. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Secretary of the Treasury to notify the Secretary of Homeland Security of employer returns showing the employment of individuals not authorized to be employed in the United States and to notify the employers that they must terminate the employment of those employees, to provide an opportunity for those employees to contest the information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and 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. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 850. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a procedure for determining whether individuals who are not authorized to be employed in the United States are so employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and 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. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 851. A bill to modify the law with respect to the death penalty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 852. A bill to prohibit the obtaining of customer information from telecommuni-

cations carriers by false pretenses, and the sale or disclosure of such records obtained by false pretenses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

H.R. 853. A bill to promote preventive health care for Americans; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CASTOR, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. WATSON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. SHEAPORTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BACA, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 854. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to eligible entities to prevent or alleviate the effects of youth violence in eligible urban communities by providing violence-prevention education, mentoring, counseling, and mental health services to children and adolescents in such communities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. POE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 855. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve the criminal law relating to terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mrs. CAPPS, and Ms. CLARKE):

H.R. 856. A bill to honor Susan B. Anthony by celebrating her legacy on the third Monday in February; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. McNULTY:

H.R. 857. A bill to clarify the rules of origin for certain textile and apparel products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MELANCON (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. JINDAL):

H.R. 858. A bill to amend the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 to authorize the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide additional assistance to State and local governments for utility costs resulting from the provision of temporary housing units to evacuees from Hurricane Katrina and other hurricanes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SALAZAR:

H.R. 859. A bill to establish the Sangre de Cristo National Heritage Area in the State of

Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SOLIS:

H.R. 860. A bill to designate certain public land as wilderness and certain rivers as wild and scenic rivers in the State of California, to designate Salmon Restoration Areas, to establish the Sacramento River National Recreation Area and Ancient Bristlecone Pine Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 861. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a national standard in accordance with which nonresidents of a State may carry concealed firearms in the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 862. A bill to provide for the return of the Fresnel Lens to the lantern room atop Presque Isle Light Station Lighthouse, Michigan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 863. A bill to improve communications interoperability for emergency response; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. TOWNS (for himself and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 864. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for reimbursement of certified midwife services and to provide for more equitable reimbursement rates for certified nurse-midwife services; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 865. A bill to grant rights-of-way for electric transmission lines over certain Native allotments in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CANNON, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.J. Res. 22. A joint resolution proposing an amendment the Constitution of the United States relating to marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Arthur Schomburg should be recognized for his leadership and contributions in documenting, recording, and researching the historical contributions to society of peoples of African descent and for his efforts to combat racial and ethnic discrimination in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution recognizing the contributions of the New York Public Library's Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture in educating the people of the United States about the African-American migration experience, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Madame

C. J. Walker should be recognized for her achievements in business, her inventions, and her commitment the African-American community; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Zora Neale Hurston should be recognized for her achievements as a novelist and anthropologist, and for her contributions to the Harlem Renaissance movement; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WEINER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DENT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H. Res. 128. A resolution urging the Department of Health and Human Services to prepare a long-term, comprehensive plan to medically monitor all individuals who were exposed to the toxins of Ground Zero following the terrorist attacks of 9/11 and to treat all those sick or injured; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 129. A resolution electing officers of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. CARSON (for herself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BUYER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. HILL):

H. Res. 130. A resolution congratulating the National Football League champion Indianapolis Colts for winning Super Bowl XLI and for bringing the City of Indianapolis and the State of Indiana their first Lombardi Trophy; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MEEK of Florida (for himself, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MACK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. KELLER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Ms. CASTOR):

H. Res. 131. A resolution recognizing and honoring the lifetime contributions of Rafael Jose Diaz-Balart on the dedication of the Rafael Diaz-Balart Hall at the Florida International University College of Law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 132. A resolution recognizing and honoring the life and achievements of Constance Baker Motley, a judge for the United States District Court, Southern District of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

5. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 248 memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to amend the definition of "Physician" in the Medicaid program to include Podiatric Physicians; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 288 memori-

alizing the Congress of the United States to increase funding to dredge Michigan's Deep-Draft Great Lakes Ports and Waterways; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 313 memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve full federal funding for the barriers designed to protect the Great Lakes from Asian Carp; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 266 memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the Hearing Aid Assistance Tax Credit Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 26: Mr. WAMP and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 73: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 82: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 137: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. SPACE, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. SARBANES, and Ms. CASTOR.

H.R. 156: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 177: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 180: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. OLVER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 184: Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 196: Mr. JINDAL and Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 197: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 211: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. MCCARTHY of California.

H.R. 224: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 225: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 232: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 270: Mrs. DRAKE.

H.R. 273: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 303: Mr. ALLEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SPACE, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 327: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 353: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 369: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. HARE.

H.R. 395: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 400: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 418: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. POE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. FALBOMAVAEGA, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 458: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 460: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 464: Ms. CASTOR and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 468: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 473: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 493: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 500: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 512: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. WATSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WALSH of New York.

H.R. 524: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 526: Mr. GORDON and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 544: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 545: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 549: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

H.R. 556: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 566: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 567: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 569: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 579: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 582: Mr. HARE.

H.R. 584: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 590: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 592: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 594: Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 607: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 620: Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 621: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 622: Mr. MEEK of Florida and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 623: Mr. WYNN, Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 624: Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 631: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas and Mr. SHADDEGG.

H.R. 645: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 654: Mr. PAUL, Ms. LEE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 657: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 659: Mr. DENT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 664: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 667: Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. STARK, and Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 676: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 678: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 692: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 695: Mr. YARMOUTH and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 698: Mr. BOREN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. JORDAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 699: Mr. TERRY and Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 700: Mr. KAGEN.

H.R. 711: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. DRAKE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. GINGREY.

H.R. 714: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 720: Mr. KAGEN, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. NADLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. ARCURI.

H.R. 721: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. BOREN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. WU, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. RENZI, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 724: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 725: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 758: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.

H.R. 759: Ms. WATSON and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 768: Mr. BONNER and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 769: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BONNER, Mr. REGULA, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 780: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 782: Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H.R. 787: Mr. HARE.

H.R. 800: Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 811: Ms. BEAN, Mr. HARE, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. CASTOR.

H.R. 819: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 820: Mr. PICKERING.

H.J. Res. 3: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BOSWELL, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.J. Res. 18: Mr. HALL of New York.

H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. BACA.

H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. NADLER, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H. Con. Res. 39: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. BACA, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 46: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. HIRONO.

H. Res. 25: Mr. GRJALVA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. WEXLER.

H. Res. 55: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H. Res. 71: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 72: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Res. 87: Mr. HARE, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H. Res. 97: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. HARE, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Ms. CASTOR, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. HODES.

H. Res. 100: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BACA, Ms. WATSON, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H. Res. 119: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GORDON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. HARE.